

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 17: GSR030 Offshore DC Connections

Date: 02 September 2025

Contact Details

Chair: [Deborah Spencer](#), Deborah.spencer@neso.energy

Proposer: [Bieshoy Awad](#), Bieshoy.Awad@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Chair welcomed Workgroup members to the meeting, confirmed that quorum was achieved, and provided an overview of the meeting's objectives. Workgroup Members were reminded of their duties and responsibilities. The agenda included reviewing the Workgroup Consultation document, the GSR030 Flow Chart, and discussing the option of splitting the 3 defects into 2 separate proposals.

Split Proposal Possibility

The Proposer led the discussion on splitting the Proposal, explaining the idea of separating defect 1 from defects 2 and 3 into different proposals. This approach would allow defect 1, which is nearly ready for submission, to progress independently, while providing additional time for further development and discussion regarding defects 2 and 3.

An update was provided on the Workgroup's progress, focusing on two main questions: the allowable loss of infeed risk for a single offshore converter and the definition of a single converter. The Workgroup concluded that the loss of infeed risk for a single offshore DC converter should be increased to 1800MW (from 1320MW). The implementation of this change is straightforward and does not have retrospective implications. The second question concerning the definition of a single converter prompted an in-depth discussion regarding situations where cables are located in close proximity. It was agreed that this topic requires further discussions and will be revisited in subsequent meetings.

The Workgroup discussed the benefits of splitting the proposals to expedite the process and avoid delays. There was general agreement for this approach, but concerns were raised about the legal implications and the need for clear governance from NESO Legal. The Chair advised Workgroup members that once a legal position had been confirmed by the NESO legal team, they would update the Workgroup with next steps.

Public

GSR030 Flow Chart

The Proposer took the Workgroup through a flow chart that was created on the back of an action to develop scenarios to understand the impact of the Proposal on existing parties connected to a subsea cable. The focus was on how the Proposal would affect the assessment and maintenance of existing cables, particularly in relation to the risk of damage from external mechanical events such as ships dragging their anchors. Regular surveys are conducted to assess the condition of the cables, and the data from these surveys is used for insurance purposes.

The discussion then turned to the methodology employed for predicting the probability of cable damage. It was clarified that while the survey itself does not directly estimate probability, it generates critical data that can be incorporated into the Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) methodology to evaluate risk levels. Members also considered whether all operators adhere to a standardised process and examined the respective roles of cable owners and operators in conducting these assessments.

The meeting also addressed the procedures for evaluating the risk of cable damage when new subsea cables are installed in close proximity to existing infrastructure. Discussion focused on calculating both the probability of damage to individual cables and the combined probability of incidents affecting multiple cables. The adopted methodology involves benchmarking these probabilities against established standards, such as the likelihood of a switch fault to determine whether additional risk assessment is warranted.

A detailed explanation of the steps involved in the assessment process was discussed, including identifying relevant cables, conducting detailed assessments, and determining the need for further reinforcement or modifications. The importance of considering the shared subsea cable route and notifying NESO about it was emphasised. The process also includes assessing the impact on the transmission system and determining if any operational restrictions are needed.

The Workgroup also considered the introduction of potential physical restrictions, such as the designation of no-fishing zones, to enhance protection for subsea cables. It was acknowledged that, while this measure could be beneficial, its implementation feasibility and the need for engagement with relevant government agencies warrant further examination.

Workgroup Consultation Review

The Chair guided the Workgroup through the Workgroup Consultation document, systematically addressing comments and proposed additions, including supplementary text and relevant footnotes. Throughout the discussion, the necessity for clarity and the inclusion of comprehensive information for stakeholders was emphasised throughout the meeting.

There was a comprehensive discussion regarding the procedures for reclassification and the distinct roles of the STC and the SQSS. The Proposer clarified that the STC outlines the processes

Public

by which requirements are met, whereas the SQSS defines the required outcomes. The group also addressed concerns about the fairness of the STC process, and the Proposer agreed to incorporate additional information on commercial risks into the document.

Concerns were expressed regarding the consistency with which OFTOs adhere to the established processes defined in the STC, as any deviation could compromise the integrity and reliability of the transmission network. Additionally, questions were raised about potential inequities or discriminatory practices under the current Grid Code and CUSC frameworks. It was suggested that the consultation include a specific question addressing instances of poor practice and the mechanisms required to resolve them. The Proposer further clarified that the Proposal has the potential to deliver substantial consumer benefits, underscoring the importance of these changes.

Next Steps

- Chair and Proposer to request legal advice on splitting the modification with a view to taking it to the next SQSS Panel.
- Chair to send a poll to Workgroup members to identify the best date for the next Workgroup meeting and send invite.
- The Workgroup Consultation to be updated and shared with Workgroup members for review.
- The next Workgroup will continue to review the Workgroup Consultation and the draft legal text.

Actions

For the full action log, click [here](#).

Action Number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
20	WG4	BA/FW	Compile text to cover ToR 3 Consider retrospective impact on existing cables.	WG15	Propose to close WG17
29	WG6	NN/LC	Slides from WG 5 were to be reviewed and updated before sharing with the Workgroup for publication.	WG15	Propose to close WG17
39	WG7	BA/SQSS Panel	Offshore Transmission Owners to be contacted about the likelihood of mechanical failures (which can be managed	WG15	Propose to close WG17

Public

			confidentially) for the Proposer to assess.		
42	WG10	BA/TP	Discuss scope with Panel and confirm	WG15	Propose to close WG17
46	WG12	All	Workgroup to review and decide if Annex 3 (including draft proposal for STC) should be deleted from the report.	WG17	Propose to close WG17
54	WG15	BA/GG	To discuss the 5 options included on the Workgroup Consultation Report	WG17	Open
55	WG15	BA/SB	Check with legal team regarding the definition of "shared subsea cable route" and its implications	WG17	Open
57	WG16	BA/AU	Arrange a meeting and develop a table that outlines the impacts on various circuit types.	WG17	Open
58	WG16	BA	To draft wording re: "DC high speed isolator"	WG17	Open
59	WG16	BA/LJ/Ross	To arrange meeting to discuss "Offshore Transmission Circuit" Definition	WG17	Open
60	WG16	BA/SB/DS	To update legal text from the meeting and forward to Workgroup Members to review and give feedback as required.	WG17	Open
61	WG17	BA	Following the meeting discussions, consider wording and update the Workgroup Consultation	WG18	Open
62	WG17	AU	Clarify GG comments offline.	WG18	Open

Public

63	WG17	BA/ Chair	Consult with NESO legal on splitting modification	WG18	Open
----	------	-----------	---	------	------

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Deborah Spencer	DS	NESO	Chair
Jess Rivalland	JR	NESO	Technical Secretary
Bieshoy Awad	BA	NESO	Proposer
Steve Baker	SB	NESO	NESO Rep
Andrew Urguhart	GG	SSE	Workgroup Member
Ben Marshall	BM	SSE	Workgroup Member Alternate
Claire Hynes	CH	RWE Renewables	Observer
Darren Jones	DJ	Hitachi Energy	Workgroup Member
Garth Graham	GG	SSE	Workgroup Member
Mick Chowns	MC	RWE Renewables	Observer
Nigel Platt	NP	Siemens Energy	Workgroup Alternate
Roddy Wilson	RW	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member
Roger Carter	RC	OFTO	Workgroup Member
Xiao-Ping Zhang	XPZ	Birmingham.ac	Workgroup Member