

Public

Code Administrator Meeting

Summary

Workgroup Meeting 20: GSR030 'Offshore DC Connections'

Date: 19 February 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Deborah Spencer, deborah.spencer@neso.energy

Proposer: Bieshoy Awad, bieshoy.awad@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Chair confirmed that the purpose of Workgroup meeting 20 was to confirm the updated timeline and continue a detailed review of the Workgroup Consultation document.

Timeline Update

The Chair outlined the updated timeline, including the inclusion of a potential additional Workgroup (21) if agreement could not be reached. A provisional Workgroup Consultation period of 03 to 24 March 2026 was discussed, with the intention of moving to the Workgroup Consultation stage if enough progress was made.

Workgroup Consultation Review

The Chair emphasised the importance of progressing through the Workgroup Consultation document rather than revisiting previous discussions, noting that all Workgroup Members would have the opportunity to provide views during the Workgroup Consultation period.

The Chair confirmed that no comments had been received on the shared-area version of the Workgroup Consultation document, but that a revised version with comments had been submitted shortly before the meeting. The NESO SME shared the updated document, and the Workgroup agreed to review comments sequentially, addressing issues as they arose and accepting changes where there was no objection.

Retrospectivity

A Workgroup Member raised concerns regarding retrospective application of the proposal, particularly the implications for projects that were already well advanced in design or procurement. The Proposer stated that while the proposal was retrospective in intent, it was not

Public

expected to trigger retrospective works in practice. The wording of the Workgroup Consultation was amended to reflect that this view represented the Proposer’s position. Discussion highlighted concerns about late-stage design changes, cost impacts, and regulatory uncertainty.

Probability Thresholds and Standards

A Workgroup Member queried why explicit probability thresholds were not defined. The Proposer explained that specific numerical thresholds had not been included to avoid constraining future projects or binding developers to fixed values, instead allowing project-specific judgement. Several Workgroup Members expressed concern that the absence of defined thresholds created uncertainty.

The Proposer stated that their preferred approach would be the development of an industry standard, potentially through the ENA, based on existing CBRA methodology. A Workgroup Member confirmed that their organisation was an ENA Member and could explore raising such a standard. It was acknowledged that NESO could not initiate this directly. The Chair noted concerns about timescales and whether the Workgroup Consultation could proceed without the standard being in place.

Accidental vs Intentional Damage

A Workgroup Member requested clarity that the proposal addressed accidental or unintentional damage only, and not malicious acts. The Proposer confirmed that intentional acts were out of scope and that the proposal focused on accidental common-mode failures. It was agreed that multiple references to ‘accidental’ throughout the document would be reviewed, with a single clarifying statement to be added near the start of the document.

Cable Classification, Mitigation, and Responsibility

The Proposer explained that where a new cable introduced additional system risk, responsibility for mitigation would sit with the new party, stating that existing assets would not be retrospectively penalised for risks introduced by later connections. Several Workgroup Members tested this position through discussing scenarios involving burial depth, seabed movement, and unanticipated changes in risk. The Proposer reiterated that the proposal intended to ensure that additional system risk introduced by new connections would be addressed by those connections.

Offshore Transmission Licensees

Public

The Proposer referred to a section within the Workgroup Consultation addressing implications for offshore transmission licensees. The Chair requested that all Workgroup Members review this section ahead of the next Workgroup meeting and provide comments. Workgroup Members noted that cost recovery, reclassification, and enforcement mechanisms were governed by existing regulatory frameworks and were not being redefined by this modification.

Next Steps

The Chair confirmed that the Workgroup Consultation would be paused, as further work was required in relation to risk treatment, standards, and clarity within the Workgroup Consultation document. The Proposer confirmed that they would also discuss with a Workgroup Member the potential development of an industry standard and consideration of alternative approaches should that route not be viable. The Chair also noted that The Proposer would continue attempts to engage with the Regulator to obtain direction on the issues raised.

The Chair confirmed that the updated Workgroup Consultation document, including comments received shortly before the meeting, would be circulated to all Workgroup Members. All Workgroup Members were asked to review the section addressing implications for offshore transmission licensees ahead of the next meeting on 10 March 2026.

Actions

Action Number Raised	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
55	WG15	BA/SB	Check with legal team regarding the definition of "shared subsea cable route" and its implications	WG17	Open
56	WG15	BA/SB	Confirm with legal team the classification of offshore transmission circuits and their compliance with Chapter 2 of the SQSS.	WG17	Open
61	WG17	BA	Following the meeting discussions, consider wording and update the Workgroup Consultation	WG18	Ongoing

Public

62	WG17	BA/DC	Clarify GG comments offline.	WG18	Open
63	WG20	BA	Draft section clarifying accidental vs intentional damage.	WG21	Open
64	WG20	RW	Explore raising ENA standard for cable risk mitigation.	WG21	Open
65	WG20	DS/BA	Review remaining document comments offline.	WG21	Open
66	WG20	All	Review 'implications for offshore transmission licensees' section.	WG21	Open
67	WG20	DS	Issue updated Workgroup Consultation document.	WG21	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Deborah Spencer	DS	NESO	Chair
Matthew Larreta	ML	NESO	Technical Secretary
Bieshoy Awad	BA	NESO	Proposer
Fiona Williams	FW	NESO	Proposer (Alternate)
Andrew Urquhart	AU	SSE	Workgroup Alternate
Benjamin Marshall	BM	SSEN-T	Workgroup Member
Jonathon Hoggarth	JH	EDF	Workgroup Observer
Nicola Barberis Negra	NBN	Ørsted	Workgroup Member
Nigel Platt	NP	Siemens Energy	Workgroup Alternate
Roddy Wilson	RW	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member
Roger Carter	RC	Transmission Investment	OFTO
Simon Allison	SA	EDF Power	Workgroup Observer
Stephen Baker	SB	NESO	NESO Representative