

Public

Code Administrator Meeting Summary

Workgroup Meeting 5: GSR035 System Access Reform: Review of the operational requirements on the Onshore Systems

Date: 20 May 2026

Contact Details

Chair: Lurrentia Walker, Lurrentia.walker@neso.energy

Proposer: Dozie Nnabuife, Dozie.Nnabuife@neso.energy

Key areas of discussion

The Chair welcomed the Workgroup members and observers to Workgroup 5 and gave a brief outline of the agenda.

Objectives and Timeline

The Chair discussed the timeline for GSR035 modification, highlighting the target date for issuing the Workgroup Consultation as 22 May.

Action Log Review

Action 03: (Closed) The Workgroup agreed to close Action 3 because the issue had already been addressed at the previous meeting and the consultation had been updated accordingly. It was confirmed that the interpretation of “unacceptable overloading” should remain as currently defined in the SQSS. The view was that any further clarification of that term was outside the scope of this modification and would need to be considered separately.

Action 13: (Closed) Proposed for closure along with Actions 15–19 on the basis that these were updates already provided at previous meetings. No further substantive discussion on Action 13 was recorded in this extract, so the summary is that it was considered complete through prior updates and closed on that basis.

Action 14: (Closed) The Workgroup’s agreed position was that it should be understood as currently defined in the SQSS. The panel view was that further definition was outside the scope of this modification and would need to be considered separately, potentially through another modification.

Action 15, 16, 17, 18, 19: (Closed) Due to updates already given at previous meetings

Action 21: (Closed) Updates at the previous workgroup meeting and linked into the workgroup consultation.

Action 22: (Open) Related modifications for the other codes have not yet been raised, although there has already been some discussion on this point. The Workgroup agreed to revisit it at the end of the meeting.

Action 23: (Closed) The Workgroup agreed to allow for any further comments on the consultation and annexes, after which the action could be treated as complete.

Action 24: (Closed) Action 24 was to be covered during that meeting, after which the action would be closed.

Public

Terms of Reference

The Workgroup reviewed the consultation against the terms of reference to check that all required points had been covered. A Workgroup member suggested it would be useful to walk through each item individually rather than assume everything had been addressed. During that review, item C was specifically raised, and a Workgroup member noted that an important point needed to be made clearer in the consultation paper, as it had only become apparent when reading Appendix K in detail.

Review Workgroup Consultation

The Workgroup reviewed the draft workgroup consultation report (and supporting outputs) focusing on how governance requirements are addressed and on clarifying the structure and purpose of the risk-based assessment approach within the SQSS framework.

Discussions considered whether the terms of reference had been met and how key methodological concepts should be interpreted and documented. Significant time was also spent reviewing the consultation document and appendix to improve clarity, consistency, and readiness for publication. The Workgroup further considered the proposed governance arrangements and identified areas requiring additional clarification before consultation.

The Workgroup agreed that the key issues set out in the terms of reference, including cost-benefit analysis, methodology, approvals, and applicability, had been addressed, with any remaining uncertainty to be managed through reporting and review. It was confirmed that the risk assessment would consider costs across all affected stakeholders, not just transmission owners.

The Workgroup also agreed to remove inaccurate wording that described events as “low impact”, as this could imply outcomes before assessment had been completed. It was further agreed that the term “time bound” was unclear and should be removed, with applicability instead explained through the risk assessment process. Workgroup members noted that the consultation document should be restructured and reworded to distinguish more clearly between the original and refined solutions, including by simplifying terminology and replacing terms such as “framework” and “mechanism” with “risk assessment process”.

The Workgroup agreed that draft text should be replaced with content taken directly from the original proposal where needed, to ensure the initial solution was reflected accurately and consistently. The Workgroup also noted that modelling assumptions and stability checks had been completed, and that the consultation text should confirm that no issues had been identified. Members agreed that duplicated consultation questions should be removed to improve clarity.

The Workgroup raised concerns about where the detailed process would sit and who would be responsible for governance, drafting, and stakeholder involvement, and noted that these points required further clarification before consultation. Questions were also raised about whether all affected parties were appropriately represented in the proposed governance arrangements. On that basis, the Workgroup concluded that the document was not yet ready for consultation and recommended a further session to resolve the remaining issues.

Next Steps

Public

Arrange a further meeting for to review and finalise Consultation Report to ensure timelines are met for next SQSS Panel. Circulate updated consultation report and possible meeting times by email so the remaining issues can be resolved quickly.

Actions

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

Action Number Raised	Workgroup	Owner	Action	Due by	Status
25	WG5	DN	Clarify item C in the consultation paper, particularly the point that only became clear when reading Appendix K in detail.	WG6	Open
26	WG5	LW	Arrange a further meeting on 26 May to review consultation report and finalised any issues/queries Distribute to Workgroup the consultation report the following week to stay on track for the 15 July panel.	WG6	Open

Attendees

Name	Initial	Company	Role
Lurrentia Walker	LW	NESO, Code Administrator	Chair
Kayte Stanton-Hughes	KSH	NESO, Code Administrator	Technical Secretary
Dozie Nnabuife	DN	NESO	Proposer
Steve Baker	SB	NESO	NESO Rep
Alan Creighton	AC	Northern Powergrid	Workgroup Member (Alternative)
Andrew Urquart	AU	SSE Generation	Workgroup Member
Bukky Daniel	BD	EDF Power	Workgroup Member
Calum Watkins	CW	Ofgem	Authority Representative
Graeme Vincent	GV	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member (Alternative)
Mark Bowker	MB	National Grid	Workgroup Member
Martin Cammidge	MC	SP Energy Networks	Workgroup Member
Maria Lopez	ML	NESO	Observer
Roddy Wilson	RW	SSEN Transmission	Workgroup Member

Public

Shaun Pereira	SP	NESO	Observer
Steve Quinn	SQ	NGED	Workgroup Member