

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status	Workgroup Closed
3	WG1	DN/SP/NESO/TO Representatives	Clarification of Unacceptable Overloading Interpretation: Clarify and document how "unacceptable overloading" is interpreted and applied in practice by NESO and the three TO's in both Scotland, England & Wales, and present findings at the next meeting.	29.04.26 Action to be revisited Clarification of unacceptable overloading required. 20.05.26 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.	To be revisited	Closed	WG5
13	WG3	DN/NESO Representative	Clarify governance location for the risk-assessment process Determine where the risk-assessment framework will sit (e.g. SQSS appendix, Grid Code, STC, or other mechanism), ensuring it	29.04.26 DN and CN addressed this action in Workgroup with discussions around "how and "what" and where these sit. Action to be revisited	WG4	Closed	WG5
14	WG3	All Workgroup Members / RW	Seek an offline view from the SQSS Panel on "what vs how" An email query to the SQSS Panel to confirm whether defining the content ("what") of the risk assessment is appropriate within SQSS, or should sit elsewhere. Lurrentia to draft the	29.04.26 Query and clarify "What vs How" and whether "unacceptable overload" is within or outside of scope.	WG4	Closed	WG5

15	WG3	DN	<p>Define the scope and minimum content of the risk assessment</p> <p>Develop clarity on what the risk assessment must cover, including:</p> <p>safety and asset risk, security of supply, voltage impacts, customer and financial consequences, criteria for approval / rejection.</p>	<p>29.04.26 Presented by DN at Workgroup regarding "how" sits outside the SQSS and the high-level description to be included in an appendix.</p> <p>No explicit close received for this action.</p> <p>20.05.26 Action closed as discussed on action 3. Action 15 was closed because it related to updates already provided at previous meetings.</p>	WG4	Closed	WG5
16	WG3	DN	<p>Clarify stakeholder roles, consent, and dispute resolution</p> <p>Define: which parties must be involved (TOs, DNOs, generators, users), whether any party has veto rights, how disagreements are resolved if consensus is not reached.</p>	20.05.26 As discussed for Action 3 to be closed.	WG4	Closed	WG5
17	WG3	DN	<p>Consider an additional Scotland-specific case study (clause 5.3)</p> <p><u>NISO to explore whether a Scottish example</u></p>		WG4	Closed	WG5
18	WG3	DN	<p>Clarify treatment of financial impacts and compensation</p> <p>Ensure the approach considers: constraint costs,</p>		WG4	Closed	WG5

19	WG	RW/ALL	Circulate draft consultation and legal text for offline comment Draft consultation and revised legal text to be shared outside meetings (email where	Draft consultation and legal text has been circulated	WG4	Closed	WG4
21	WG3	DN/AH	Review the appropriate governance/code location (e.g., Grid Code, STCP, NAP) for the risk assessment process to ensure all impacted users (including DNOS and generators) are properly included, and	29.04.26 action to be revisited	WG4	Closed	WG5
22	WG4	RW	Arrange Meeting with Proposer and follow-up on consequential modification timelines / packaging: understand when consequential mods (e.g., OC2 / SDCP) need to be raised and how timelines/panels align, to support submitting a coordinated package to Ofgem.	20.05.26 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. To return to this action once the related modifications for the other codes have been raised. 03.06.26 The action remains open, the Workgroup to review and finalised the approach to consequential modifications, including whether they should be raised and submitted as a package, the timing of the Grid Code modification, and how this aligns with the overall delivery timeline.	WG5	Open	
23	WG4	All	To review Workgroup Consultation Report and give feedback/comments		COP 01.04.26	Closed	WG5
24	WG4	DN	To review and update legal text comments and liaise with Legal department		WG5	Closed	WG5
25	WG5	DN	Clarify item C in the consultation paper, particularly the point that only became clear when reading Appendix K in detail.	20.05.26 Workgroup to give further comments on consultation report following updates to Annex K	WG5	Closed	
26	WG5	LW	Arrange a further meeting on 26 May to review consultation report and finalised any issues/queries Distribute to Workgroup the consultation		WG5	Closed	