

Final Modification Report

GSR036: System Access Reform: Review of the voltage limits

Overview: This modification reviews the voltage limits applicable to operational timescales and the potential for provision of increased flexibility around them.

Modification process & timetable

1	Proposal Form 20 May 2026
2	Code Administrator Consultation 12 June 2026 – 03 July 2026
3	Draft Final Modification Report 13 July 2026
4	Final Modification Report 11 August 2026
5	Implementation 10 BD after Authority Decision

Have 5 minutes? Read our [Executive summary](#)

Have 80 minutes? Read the full [Final Modification Report](#)

Have 160 minutes? Read the full Final Modification Report and Annexes

Status summary: This report has been submitted to the Authority for them to decide whether this change should happen.

Panel recommendation: The Panel has recommended unanimously that the Proposer's solution is implemented.

This modification is expected to have a: Medium impact on Transmission Owners (TOs), National Energy System Operator (NESO), Distribution Network Operators (DNOs), Non-Embedded Customers, Offshore Transmission Owners (OFTOs), Interconnector Operators and Generators.

Governance route	Standard Governance modification to proceed to Code Administrator Consultation
-------------------------	--

Who can I talk to about the change?	Proposer: Dozie Nnabuife Dozie.Nnabuife@neso.energy 07970004786	Code Administrator Chair: Box.SQSS@neso.energy
--	--	--

Contents

What is the issue?.....	3
Why Change?.....	4
What is the solution?	8
What is the impact of this change?	11
Code Administrator Consultation Summary	15
Proposer's Considerations of Code Administrator Consultation Responses.....	16
Panel Recommendation vote	18
When will this change take place?.....	21
Implementation date	21
Date decision required by	22
Implementation approach.....	22
Interactions.....	22
Acronyms, key terms and reference material	23
Annexes	24

What is the issue?

This proposal addresses a significant operational challenge faced by the National Energy System Operator (NESO) in managing the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). The challenge arises from the application of stringent postfault voltage limits, particularly on the 200 kV–300 kV network.

In practice, these limits can have a material impact on day-to-day system operation. They can delay essential network outages, require the production of Voltage Event Reports (VERs), and necessitate the operation of synchronous generation that would otherwise be unnecessary. These actions arise solely to manage the risk of post-fault voltage excursions exceeding the limits currently specified in the Security and Quality of Supply Standards (SQSS).

Section 6 of the National Electricity Transmission System Security and Quality of Supply Standard (NETS SQSS) defines the upper voltage limit applicable to the 275 kV network as +9%. This position has been in place since 2017, following a Fundamental Review of the SQSS initiated in 2010¹, which reduced the upper voltage limit for the 275 kV network from 302.5 kV (+10%) to 300 kV (+9%)². The historical background to this change is set out in **Annex 02**.

As the energy landscape has evolved, several factors have prompted a reassessment of the +9% limit. First, the rapid growth of renewable generation and interconnectors have increased the variability of operational conditions, requiring greater flexibility in system operation. Secondly, economic pressures to optimise outage planning and reduce reinforcement costs have highlighted the benefits of conditional flexibility³.

In practice, application of the +9% voltage threshold has become a primary driver of outage rejections, particularly where large power stations are unavailable, or voltage control equipment is out of service alongside major network reinforcement works. As a result, the current voltage limits can delay the delivery of critical projects.

This proposal supports Clean Power 2030 by introducing greater flexibility in the application of voltage limits, enabling outage planning and operational

¹ GSR008, Working group 4 Report, Fundamental SQSS Review, 2010

² Transmission Acceleration Action Plan, Public Consultation, February 2025, page 30.

³ Transmission Acceleration Action Plan, Public Consultation, February 2025, page 30

decisions to reflect actual system risk and engineering judgement. This will help essential works proceed safely and efficiently while Transmission Owners (TOs) retain responsibility for determining equipment voltage capability. Where operation remains within that capability, the proposal introduces no additional system risk assessment.

For clarity, the Proposal comprises two distinct elements. First, it increases the standard SQSS upper voltage limit from +9% to +10%, such that operation within this range is treated as compliant and part of the normal operating envelope. Second, it retains the existing arrangements under which operation above +10% may be permitted only through explicit agreement between the relevant parties, consistent with established SQSS and Grid Code processes. The first element amends the standard limit itself; the second applies only to genuinely non-standard conditions and does not alter existing escalation or approval routes.

Why Change?

The current system access arrangements lack the flexibility required to support the scale and pace of transmission network development needed to meet the Clean Power 2030 and 2050 Net Zero targets. There is a view that the existing rules governing system access are overly restrictive and were not designed to accommodate the delivery of infrastructure at a rate several times greater than historical norms⁴. Achieving this acceleration will require a strategic evolution of existing regulatory frameworks including revisiting current voltage limits and establishing an appropriate operational voltage threshold.

Recent NESO studies demonstrate that the system running up to a post-fault voltage limit of +10% is feasible on the 275 KV network where the TOs equipment is capable of operating at +10%⁵. These studies identified multiple cases where outage requests were rejected due to non-compliance with the existing 9% limit, typically involving voltages close to +10%. In some observed cases the need for a VER was triggered only after operational limits had already been exceeded. In certain cases, NESO sought to progress outages by requesting derogations from the SQSS, with the agreement of TOs, who confirmed that their equipment could operate safely at higher voltages than the 9% limit.

⁴ [Transmission Acceleration Action Plan, Public Consultation, 2025](#)

⁵ See GSR036 Annex 2

Reliance on derogations granted by Ofgem on a case-by-case basis outside the SQSS imposes significant administrative burden. In the short-term, such reliance undermines clarity, consistency, and legal certainty, making it more difficult for NESO, TOs and connected Users to make plans based on stable and predictable criteria.

The 9% limit in Table 6.3 and Table 6.4 in the SQSS was reduced from 10% to align the voltage limits of the NETS SQSS on the 275kV⁶. This limit was then extended to the whole voltage range of 200 kV to 300 kV. Historical changes to voltage limits including alignment with International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standards and subsequent extensions across voltage ranges) are summarised in **Annex 02**.

Consistent with emerging European approaches to operational coordination and system security, the studies set out in **Annex 03** demonstrate that proposals to revert to the previous limits are beneficial and do not compromise system security when applied under defined conditions. Additionally, Great Britain aligned its voltage ranges with the European Network Codes incorporated into the Grid Code in 2018, to ensure compatibility with the European Network Codes on Requirements for Generators (RfGs)⁷, the Network Code on Requirements for Demand Connections Conditions (DCC)⁸, and the Network Code on Requirements for High Voltage Direct Current Systems (HVDC Systems)⁹.

While sustained operation beyond +10% is not recommended due to potential plant risks, the European Regulation Guideline for Transmission System Operators Guidelines (SOGL)¹⁰ permits operation beyond this limit only where such operation is subject to explicit agreement between Significant Network Users and the relevant TOs increasing the upper voltage limit from +9% to +10% is consistent with the Grid Code and with the retained EU Network Codes already implemented within it, including ECC 6.1.4. Further detail on these provisions is provided in the NESO assessment in **Annex 03**.

⁶ [GSR021: Operational and Planning Criteria for 220 kV Transmission Assets | National Energy System Operator](#), for historical background Annex 1

⁷ [Regulation - 2016/631 - EN - EUR-Lex](#)

⁸ [Network Code on Requirements for Demand Connection, Regulation - 2016/1388 - EN - EUR-Lex](#)

⁹ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/1447/oj/eng>

¹⁰ [European Commission, Regulation 2017/1485, System Operator Guidelines, 2017](#)

This proposal would enable a greater number of outages and increased system access, supporting the timely delivery of construction works required for network upgrades without compromising system security. This applies to all types of outages, not solely those considered to be beneficial.

By extending the range of postfault outage combinations that are currently rejected due to marginal voltage exceedances, the proposal would reduce delays driven by voltage related constraints and allow essential maintenance and reinforcement works to proceed more efficiently.

By contrast, derogations typically apply only to specific scenarios or limited time periods. They cannot be relied upon to support a broader range of outage combinations or to accommodate unforeseen operational circumstances. As a result, reliance on derogations alone perpetuates the current lack of operational flexibility.

Reasons supporting this proposed change include:

1. **Improving outage planning flexibility and efficiency.** Expanding the permissible post-fault voltage range enables NESO and TOs to proactively accommodate a wider range of outage scenarios without repeatedly seeking derogations. This approach mitigates and reduces delays caused by voltage-driven limitations and allows outages, including those for essential maintenance or reinforcement works, to proceed more promptly. Ultimately, greater flexibility supports more efficient system operation, enhances security, and fosters clearer, more coordinated decision-making across all parties, rather than relying on a restrictive and time-consuming derogation process.
2. **Updating the SQSS voltage limits in Tables 6.3 and 6.4 to reflect current best practice in system management** is a key driver for this change. NESO's case studies show that increasing the post-fault voltage limit to +10% allows outage combinations that would otherwise be rejected to proceed, avoiding the need to prepare unnecessary VERs and to take corrective actions. If this change is implemented, with agreement of affected Users there could be more efficient outage scheduling while maintaining system security and improving coordinated decision making

throughout the outage planning process. Applying this approach ensures that system security is upheld throughout the lifecycle of the network — from design and construction, through to operation and maintenance, and supports a holistic and resilient approach to system management.

3. Any directly observable financial impacts are expected to be modest; however, **operational evidence indicates that applying a +10% postfault voltage limit at 275 kV can reduce the need to instruct generators to operate solely to provide reactive power support.** For clarity, the revised +10% upper voltage limit applies equally to both pre-fault and post-fault conditions, consistent with the SQSS voltage framework. Case studies demonstrate that the additional voltage headroom can prevent avoidable operational interventions and reduce reactive power dispatch costs, while maintaining system security. These benefits are most evident during low-demand overnight conditions, when voltage sensitivity is highest, as illustrated by the West London and North-West England and Wales scenarios set out in **Annex 03**. In these cases, voltage exceedances arise primarily from combinations of low demand and outage configurations rather than during normal or peak system operation.
4. The case studies examined in **Annex 03** show that **there may be cost efficiencies that can be achieved** by reducing reliance on generators operating solely for voltage support.
5. Moreover, the case studies demonstrate that when operating within a slightly more flexible post-fault voltage range, **system security is maintained without additional intervention.** In several examples, the proposed +10% limit would allow outages to proceed without generator instructions, without the cancellation of maintenance tasks, and without reliance on emergency operational measures. The common outcome across these scenarios is not an improvement in technical resilience¹¹ per se, but an improvement in operational efficiency, achieved by avoiding actions whose primary purpose is regulatory compliance rather than

¹¹ For clarity, “technical resilience” is used here to mean the inherent robustness of the transmission system, as planned under the SQSS, to remain within defined technical limits under credible faults, rather than the use of operational or non-standard processes to manage risk processes.

system protection. This reinforces the assumption that reducing reliance on such remedial actions leads directly to more economical system operation.

6. Implementing this change would **accelerate transmission network development** by enabling TOs to request and take outages required for reinforcement works with greater certainty. The enhanced framework allows NESO and TOs to agree defined circumstances and durations for operating within the revised standard SQSS voltage limit of +10% (rather than through non-standard arrangements), analogous to existing Operational Capacity Limit Report (OCLR) arrangements, supporting a controlled, consistent application of existing limits rather than a universal relaxation.

Overall, the proposal is a proportionate and no regrets modification that delivers operational efficiency without materially reducing system resilience or security. It clarifies the application of existing outage planning and operational controls within the revised standard limits, without introducing enhanced risk assessment processes. By establishing a consistent and transparent approach within routine processes, this proposal reduces reliance on exceptional and administratively burdensome approvals.

What is the solution?

Proposer's solution

This proposal recommends restoring the upper voltage limit to +10% as a practical means of easing operational constraints and supporting the timely delivery of critical network maintenance and reinforcement works, without compromising system security or resilience. Reinstating the former voltage threshold is consistent with the objectives of the Clean Power 2030 strategy and the wider ambition to deliver a more flexible and robust electricity system.

The recommendation is supported by evidence from the case studies set out in **Annex 03**, which demonstrate that certain outage configurations would not have been permitted under the existing +9% SQSS voltage limit but would fall within

the standard operating envelope under a revised +10% limit. These findings are consistent with the conclusions of the SQSS review process as part of this Modification, which indicated that the original voltage limit had a negligible impact on equipment performance and overall system costs **Annex 03**.

The case studies underpinning GSR036 show that post-fault voltage exceedances at or marginally above the current +9% limit are increasingly predictable outcomes of routine outage conditions rather than exceptional events. Treating such routine conditions as non-standard under GSR026 is therefore increasingly inefficient, leading to avoidable operational interventions and costs where voltages remain well within established equipment capability. Referencing GSR026- clarifies that these scenarios are not being reclassified as “non-standard” but are instead brought back within the standard operating envelope. More extreme or prolonged exceedances would continue to be managed through existing GSR026 arrangements.

The case studies do not suggest that all outages are constrained by the existing voltage limits, nor that all outages would benefit equally from a revised threshold. Instead, they show that specific outage combinations typically associated with major network reinforcement works and occurring under particular system conditions, most notably low demand and limited reactive power availability are disproportionately affected by the current +9% limit. The constraint is therefore scenario-specific rather than a general limitation on system operation.

The primary change proposed is to the SQSS itself, by setting the upper operational pre-fault and post-fault voltage limit at +10%. The supporting analysis demonstrates that voltages approaching or marginally exceeding the current +9% limit are within transmission asset capability and consistent with existing Grid Code requirements. For completeness, Table 6.3 of the SQSS defines pre-fault steady-state voltage limits, and this Proposal aligns the standard pre-fault operating envelope with the revised +10% limit. Existing post-fault and non-standard governance arrangements remain unchanged.

In considering impacts on Users, this modification relates to operational pre-fault and post-fault voltages on the transmission network under defined outage conditions. It does not imply an increase in voltages experienced by end-Users or

connected parties. The case studies illustrate voltages close to, or marginally above, the current +9% SQSS threshold but identify no harm to connected Users or breaches of equipment capability. Directly connected generators and demand customers continue to operate within established design tolerances, as their equipment is already required to withstand voltages up to 1.1 per unit in accordance with Grid Code CC6.1.4 and ECC6.1.4. Impacts on distribution networks and downstream Users are managed through existing voltage-control arrangements, with no evidence of uncontrolled propagation in the scenarios assessed.

To support implementation, the proposal introduces clarifying notes to the relevant SQSS tables to confirm that, under defined circumstances, operation to the revised voltage limit may be permitted where agreed with the relevant onshore licensee for one or more nodes on that licensee's transmission system. Any such agreement would be based on a case-by-case assessment and would specify the affected nodes, the applicable voltage limit, the duration of the arrangement, and any conditions or restrictions on operation. This approach aligns with existing Grid Code provisions, including CC6.1.4 and ECC6.1.4.

Scope clarification

This Proposal is limited to revising the SQSS steady-state and post-fault voltage limits applicable to the 200 kV–300 kV network from +9% to +10%, reflecting equipment capability and current operational practice.

The Proposal does **not**:

- permit steady-state or post-fault operation above +10% within the SQSS standard without TO/ User agreement;
- introduce or modify any system risk assessment, either by NESO or TOs;
- amend existing Grid Code requirements or arrangements (including those established under GSR026) for non-standard voltage operation; or
- introduce amendments to the derogation processes.

Any operation above the revised SQSS limit would continue to be treated as non-standard and managed in accordance with existing arrangements outside the scope of this modification.

Legal Text

The Legal Text for this proposed change can be found in **Annex 05**.

What is the impact of this change?

The proposal is assessed as having a medium impact on TOs, NESO, Distribution Network Operators (DNOs), Non-Embedded Customers, Offshore Transmission Owners (OFTOs), Interconnectors, and Generators.

For NESO and TOs, the change increases operational flexibility to plan, approve, and implement network outages associated with reinforcement works without triggering disproportionate operational constraints. This enables system needs to be managed more effectively while maintaining compliance with existing technical limits and asset integrity requirements.

For DNOs, the proposal supports more effective coordination at transmission–distribution interfaces, allowing a wider range of construction, connection, and outage activities to be progressed. While the case studies do not present DNO-specific metrics or identify improved project delivery as a primary objective, they demonstrate how transmission level constraints—particularly those linked to voltage management for demand security—can materially influence coordination at these interfaces.

For Non-Embedded Customers, impacts are expected to be minimal. The proposed change remains within standard equipment design margins, and voltages remain within existing Grid Code limits. Some customers may, however, need to review protection or alarm settings that were previously aligned to the +9% operational limit. Any benefits for this group are indirect, arising from increased system flexibility rather than from defined or quantified customer outcomes.

OFTOs, Interconnectors, and Generators may benefit from fewer outage rejections and improved timeliness of connections, as the approach enables system value to be prioritised while maintaining asset integrity. For directly connected Users, the case studies confirm that operating voltages remain within Grid Code requirements, with equipment already required to operate up to 1.1 per unit. Accordingly, the Proposal does not expose Users to conditions beyond their existing technical resilience or introduce new technical risks.

Proposer's assessment against SQSS Objectives	
Relevant Objective	Identified impact
(a) facilitate the planning, development, and maintenance of an efficient, coordinated, and economical system of electricity transmission, and the operation of that system in an efficient, economic, and coordinated manner;	Positive Increasing the post-fault voltage limit to +10% would reduce unnecessary constraints that, in specific cases, lead to the rejection of otherwise deliverable outages, thereby supporting more efficient network upgrades. By reducing reliance on VERs and other corrective interventions, this change is expected to improve operational coordination and risk management without altering underlying security standards. The approval of GSR036 would not, in itself, grant that all previously rejected outages could proceed. However, the case studies indicate a credible potential for improved outcomes in certain circumstances.
(b) ensure an appropriate level of security and quality of supply and safe operation of the National Electricity Transmission System;	Positive Once implemented, this proposal would improve outage planning by clarifying compliant operation under the SQSS and reducing reliance on exceptional arrangements for routine scenarios. It does not introduce new risk-assessment processes; any operation beyond the revised limit remains subject to existing NESO-TO coordination and Grid Code governance.
(c) facilitate effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (as far	Positive This proposal improves outage planning by enabling transmission maintenance and

as consistent therewith) facilitating such competition in the distribution of electricity; and	upgrade work to be undertaken more efficiently, supporting a more predictable and available Transmission System. In doing so, it can indirectly support effective competition in generation and supply over time, while remaining consistent with existing access and governance arrangements.
(d) facilitate Licensees to comply with any relevant obligations under Assimilated law	Positive This modification has a positive impact as it neither alters nor expands licensees' statutory duties under assimilated law. It aligns with EU Regulations, and the European Electricity Network Codes retained in UK law. Consequently, the modification enhances regulatory coherence while maintaining a neutral compliance position for licensees (see report in Annex 04).

Proposer's assessment of the impact of the modification on the stakeholder / consumer benefit categories	
Stakeholder / consumer benefit categories	Identified impact
Improved safety and reliability of the system	Positive The relaxation, applied in a controlled manner, ensures the system remains secure and resilient, reduces unnecessary delays, and supports a reliable electricity supply for consumers. Any increase in operational risk continues to be carefully managed through existing joint NESO-TO

	operational arrangements and established capability limits.
Lower bills than would otherwise be the case	Positive This modification may reduce costs indirectly by enabling essential upgrades and maintenance to be delivered more efficiently and with fewer delays. This reduces unnecessary constraint costs and project overruns, leading to a more cost-effective electricity system. Savings from improved planning and flexibility are ultimately passed on to consumers through lower network charges.
Benefits for society as a whole	Positive This modification might benefit society by supporting a faster transition to a cleaner, more reliable, and cost-effective electricity system. It enables timely delivery of essential upgrades and new connections, helping to meet climate goals, boost economic growth, and ensure a secure energy supply for everyone. Improved planning and flexibility also reduce disruption and costs, delivering broad social and environmental benefits.
Reduced environmental damage	Positive This modification may help mitigate climate change by reducing transmission losses associated with unnecessary voltage-control interventions and by enabling faster delivery of network reinforcements that support low-carbon generation. It also strengthens system resilience by providing more flexible voltage management under increasingly variable climate-driven operating conditions.

Improved quality of service	Positive This modification will improve quality of service by enabling faster and more reliable delivery of network upgrades and maintenance. This reduces the likelihood of unplanned outages, ensures a more stable electricity supply, and allows consumers to benefit from a higher standard of service. Enhanced planning and flexibility also mean issues can be addressed more proactively, further supporting consistent and dependable service.
------------------------------------	---

Code Administrator Consultation Summary

The Code Administrator Consultation was issued on the 12 June 2026 closed on 03 July 2026 and received 03 non-confidential responses and 0 confidential responses, with no late responses. A summary of the responses can be found in the table below, and the full responses can be found in **Annex 07**.

Code Administrator Consultation summary	
Question	
Do you believe that the GSR036 Original Proposal better facilitates the SQSS Applicable Objectives?	All respondents considered that the GSR036 Original proposal better facilitates the SQSS Applicable Objectives.
Do you support the proposed implementation approach?	Two respondents support the proposed implementation approach. One respondent raised concerns that the implementation approach lacks sufficient detail but noted support for the modification.

Do you have any other comments?	Respondents provided some additional comments, mainly minor editorial suggestions to the Legal Text and questions about implementation timing, User guidance, and whether protection/alarm settings need review.
Legal Text issues raised in the consultation	
A few minor drafting and presentation comments on the Legal Text. These relate to the consistent use of defined terms, alignment of wording.	
EBR issues raised in the consultation	
No EBR issues were raised.	

Proposer's Considerations of Code Administrator Consultation Responses

Consultation response

"We do support the modification but there is insufficient detail in the implementation approach to decide whether the approach is appropriate. The date is not specific and there is no plan. It calls for a robust and coordinated approach but doesn't suggest how that may be achieved."

Proposer's response

As GSR036 primarily amends the SQSS voltage limits and associated explanatory notes, implementation activities are expected to be limited. The implementation date is expressed relative to the Authority decision to maintain flexibility and alignment with the wider System Access Reform programme.

Following Authority approval, NESO will coordinate implementation with TOs and relevant stakeholders, including communication of the revised voltage limits, confirmation of any consequential documentation updates, and consideration of whether affected users should review existing alarm or protection settings.

Consultation response

"In terms of implementation, do NESO intend to advise Users that they might need to review their alarm and protection settings as suggested on page 11 of the CAC report? If so, would any such reviews need to be completed before the relaxed voltage limits could be applied?"

Proposer's response

The proposal does not introduce any mandatory requirement for Users to review alarm or protection settings as a pre-condition to implementation.

Following Authority approval, NESO will communicate the revised voltage limits (+9% to +10%) to affected stakeholders, including communication regarding the review of alarm or protection settings that affected stakeholders may need to be re-configured with reference to the updated operational voltage limits.

Legal Text

Several minor drafting and presentation comments on the Legal Text were made. These relate to the consistent use of defined terms, alignment of wording between notes, and ensuring renumbered notes are visible through tracked changes.

Comment	Action
Table 6.3 Note 7 – "Transmission system" is a defined term	Accept. Capitalise and use the defined SQSS term consistently if that is how it appears elsewhere in the code.
Table 6.4 Note 9 – "...on the Onshore Transmission Licensee's transmission system" – consistency with Note 7	Accept. Align the drafting in Note 9 with whatever wording is finally adopted in Note 7 so the same concept is expressed consistently.
Table 6.5 Point 6 – renumbered notes should be shown as tracked changes	Accept. This is a document transparency/presentation point rather than a Legal Text issue. Ensure all note renumbering is visible in tracked changes for Panel and Authority review.

Panel Recommendation vote

The Panel met on the 28 July 2026 to carry on their recommendation vote.

They assessed whether a change should be made to the SQSS by assessing the proposed change against the Applicable Objectives.

Panel comments on Legal Text

Ahead of the vote taking place, the Panel considered the Legal Text amendments proposed as part of the Code Administrator Consultation and agreed next steps. The suggested changes can be found in **Annex 06**.

Panel comments on EBR impacts

No EBR issues were raised.

Vote 1: Does the Original facilitate the Applicable SQSS Objectives better than the Baseline?

Panel Member: **Alan Creighton, DNO Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					
The proposal should facilitate outages without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the system.					

Panel Member: **Antony Johnson, NESO Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					
GSR036 supports the SQSS Applicable Objectives by restoring the upper voltage limit to +10%, reducing unnecessary operational constraints and supporting efficient delivery of network maintenance and reinforcement works whilst maintaining established governance arrangements for genuinely non-standard voltage conditions. We also note that the revised limits now re-align with those in the Grid Code. Consultation respondents supported the proposal and no material issues have been identified. We noted some parties identified Legal Text comments / drafting inconsistencies which we recognise are typographical and do not alter the intent or effect of the modification.					

Panel Member: **Bless Kuri, SHET Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					
SSEN Transmission considers that the proposed modification better facilitates Applicable Objective (a). We consider that increasing the standard upper operational voltage limit from +9% to +10% should reduce operational constraints associated with the current upper voltage limit. This should facilitate the efficient planning and coordination of outages required for maintenance and network reinforcement activities, while maintaining the existing security standards.					

Panel Member: **Garth Graham, Generation Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					

Panel Member: **Graeme Vincent, SP Transmission Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					
Reverting to 275kV +/-10% voltage limits which were in existence prior 2017 better aligns with the voltage ranges specified in the retained EU legislation and should provide greater operational flexibility to NESO.					

Panel Member: **Le Fu, NGET Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					
The proposed change to the 275kV operational voltage range better supports the objectives of the SQSS.					

Panel Member: **Mike Lee, OFTO Representative**

	Better facilitates SQSS AO (a)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (b)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (c)?	Better facilitates SQSS AO (d)?	Overall (Y/N)
Original	Yes	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Yes
Voting statement					

Vote 2 – Which Option best meets the Applicable SQSS Objectives?

Panel Member	Best Option	Which objectives does this option better facilitate? (If baseline not applicable)
Alan Creighton	Original	a, b
Antony Johnson	Original	a, b, c
Bless Kuri	Original	a
Garth Graham	Original	a, b
Graeme Vincent	Original	a, b
Le Fu	Original	a, b, c
Mike Lee	Original	a, b

Panel Conclusion

The Panel has recommended unanimously that the Proposer's solution is implemented.

When will this change take place?

Implementation date

Target date: Q4 2026

Date decision required by

Sufficient time to achieve implementation above.

Implementation approach

Implementation will need to be co-ordinated and communicated with all affected parties. By design, the implementation process requires a robust and coordinated approach, supported by effective communication channels and clear procedural updates between NESO, TOs, DNOs, Non-Embedded Customers, interconnectors, and generators.

The core objective is to amend the SQSS standard threshold to +10%, such that operation up to this level becomes compliant by definition and does not require additional approvals beyond existing SQSS governance and operational coordination arrangements. In this context, NESO and the TOs are the relevant parties, responsible for system operation, security assessment, and confirmation of asset capability within established design limits. The case studies support this approach, demonstrating that voltages up to +10% remain within equipment capability and consistent with Grid Code assumptions.

Where operation above +10% is considered in exceptional circumstances, this would be subject to agreement through existing Grid Code provisions (including CC6.1.4 and ECC6.1.4). This proposal does not require amendments to the Grid Code and does not introduce new governance forums or approval processes. Furthermore, the proposal is also to amend SQSS such that voltages above +10% continue to be treated as non-standard and managed through existing agreements consistent with current SQSS and Grid Code processes provided that all affected parties agree.

Interactions

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| ☒ Grid Code | ☐ BSC | ☒ STC | ☐ CUSC |
| ☐ European Network Codes | ☐ Other modifications | ☐ Other | |

This proposal is part of a broader programme of work under System Access Reform and is expected to interact with other code modifications. Concurrent changes to the STC and Grid Code are being considered to ensure alignment across the industry’s technical and governance frameworks. These interactions are being actively scoped and coordinated to support a consistent and efficient implementation pathway, with warm-up presentations and stakeholder engagement already underway across all relevant Panels.

During presentation of the proposal the Panel noted the recent Energy Networks Association (ENA) Statutory Voltage Limits Consultation (January 2026), which proposes changes to lower voltage limits on distribution networks (LV).

This work is focused on reducing the lower voltage limit to facilitate increased connection of low carbon technologies. The Panel considers that this proposal relates to distribution-level voltage management and operates on a different part of the voltage envelope when compared to GSR036, which specifically addresses the upper voltage limit at 275kV on the transmission system. As such, no direct interaction is expected between the ENA Consultation and GSR036, although the existence of parallel industry activity is noted for transparency.

Acronyms, key terms and reference material

Acronym / key term	Meaning
BSC	Balancing and Settlement Code
CUSC	Connection and Use of System Code
CP30	Clean Power 2030
DCC	Demand Connections Conditions
DNOs	Distribution Network Operators
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current

IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
NESO	National Energy System Operator
NETS	National Electricity Transmission System
OCLR	Operational Capability Limits Record
OFTO	Offshore Transmission Owners
STC	System Operator Transmission Owner Code
SOGL	System Operations Guidelines
SQSS	Security and Quality of Supply Standards
TO	Transmission Owners
TSO	Transmission System Operator
VERs	Voltage Event Reports

Reference material

Annexes

Annex	Information
Annex 01	GSR036 Proposal Form
Annex 02	GSR036 Background History
Annex 03	GSR036 Impact Assessment
Annex 04	GSR036 Monitoring Report
Annex 05	GSR036 Legal Text (pre-CAC)
Annex 06	GSR036 Final Legal Text

Annex 07	GSR036 Code Administrator Consultation responses
Annex 08	GSR036 Code Administrator Consultation responses Summary

References

- [United Kingdom Government, Clean Power 2030 Action Plan, 2024](#)
- [Electricity Networks Commissioner Companion Report, 2025](#)
- [ENTSO-E, Biennial Report on Probabilistic Risk Assessment 2025.](#)
- [European Commission, European Commission, Regulation 2016/631](#)
- [European Network Code on Requirements for Generators, 2016](#)
- [European Commission, Regulation 2016/1388 on Requirements for Demand Connection, 2016](#)
- [European Commission Regulation 2016/1447, Requirements for HVDC Systems, 2016](#)
- [European Commission, Regulation 2017/1485, System Operator Guidelines, 2017.](#)
- [GSR026: Adding Non- Standard Voltages to the SQSS, 2021](#)
- [International Electrotechnical Commission 2009, International](#)
- [Electrotechnical Standard, 60038:2009, Standard Voltages, 2009](#)
- [System Access Reform | National Energy System Operator Website, 2025](#)
- [Transmission Acceleration Action Plan, 2025](#)
- [GSR 008, Work Group 4 Report, Fundamental SQSS Review, 2010](#)