GSR030

Workgroup 6 - 18 December 2023

Online Meeting via Teams



Modification Process

Code Modification Process Overview



Objectives and Timeline

Objectives for GSR030 Workgroup 6

- Share the updated timeline
- Review Actions and Outcomes
- Workgroup Consultation review (continued)

Timeline for GSR030

Milestone	Date	Milestone	Date
Modification presented to Panel	09 November 2022	Workgroup 9 Finalise Workgroup Report and Legal text	29 February 2024
Workgroup Nominations (15 Working Days)	14 November 2022 to 09 December 2022	Workgroup Report completion deadline	01 March 2024
Workgroup 1 Proposer's presentation, check Terms of Reference, initial review of legal text	20 January 2023	Workgroup Report – Submission to Panel	06 March 2024
Workgroup 2 Bipole, anchor drag risk, N-1-1 criteria	07 March 2023	Panel sign off that Workgroup Report has met its Terms of Reference	14 March 2024
Workgroup 3 Scoping for cost benefit and impact assessment	18 May 2023	Code Administrator Consultation	26 March – 24 April 2024 (20 days CAC to allow for Easter)*
Workgroup 4 Refine solution(s) and materials to be provided with Workgroup Consultation	d 21 September 2023	DFMR Submission to Panel	3 July 2024*
Workgroup 5 Develop Workgroup Consultation document	17 November 2023	DFMR Panel Vote	10 July 2024*
Workgroup 6 Discuss Workgroup feedback on Workgroup Consultation document	18 December 2023	FMR to Ofgem	23 September 2024*
Workgroup 7 Finalise the Workgroup Consultation	16 January 2024	Ofgem decision	TBC
Workgroup Consultation	22 January – 02 February 2023	Implementation Date	TBC
Workgroup 8 Discuss consultation responses, refine solution and legal text	n 08 February 2024	*Subject to CAC timings. CAC period could be reduced to 20 days due to the holiday)	o 15 days over Easter (extended to

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
9	2	MG	Provide detail on bipole / rigid bipole faults		WG5	Propose to close
13	3	BA	A sentence should be added to an appropriate existing guidance note to ensure faults on metallic returns are addressed. Suggested sentence and suggested guidance note where this will sit to be provided		Ongoing	Proposer to close – an action for after Authority decision
15	4	All	Review use of CBRA for cable installation to discuss at the next meeting	NA	19.10	Open
16	4	ВА	Send amended wording for the definitions slide from WG4 presentation		25.09	Propose to close
17	4	ВА	Consider other possible impacting factors, such as compass deviation		29.09	Propose to close (included in consultation document under Other Risks and possible WG Consultation question)
18	4	JG	Share slides from WG4 presentation (after checking for commercially sensitive information)		25.09	Closed
19	4	ВА	Share overhead circuit risk tolerances, calculations and rationale behind what's deemed an acceptable level of risk (and relevance to cable scenarios)		29.09	Open
20	4	BA, FW	Compile text to cover ToR 3 - Consider retrospective impact on existing cables.		05.10	Open - review WG 4 notes

Actions

Action number	Workgroup Raised	Owner	Action	Comment	Due by	Status
21	4	LC	Consider what acceptable levels of risk are, what could be included in the SQSS & BA's suggested units involved for assessing risk		05.10	Open
22	4	NN, BA, LC	To discuss offline - risk and associated costs (investment in reinforcing the network and build/maintenance). BA to send a written narrative to help Orsted understand this ahead of a discussion		05.10	Open
23	4	All	Consider details of the above once shared and provide a proposal for discussion at the next WG		05.10	Open
24	5	ВА	Put together the wording for the intentional damage/terrorism risk		17.11	Open
25	5	BA	Add more examples to the Mechanical Common Modes of Failure section		17.11	Open
26	5	ВА	To redraft page 10 section, reach out to SMEs		17.11	Open
27	5	BA/ NN	Offline discussion to see if previous CBA will fit into this mod		17.11	Open

Workgroup Consultation

Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Workgroup Term of Reference	Location in Workgroup Report (to be completed at Workgroup Report stage)
If there is no reliability data available, consider alternative ways of assessing the risks and the benefits for the increase of the loss of infeed risk.	
Consider risk-based approach for the specification of any restriction on the loss of infeed risk associated with multiple cables sharing the same route.	
Consider retrospective impact on existing cables.	See Action 20

Any Other Business Teri Puddefoot – ESO Code Administrator

Next Steps Teri Puddefoot – ESO Code Administrator