

Network Innovation Competition Full Submission

Supplementary Answer Form

Tick if this answer is Confidential: ☐

Tick if this answer has been provided verbally: ☐

Project code:	SPT EN 01	Question Number	21
Question date	03/09/2013	Answer date	05/09/2013
Submission section question relates to	Section 4		
Topic	Evaluation criteria e)		
Question	Please explain clearly the rationale for this project being led by SP as a TO, rather than by NGET in its capacity as the GBSO. Please highlight any challenges that you consider are overcome by this approach, and point out any issues that are likely to require resolution in running the project this way.		
Notes on question			
Answer	<p>The VISOR proposal has been developed as a <u>collaborative TOs/SO</u> project so that all transmission licensees have contributed during the proposal development stage. The trial project could be led by either a TO or the SO as it <u>has benefits for all the licensees</u>. While working on the proposal it was agreed that the project would gain if SPT was the leading licensee.</p> <p><u>While the benefits are recognised for NGET as both the TO and GBSO, there is a very strong interest in this project from SP as a TO</u>, relating to the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Asset monitoring to ensure stable operation of the assets and avoid damage to the assets or other connected plant, in accordance with its obligations under STC and SQSS. ✓ Understanding new interactions between transmission assets and connected plant. New non-conventional transmission assets such as series compensation and embedded HVDC have dynamic characteristics and active control, while traditional transmission equipment is largely passive. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Maximising asset use through new measurement approaches, for efficient capital investment ✓ Model validation for network investment purpose; ✓ Network characteristics base lining to risk-mitigate the deployment of new technology; <p><u>SPT justified its leading role in the VISOR project, based on the in-depth understanding of the unique characteristics of B6 (England- Scotland boundary), previous experiences in lead similar IFI project (IFI 0713: Wide area monitoring, protection and control in future Great Britain power system) and the obligations of STC and SQSS as a TO- as detailed in Section 4 e).</u></p> <p>The letters of support from NGET and SHE Transmission clearly state the willingness to participate and support the VISOR project delivery. The Letter of Commitment from the Managing Director at SPEN clearly states the enthusiasm to lead the project.</p> <p>It is recognised that the national roll out of the operational aspects of the approach tested in VISOR, should be led by the NETSO. Asset monitoring, control tuning, and investment-related and risk information will continue to be used within the TO businesses.</p> <p><u>Regarding the potential challenges/issues</u>, it has been recognised that the complex engagements within each organisation and the interfaces between the project partners and suppliers are critical (as detailed in Section 6.7 and the Risk Registration).</p> <p><u>A robust and appropriate project management structure</u> has been proposed to address this issue. Each TO/NETSO partner has a focal point (where NGET has a combined focal point as both NETSO and TO) to safeguard the ownership of project delivery and to facilitate culture changes.</p> <p>From the technology challenges, it has been recognised that <u>a fit for purposes technical specification</u> is very important. Each organisation has different requirements. NGET, as the NETSO, will have to take into account the conditions of existing infrastructure and the future development demands. In that case, the components, such as the PDC at NETSO side, will be specified by NETSO.</p>
Attachments	
Verbal Clarifications (Consultants)	