

Low Energy Automated Networks (LEAN) - SSE										
Question No.	Question asked by	Proforma section	Topic	Question	Date question asked	Date response required	Date response received	Follow up to Question #	Confidential (y/n)	Attachments
1	Co	1.3 Project Summary, p1	Project Methodology	The proposal specifies that two methods will be trialled which will reduce losses on the 33kV/11kV networks. Does ANT reduce losses? It's description suggests that it mitigates any reduction in grid resilience produced by TASS.	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
2	Co	3.5 Project Benefits, p16	Document Content	In this section, when quoting the energy saved per substation per year, 90MWh/annum is quoted as the 'typical' figure. In Section 3.4, however, 90MWh/annum is presented as a higher bound figure ('...losses equated up to...') for sites with higher loss transformers. Is 90MWh/annum a mean or a maximum figure?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
3	Co	3.5 Project Benefits, p17	Document Content	What is the justification for the 45 year value calculation? Is this based on anticipated asset life or is it an accounting measure?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
4	Co	3.5 Project Benefits, p18	Document Content	What is the justification for the estimated cost of Options 1, 2 or 3?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
5	Co	2.1.2 Methods, p8	Document Content	Figure 2.e is titled "Simple diagram of Alternative Network Topology"; when the same diagram is reproduced in Appendix 3 it is titled "Primary Substation with Additional Switching Equipment" - suggesting that it is a diagram of breakers installed for TASS. Can you please clarify?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
6	Co	2.1.2 Methods, p9	Project Approach	"Development of loss-reduction model: This activity involves in-depth study and analysis to investigate actual load profiles across the network..." Is this information already known as part of business as usual?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
7	Co	3.5 Project Benefits, p17	Document Content	This section suggests that Appendix 5 provides further detail on the claims made in the business case. However, Appendix 5 contains a reiteration of the Method already detailed in Section 2.1, without providing further facts or evidence for the claims presented, is this intentional?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
8	Co	4 Evaluation Criteria, p22	Document Content	How have the risks that are tabulated been judged to be the most significant for the project?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
9	Co	Appendix 4, p53 ono	Document Format	The tabular format used for the project plan makes it difficult to navigate - can you please provide a copy where the headers are repeated across pages?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	SSET207 Collated Appendices rev 1.1.pdf (Redacted for public version)
10	Co	Appendix 4, p59	Numerical Query	In the tables of financial and carbon benefits the numbers don't tally with those found in the body text (for example xxxxx rather than the xxxxx quoted in the text). Which of these numbers is correct?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	SSET207 Collated Appendices rev 1.1.pdf (Redacted for public version)
11	Co	Appendix 4, p59	Numerical Query	It is not clear from the table how the base case costing has been calculated. Is there a reference that could be provided in order to clarify these numbers?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	
12	Co	Appendix 6, p66 ono	Document Format	The tabular format used for the risk register makes it difficult to navigate - can you please provide a copy where the headers are repeated across pages?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	SSET207 Collated Appendices rev 1.1.pdf (Redacted for public version)
13	Co	Appendix 6, p66 ono	Document Content	The qualitative descriptions for risks 'Remote', 'Occasional', 'Improbable', etc are unclear and leave the table open to misinterpretation. Please can you provide numerical bandings for these values?	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	SSET207 Collated Appendices rev 1.1.pdf (Redacted for public version)
14	Co	Appendix 7, Appendix M	Document Content	The first 62 references in Appendix 7, Appendix M are unreferenced by the body text - suggest removing.	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	SSET207 Collated Appendices rev 1.1.pdf (Redacted for public version)
15	Co	Appendix 8	Document Format	Should Appendix M appear after both Appendix 7 and 8? - It appears to pertain to both of them.	31 July 2014	04 August 2014	04 August 2014	N/A	N	SSET207 Collated Appendices rev 1.1.pdf (Redacted for public version)
16	Ofgem	Section 1	Project Partners	Please clarify the role of S&C Consulting within the project.	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
17	Ofgem	Section 1	Project Partners	On page 30, of the proforma you outline the potential role of an academic partner in the project. Please clarify whether you have already engaged with potential academic partners to establish the interest, resources and specialisms to carry out the roles described.	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
18	Ofgem	Section 2	Project Description	At how many substations are you planning to trial TASS? I couldn't see it in the report, but I assume that there must be a planned number as financial costs and benefits have been produced.	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
19	Ofgem	Section 2	Project Description	How interchangeable are the three TASS options? For example, can you easily and cheaply upgrade from option 1 to option 3, or could you reuse the option 3 assets in another substation once they are no longer required? If so, has investigation and learning from this been included as part of the project?	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
20	Ofgem	Section 2	Project Description	The inrush current from transformer energisation can cause adverse voltage dips on the network. Will these be monitored and assessed as part of the project?	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
21	Ofgem	Section 2	Project Description	Please could you provide more information on the Network Losses Reduction Tool. Very little information is provided on it. What will it do, what does it consist of, why is it required etc.?	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
22	Ofgem	Section 5	IPR arrangements	At what point will you be able to confirm whether the project will conform to the default IPR arrangements?	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
23	Ofgem	Section 3	Benefits case	When calculating the benefits it appears that you have not taken into account that transformer losses will naturally be reducing due to the EU directive. Why?	14 August 2014	18 August 2014	18 August 2014	N/A	N	
24	Ofgem	Appendices	Project Plan	The project plan, as resubmitted as an annex to your interrogation report responses, provides limited detail of the interdependencies for project delivery and does not clearly reference to the SDRC outlined in section 9 of your full submission. Do you have a more detailed project plan which includes the tasks associated with the SDRC? If so, please provide it.	16 September 2014	18 September 2014	18 September 2014	N/A	N	Attachment to Q24 - LEAN Project Plan
25	Ofgem	Section 2	Project Description	Are there any potential impacts of the proposed TASS method on the warranty of the transformers it will be applied to? If so, have you discussed these with the manufacturer?	25 September 2014	29 September 2014	29 September 2014	N/A	N	
26	Ofgem	Section 3	Business case assumptions	We note that you state on p.17 of your submission that you have assumed a value of £48.42 per MWh saved by the solution. Dividing the gross benefits shown in the table by the total MWh saved gives a figure of around £43.10. Please clarify how you have calculated the financial value of the MWh avoided losses for each of the 3 options.	21 October 2014	23 October 2014	23-Oct-2014	N/A	N	CBA Workbook (Redaction - not available in public version)

27	Ofgem	Section 3	Business case assumptions	You state on p.62 of your submission that you have assumed carbon saving of 428g CO2/ KWh saved (equivalent to 0.428tonnes CO2/ MWh saved). However, p.19 states that the solution could provide 'a reduction in annual network losses of up to 31,838 MWh, which is equivalent to 6,421 tonnes of CO2'. These numbers would seem to imply a assumption of 0.2017 tonnes CO2/ MWh saved (or 201.7g/ KWh). Furthermore, Figure 3.e on p.17 states a total of 306,773 ktCO2e saved over 45 years – this is orders of magnitude greater than the 289,945 tonnes CO2 implied by the figures stated on p.19. Please clarify how you derived the total CO2e benefits for each of the 3 options.	21 October 2014	23 October 2014	23-Oct-2014	N/A	N	CBA Workbook (Redaction - not available in public version)
28	Ofgem	Project summary	Project benefits	We note that the potential 45-year NPV benefits range from £49m, if option 1 is applied to 30% of the substations, to £17m if option 3 only is applied to 5% of the substations. In your submission (see p. 1) and in the your bilateral presentations you stated a potential benefit figure of £40m. How was this figure derived?	21 October 2014	23 October 2014	23-Oct-2014	N/A	N	
29	Ofgem	Section 9/ Appendix 4	SDRC	We note that SDRCs 9.3 and 9.6 do not have associated delivery dates included in section 9 of the proforma – the dates shown in the plan against these criteria should be included in the proforma). We also note that the Delivery dates for SDRC 9.1, SDRC 9.4 and SDRC 9.5 included in section 9 of the proforma are different to the dates included in the plan. The plan included in the appendix does not appear to show SDRCs 9.7 or 9.8 is this an error?	21 October 2014	23 October 2014	23-Oct-2014	N/A	N	Appendix 4 Revised Detailed Project Plan
30	Ofgem	Section 9/ Appendix 4	SDRC	We note the revised SDRC in your resubmission, including the proposed evidence for SDRC 9.3 - 'Written confirmation from external stakeholders that the solution proposed in conjunction with the projected benefits is applicable for GB wide rollout. In order to move into phase 2 of the project, the modelling work must show a positive return on investment and acceptably mitigate the risk to network security and asset health.' In relation to this SDRC and the proposed evidence, please clarify – 1) Which external stakeholders you would expect gather responses from as a minimum. 2) What aspects of the project they would be asked to comment on. 3) What consultation you would have with these stakeholders prior to reaching the decision point vis-à-vis the aspects of the project they will be asked to comment.	28 October 2014	30 October 2014	30-Oct-2014	N/A	N	

Redacted area

XX

Actual redacted text