

# *Electricity Network Innovation Competition Full Submission*

## *Supplementary Answer Form*

### **Project: REVISE**

Tick if this answer has been provided verbally: ☐

Project code	WPD/EN/NIC/05	Question Number	31
Question date	04 September 2018	Answer date	06 September 2018
Submission section question relates to	N/A		
Topic	a) Low carbon/environment and net financial benefits;  d) Is innovative		
Question	Please explain why the average of FES carbon intensity figures was chosen rather than any particular scenario. Please comment on the carbon benefits that would be expected if the estimate were based on either Slow Progression (2017 data) or Steady Progression (2018 data)		
Notes on question	None		
Answer	<p>We chose an average carbon intensity figure for calculating the carbon benefits as a single set of values is required in Appendix A and selecting a particular scenario would potentially mean that the benefits would be significantly over or under estimated. It was our view that providing benefits on an average of the four scenarios delivers a transparent and realisable set of projected carbon benefits.</p> <p>As previously discussed, the carbon benefits detailed in Appendix A are based on the average carbon intensity figures from the 2017 FES. We have assessed how these benefits would change if the carbon intensity figure were to change. This is summarised below:</p> <p><u>Slow Progression (2017 data)</u></p> <p>The Slow Progression FES has a higher carbon intensity compared with the average figure used in Appendix A. Using the higher carbon intensity figure, the carbon benefits for REVISE would increase by around 12% for GB roll-out of all three Methods.</p>		

Steady Progression (2018 data)

The revised FES released in July 2018 has four new scenarios which all have lower carbon intensity figures compared with FES 2017 (due to increased volumes of low carbon generation). The Steady Progression scenario has a lower carbon intensity compared with the average figure used in Appendix A. Using the lower carbon intensity figure, the carbon benefits for REVISE would reduce by around 13% for GB roll-out of all three Methods.

The table below indicates the total cumulative carbon benefit for each of the scenarios described above at the 2030, 2040 and 2050 time periods for GB scale roll-out.

Total Carbon Benefit (GB Roll-out)				
Scenario	2030 (tCO2e)	2040 (tCO2e)	2050 (tCO2e)	Diff (%)*
Average (2017 Data)	219,287	718,505	1,343,653	0
Slow Progression (2017 Data)	245,259	804,569	1,505,472	+12
Steady Progression (2018 Data)	190,279	622,382	1,162,919	-13

\*relative to the average scenario

Attachments

None