

Engineering Hub Approval	Ofgem Scheme Reference (OSR)	Scheme Name	Project Name	Justification Proposal	Information Sent	Date Sent	Ofgem Reply	Date Received
				Non-load				
	SPNLT2024	XL ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	XL ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	EJP for the T3 output schemes will be provided.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT2024 to 2032	11/08/2020		
	SPNLT2025	BE ROUTE 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	BE ROUTE 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2026	BV ROUTE 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	BV ROUTE 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2027	BR ROUTE 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	BR ROUTE 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2028	YB & YC ROUTES 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	YB & YC ROUTES 132kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2029	XW ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	XW ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2030	XT ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	XT ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2031	YF ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	YF ROUTE 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2032	XD119-131 / XK / XN / XM 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT	119-131 / XK / XN / XM 275kV MAJOR REFURBISHMENT					
	SPNLT2039	Galashiels 132kV switchgear replacement	Galashiels 132kV switchgear replacement	EJP will be provided	EJP_SPT_SPNLT2039.pdf	29/07/2020		
	SPNLT2042	Cockenzie SGT1 Transformer Replacement	Cockenzie SGT1 Transformer Replacement	EJP for Transformers with T3 output will be provided.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT2042-44-45.pdf	29/07/2020		
	SPNLT2044	Strathaven SGT1 Transformer Replacement	Strathaven SGT1 Transformer Replacement					
	SPNLT2045	Kaimes SGT2 Transformer Replacement	Kaimes SGT2 Transformer Replacement					
FALSE	SPNLT2047	Torness 400kV Shunt Reactors Replacement	Torness 400kV Shunt Reactors Replacement	Independent expert report into the decision will be provided.	EJP_SP_SPNLT2047 Issue 3.pdf	29/07/2020		
FALSE	SPNLT2055	400 / 275kV Telecomms Resilience	400 / 275kV Telecomms Resilience	Independent expert report into the decision will be provided. Additional data will be provided.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT2055 Issue 3	11/08/2020		
	SPNLT2075	Clydesmill SGT2 Transformer Refurbishment	Clydesmill SGT2 Transformer Refurbishment	EJP for Transformers with T3 output will be provided.	EJP_SPNLT2075 to 2077-2079 to 2084.pdf	29/07/2020		
	SPNLT2076	Partick T2 Transformer Refurbishment	Partick T2 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2077	Glenluce T2 Transformer Refurbishment	Glenluce T2 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2079	Wishaw 275kV SGT7 Transformer Refurbishment	Wishaw 275kV SGT7 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2080	Wishaw 275kV SGT6 Transformer Refurbishment	Wishaw 275kV SGT6 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2081	Ayr STG1 Transformer Refurbishment	Ayr STG1 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2082	Saltcoats T1A Transformer Refurbishment	Saltcoats T1A Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2083	Glenluce T1 Transformer Refurbishment	Glenluce T1 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2084	Dunfermline T1 Transformer Refurbishment	Dunfermline T1 Transformer Refurbishment					
	SPNLT2095	Grangemouth SGT1 Transformer Refurbishment	Grangemouth SGT1 Transformer Refurbishment	This has been rejected in error. An EJP was provided and all other schemes covered by this were approved.	N/A	N/A		
	SPNLT20105	Jnc. XN route to Kincardine Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)	Jnc. XN route to Kincardine Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)	An EJP will be provided for this scheme	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20105 to 108	11/08/2020		
	SPNLT20106	Jnc. XM route OHL modernisation Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)	Jnc. XM route OHL modernisation Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)					
	SPNLT20107	Jnc. route to Currie OHL modernisation Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)	Jnc. route to Currie OHL modernisation Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)					
	SPNLT20108	Jnc. XK route/ Jnc. XK route to Grangemouth Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)	Jnc. XK route/ Jnc. XK route to Grangemouth Major Refurbishment (Recond 10cct)	An EJP will be provided for this scheme	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20110	11/08/2020		
	SPNLT20110	Devol Moor - Erskine 132kV Overhead Line	Devol Moor - Erskine 132kV Overhead Line					
	SPNLT20114	TOWER PAINTING PROGRAMME	TOWER PAINTING PROGRAMME		EJP_SPT_SPNLT20114 Tower Painting.pdf	29/07/2020		
	SPNLT20119	Servitudes	Servitudes	Page 127 of the business plan. Ofgem to confirm if this has been reviewed in their assessment. Additional information will be provided.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20119	10/07/2020		
	SPNLT20121	Community Fund T2	Community Fund T2	Due to ongoing COVID issues this will not be progressed.	N/A	N/A		
	SPNLT20134	N/r Diversions	N/r Diversions	An EJP will be provided for this land cost item.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20134	10/07/2020		
	SPNLT20138	ZP ROUTE 400kV MINOR REFURBISHMENT	ZP ROUTE 400kV MINOR REFURBISHMENT (Circuit 2)	EJP to be updated to clarify the inclusion of the 2nd circuit as a T3 deliverable.	EJP_SPT_OHL Minor Refurbishment Programme Issue 3	11/08/2020		
	SPNLT20139	Giffnock SGT1 & SGT2 Transformer Replacement	Giffnock SGT2 Transformer replacement	EJP to be updated to clarify the inclusion of the 2nd transformer as a T3 deliverable.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT2066 and SPNLT20139.pdf	29/07/2020		
ADJUSTED	SPNLT20140	SF6 repair works	SF6 repair works	Updated EJP to contain a report on the Ofgem/Atkins Decision	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20140 Issue 2.pdf	29/07/2020		
	SPNLT20143	Injurious affection	Injurious affection	Page 128 of the business plan. Ofgem to confirm if this has been reviewed in their assessment. Additional information will be provided.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20143	10/07/2020		
	SPNLT20144	N/r Diversions (RIIO-T2)	N/r Diversions (RIIO-T2)	Page 128 of the business plan. Ofgem to confirm if this has been reviewed in their assessment. Additional information will be provided.	EJP_SPT_SPNLT20144	14/08/2020		
				Load				
	SPT20066	GSP Charlotte Street 275/33/33 New SGT1 - Output	GSP Charlotte Street 275/33/33 New SGT1	Uncertain if rejected - see LRC-022 in issues log. EJP can be provided if required	EJP_SPT_SPT20066	02/09/2020		
	SPT20067	GSP Charlotte Street 275/33/33 New SGT1 - A1 & C1	GSP Charlotte Street 275/33/33 New SGT1					
	SPT20068	GSP Charlotte Street 275/33/33 New SGT1 - H1	GSP Charlotte Street 275/33/33 New SGT1					
	SPT20096	Network Rail Marshall Meadows Capacity Increase - Output	Network Rail Marshall Meadows Capacity Increase	New EJP to be provided	EJP_SPT_SPT20096	10/07/2020		
	SPT20097	Network Rail Marshall Meadows Capacity Increase - A1 & C1	Network Rail Marshall Meadows Capacity Increase					
	SPT20098	Network Rail Marshall Meadows Capacity Increase - H1	Network Rail Marshall Meadows Capacity Increase					
	SPT20099	Network Rail Innerwick Capacity Increase - Output	Network Rail Innerwick Capacity Increase	New EJP to be provided	EJP_SPT_SPT20099	10/07/2020		
	SPT200100	Network Rail Innerwick Capacity Increase - A1 & C1	Network Rail Innerwick Capacity Increase					
FALSE	SPT200130	Circuit Rating Management System - Output	Circuit Rating Management System					
FALSE	SPT200131	Circuit Rating Management System	Circuit Rating Management System	Updated EJP to be provided	EJP_SPT_SPT200130 Circuit Rating Management System Issue3	14/08/2020		
	SPT200136	Pre-Engineering Works	Pre-Engineering Works	Updated EJP	EJP_SPT_SPT200136 Issue_2	02/09/2020		
	SPT200195	NR Currie Feeder - Output	NR Currie Feeder	New EJP to be provided	EJP_SPT_SPT200195	10/07/2020		
	SPT200196	NR Currie Feeder - A1 & C1	NR Currie Feeder					

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type		Issue Description	Date Issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status Open/Closed
			Mathematical Error/Interpretation/Methodology/D	Assessment						
NLRC-001	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex 3.59	Interpretation		The Net Zero fund has been approved as a bespoke PCD but has been removed as there was no EJP. An EJP is not required as per the published guidance	16/07/2020		Agree Ofgem needs to address this anomaly. Will be addressed with policy team (have had initial confirmation that approval was their policy intent)		Open
NLRC-002	Rejected Costs	NARM Annex 1.5 & ET Sector Annex 3.33	Interpretation		Costs relating to projects with RIO- T3 outputs have been disallowed due to lack of justification. However these should have been captured in the fixed pot bridging fund with a true-up at the end of RIO- T2. These cost should not be factored into the BPI.	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Ofgem require justification for all proposed investments, whether with output delivery years in RIO- 2 or RIO- 3. Once justification for these works has been provided, they will be reviewed and considered for Final Determination, for inclusion in the bridging fund for schemes crossing T2-T3.	Justification has been provided for all such schemes and feedback is awaited.	Open
NLRC-003	Rejected Costs	Engineering Justification Guidance	Interpretation		Land costs have been disallowed despite not falling within the scope of EJPs and being explained and justified in the business plan core document.	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	We acknowledge that this needs to be reviewed.	Additional information has been provided to assist with the review.	Open
NLRC-004	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex 3.57	Interpretation		Torness shunt reactor costs have been removed from the plan despite strong independent evidence, independent audit of the decision, positive CBA & NARM health score.	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	NM: SPT have sent further info which is under review by the Engineering team and Ofgem's consultant.		Open
NLRC-005	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Interpretation		Please provide details of the reconciliation between the cost models and table C2.2a.	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Cost models shared on 22/07. Does this action close this item?	No: The submitted T2 costs C2.2a adjusted for indirects using Ofgem's methodology has a total of £507m. The final total from the PAM is £320m, a reduction of £187m, not £132m as stated in the DD SPT annex.	Open
NLRC-006	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Interpretation		Please provide asset level adjustment values for each project	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Cost models shared on 22/07. Does this action close this item?	Yes	Closed
NLRC-007	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Interpretation		Please provide details of the calculation of adjustments for Risk & Contingency at a scheme level	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	R&C spread sheets shared on24/07. Does this action close this item?	Yes	Closed
NLRC-008	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Error		Scheme SPNLT2095 Grangemouth SGT1 Transformer Refurbishment has been disallowed in the model but not in the DD documents	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	We acknowledge the error in our model. This scheme should have been approved. We'll consider including this scheme in the allowance for FDs.		Open
NLRC-009	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Error		Costs for strategic spares (SPNLT20116 & SPNLT20117) have been removed with no equivalent explanation in the DD documents	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Ofgem's BPDOT Guidance for table C2.5/C2.5a states "The licensee is required to input cost and volume data for all lead and non-lead assets attributed against each scheme listed in worksheet C.07 (master table). Costs recorded against each scheme on this table will reconcile to the applicable subset of costs reported in worksheet 2.2a_C1 (columns M and O)". For these schemes, SPT have entered total lead/non-lead asset costs in 2.2a_C1 but haven't entered any cost or volume breakdown by asset type in the subsequent scheme asset breakdown (c2.5/a) tables. Please explain if you have a different interpretation of the BPDOT guidance and why; or if there is any other reason for not including cost and volume breakdowns in the scheme asset breakdown tables of the BPDOT. Please also provide a list of any other such instances. We will then need to consider how to treat these costs. For SPNLT20117, £2.1m was not part of baseline allowance due to this issue. A further £0.031m relating to Other (Direct) cost category should have been approved, however wasn't due to a spreadsheet error by Ofgem. For SPNLT20116, £0.381m was missed from allowance due to the above interpretation issue. This issue is similar to NLRC-011 and 18.	We note that the projects are approved meaning that Ofgem agree that the works are necessary and in consumers' interests. We cannot reconcile this with the removal of costs to deliver them due to a potential difference of interpretation in the population of a data table. We remain of the view that our interpretation is correct but, without prejudice, could update the tables to resolve the issue. Please advise. In this case, the guidance for spares in C2.11 requires that costs are recorded in C2.11 which has been done. However these costs do not flow to the baseline totex so they have also been entered in C2.2a. We note the guidance for spares states "No volumes to be recorded in the Costs and Volumes Reporting Pack at the point of acquisition as the strategic spare has not yet been utilised on the network (Licensees should maintain their own record of volumes, as they would for stock items)." Therefore we have complied by not entering volumes in the Costs and Volumes Reporting Pack. This is contrary to the section of the guidance quoted in column M by Ofgem inferring that the guidance is inconsistent. We note that there was no SQ issued by Ofgem on this topic.	Open
NLRC-010	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Error		All T1 'cross-over' schemes have been removed from the analysis with no explanation in the DD documents	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Is this in reference to item 3 in the 'SPT – Specific adjustments to cost assessment model' accompanying document shared on 16/07/20? If so, then these schemes are from the list provided by SPT of schemes with minor T2 touchpoints. Where applicable, each company identified a list of schemes (and associated assets), where there was a minor T2 'touch point', for example, outstanding spend, but where the majority of the scheme had been delivered in T1 and no output was expected to be delivered in T2. As there was no output delivery in T2 for these schemes, they were excluded from our cost assessment to establish the T2 baseline allowance. The rows relating to these schemes were deleted from the inputs to our cost assessment models. If this item relates to other schemes that weren't in the above list, then please provide reference numbers of the schemes in question.		Open
NLRC-011	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Error		Costs for schemes SPNLT2049,SPNLT2051,SPNLT2052,SPNLT2053,SPNLT2054,SPNLT2056,SPNLT2057,SPNLT2058,SPNLT2059,SPNLT2060,SPNLT2061,SPNLT2062,SPNLT20116,SPNLT20117 appear to have been removed completely but this is not referenced in the DD documentation	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Ofgem's BPDOT Guidance for table C2.5/C2.5a states "The licensee is required to input cost and volume data for all lead and non-lead assets attributed against each scheme listed in worksheet C.07 (master table). Costs recorded against each scheme on this table will reconcile to the applicable subset of costs reported in worksheet 2.2a_C1 (columns M and O)". For these schemes, SPT have entered total lead/non-lead asset costs in 2.2a_C1 but haven't entered any cost or volume breakdown by asset type in the subsequent scheme asset breakdown (c2.5/a) tables. Please explain if you have a different interpretation of the BPDOT guidance and why; or if there is any other reason for not including cost and volume breakdowns in the scheme asset breakdown tables of the BPDOT. Please also provide a list of any other such instances. We will then need to consider how to treat these costs. This issue is similar to NLRC-009 and 18.	This query should have been superseded by NLRC-018 when the PAM models became available so this item is closed	Closed
NLRC-012	Cost Model	Cost Model & SPT Annex	Error		In the document titled "SPT – Specific adjustments to cost assessment model" received from Konark Anand on 17/07/20, it is stated that £6.284m has been added to the costs for scheme SPNLT2033 following the response to SPTL SQ_CA_64. In that response, SPT highlighted that this should apply to all such schemes. Therefore the following additions should have been made: SPNLT2036: £2.363m SPNLT2037:£2.202m	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	These costs relate to assets for which no volumes have been reported in the scheme asset breakdown table of the BPDOT. We note that there will be instances where allocated costs do not have a corresponding volume count due to interpretation of the BPDOT guidance/glossary. Please confirm if the disallowed costs relating to SPNLT2036/7 relate to the same issue as noted in the SQ response for SPNLT2033, i.e. the costs with no corresponding additions volumes are related to disposal of 'switchgear - other' items (this is evident from the BPDOT, albeit for 400kV and 132kV for these two schemes rather than 275kV, but please confirm). We will consider inclusion of these costs for FDs.	Confirm that these two schemes are as previously advised in SPTL SQ_CA_64, i.e. that they have costs for addition of items not required to be counted as volumes but also have cost items for disposal of items to be counted as volumes. The disposal volumes are recorded in C2.5. Please also see NLRC-017	Open
NLRC-013	Cost Model	Cost Model	Error		During a bilateral call with Ofgem on 17/07/20, Konark Anand Stated that there were two schemes (SPNLT2037 and SPNLT20100) where the models had failed and some costs (Civil and Other Direct) were not transferred to the assessment model. Please confirm that these costs will be reinstated.	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	Yes, we will consider restating these costs in FDs. However, we have a total of £9.22m relating to RIO-2 costs that has been missed from the allowance instead of £9.85 noted by SPT.		Open
NLRC-014	Cost Model	Cost Model	Error		For schemes, such as SPNLT 2033, where an activity has only a disposal for that asset class costs are expressed in the top half of C2.5 while the asset volumes are recorded against disposal. Costs not allowed through mismatch.	28/07/2020	14/08/2020			Open
NLRC-015	Cost Model	Cost Model	Error		Volumes have not been brought into C2.5 loader for scheme SPNLT2040 resulting in costs being disallowed.	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	Please provide further details on why volumes have not been reported in C2.5.	These volumes have been included in SPT's submission of C2.5 but have not been correctly imported into Ofgem's PAM model.	Open
NLRC-016	Cost Model	Cost Model	Disagreement		Engineering volumes are higher or lower than those in C2.5 with no justification given. Likely as a result of no update post SQ_NARM_1. Clarification required on reconciliation to RIO_T2_BPDOT_SPT_Dec_v9.0 Schemes: 201 / 202 / 203 / 205 / 2014 / 20114	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	To be reviewed.		Open
NLRC-017	Cost Model	Cost Model	Error		Costs have been disallowed for switchgear other where costs but no volumes have been recorded. Works categories are undertaken in a number of schemes without the addition of additional or disposal of disconnectors or earth switches. This includes, but not limited to, replacement of multicore cables and surge arrestors and works undertaken on GIS installations where the disconnectors and earth switches are indivisible from the circuit breaker asset. The Transmission Glossary requires that only volumes of disconnectors and earth switches are recorded against this category. This was detailed in the BPDOT query log and in our response to SQ_CA_64. SPNLT2035 / 2036 / 2037 / 2065 / 20139.	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	Similar to NLRC-012? Can you confirm that the additional schemes noted (2035, 2065 and 20139) have the same issue as 2033/2036/2037? We will consider inclusion of these costs for FDs where appropriate.	Confirm that these schemes refer to the same issue affecting 2033/2036/2037. We have also identified the same issue on scheme SPNLT2040 with respect to 132kV Air Insulated CB (OD). A separate issue will be raised for clarity.	Open
NLRC-018	Cost Model	Cost Model	Error		For schemes SPNLT2049 to 54 and 56 to 62 inclusive, asset costs have not been processed in the models. No volumes have been included in table C2.5 for these schemes as there is no applicable asset category. This was explained in the BPDOT but was not the subject of an SQ.	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	Ofgem's BPDOT Guidance for table C2.5/C2.5a states "The licensee is required to input cost and volume data for all lead and non-lead assets attributed against each scheme listed in worksheet C.07 (master table). Costs recorded against each scheme on this table will reconcile to the applicable subset of costs reported in worksheet 2.2a_C1 (columns M and O)". For these schemes, SPT have entered total lead/non-lead asset costs in 2.2a_C1 but haven't entered any cost or volume breakdown by asset type in the subsequent scheme asset breakdown (c2.5/a) tables. Please explain if you have a different interpretation of the BPDOT guidance and why; or if there is any other reason for not including cost and volume breakdowns in the scheme asset breakdown tables of the BPDOT. Please also provide a list of any other such instances. We will then need to consider how to treat these costs. This issue is similar to NLRC-009 and 11.	We note that the projects are approved indicating that Ofgem agree that the works are necessary and in consumers' interests. We cannot reconcile this with the removal of costs to deliver them due to a potential difference of interpretation in the population of a data table. We remain of the view that our interpretation is correct but, without prejudice, could update the tables to resolve the issue. Please advise. In this case, we advised Ofgem of this issue in the BPDOTC in compliance with the guidance. We stated "As noted in the commentary for C0.7, some schemes have been identified as Protection, Control, Telecoms as the closest Asset Type but do not fit with the glossary definition of protection schemes. Therefore, no costs or volumes have been recorded in C2.5 and C2.5a respectively. This causes an error in the check cells for the relevant schemes." We remain of the view that the Glossary does not account for the asset types relevant to these schemes. Given that we specifically highlighted this point, we are surprised that no SQ was raised to resolve this issue.	Open
NLRC-019	BPI	NLRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error		Scheme SPNLT2033 Windyhill 275kV has been subject to an asset cost disallowance of £6.266m. However, it has already stated that this was an error for which a manual adjustment has been made. This adjustment did not flow into the BPI calculation	04/08/2020	14/08/2020	Under review.		Open
NLRC-020	BPI	NLRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Interpretation		Risk & Contingency costs have effectively been benchmarked by the assessment model and so should be considered high confidence, removing them from the BPI penalty.	04/08/2020	14/08/2020	Under review.		Open

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type	Issue Description	Date Issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status Open/Closed
URC-001	Not assessed costs	SPT Annex -Wider Works	Interpretation	SP7200117 E2DC - Offshore - Eastern Subsea HVDC Link costs included within the BPOT have not been asaned. There is no reference within the whole document to them.	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Ofgem to provide clarification of treatment w/c 17 August		Open
URC-002	Wrong Reference	SPT Annex 3.28	Error	Total costs (£171m) and T2 expenditure (£164m) stated in this section for the 4 percent NOA projects (HNNO,ECU2, WLT1 and ECU2) does not align with the values included in the BPOT. Values should be £137.99m. (Total cost) with £133.05m of T2 expenditure.	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Ofgem to provide clarification as per LRC-011		Open
URC-003	Wrong Reference	SPT Annex 3.30	Error	Costs stated in this section for ECU2 and DWN0 as schemes totals (£153m) and T3 expenditure (£125m) does not align with the values included in the BPOT. Values should be £85.6m for the Total expenditure and £129.09m for T3 expenditure.	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Ofgem to review and confirm values w/c 17 August		Open
URC-004	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex - Table 28	Error/Interpretation	The allowance for Windyhill to Lambhill to Longannet 275kV (WLT1) has been set at £20k. This is a very low amount and inconsistent with reductions applied elsewhere. Is this an error? Most of the cost has been shifted into T1 (LRE_Ofgem_View table).	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	We acknowledge this issue is shifting the allowance profile. We'll consider rectifying this for FDs upon conducting a review to confirm if this was done by error.		Open
URC-005	High - Low Confidence Costs	SPT Annex - 3.46/3.49	Error/Interpretation	Ofgem specify differing values for High/Low Confidence costs across varying sections. Within 3.46 it's stated as £186m High/Low Low. Within 3.49 it's stated as £225m Low. Which of these values is correct? How have they been calculated as they do not align with values within the Summary table.	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	The numbers in section 3.46 relate to our allowance, whereas the number in 3.49 relates to SPT's submission.		Open
URC-006	Cost Efficiency Reductions	SPT Annex 3.37/3.38/3.39	Error/Interpretation	Costs stated for reduction in costs are as follows: £16m unit cost efficiency £21m risk reduction £37m review of approved scheme costs £14m poorly justified non-asset costs £33m schemes not approved These values do not align with the stated reduction for LRE	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	We acknowledge the issue and will consider providing a more accurate breakdown.		Open
URC-007	Allowances	SPT Annex - Tables 23-24	Interpretation/Disagreement	Section 3.4.8 of SPT Annex states that "Ofgem proposes to give an Allowance that matches what have been proposed by SPT for both civils and other non-unit cost categories" (i.e. Other (Directs)). Some allowances given to proposed generation projects does not cover those two totals or even the civils works. As an example "SP7200208 TOR 198 132 kV Newton Street Upgrading" has a given allowance by Ofgem of £0.49m, while the civils cost are £0.65m and Other directs are £1.13m.	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Under review.		Open
URC-008	Not assessed costs	SPT Annex Local Enabling (Entry) and LRE (Entry sole use)	Interpretation	There is no reference to four T2 schemes (SP720036, SP720024, SP720034, SP720019) included within the BPOT that have some expenditure in T2. They are mainly customer funded protection schemes apart from TOR1 268. Are we getting the proposed expenditure within T2? There is also no reference to 3 schemes (T2 schemes) that has expenditure in T2 but has not been included as crossover by Ofgem. (SP7200152, SP7200163, SP7200164). Are we getting the proposed expenditure in T2 or should we assume that the expenditure is cover by T1?	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	We acknowledge this issue in shifting the allowance profile. We'll consider rectifying this for FDs upon conducting a review to confirm if this was done by error.		Open
URC-009	Allowances	SPT Annex Local Enabling (Entry) and LRE (Entry sole use)	Interpretation	Customer funded (A1) and SPT Funded (H1) split not available for Ofgem DD proposed allowances. Impact on current customer contracts unknown	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree to address this during development of UM model for FD		Open
URC-010	Allowances	SPT Annex - Table 22	Interpretation	Total allowance of £72m for Local Enabling (Entry) and LRE (Entry sole use) included within Table 22 does not align with the proposed allowances included within Tables 23-24.626 totalling £76.51m.	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-011	Allowances/Permitted Schemes	SPT Annex - 3.28	Error	Section 3.28 refers to proceed on 4 NOA schemes however value quoted in text of £164m T2 spend includes 5 NOA schemes. Additional scheme is ECU2	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Ofgem to provide clarification w/c 17 August		Open
URC-012	Cost Assessment	SPT Annex - 3.38	Error	Ofgem State 3.38 blanket 9.1% Risk Uplift has been included on Risk and Contingency, this is incorrect	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Our analysis shows that the vast majority of SPT projects came in at 9.0 - 9.1% risk and contingency. This was included in the spreadsheet provided by Kelvin ui. Happy to discuss if you believe these are incorrect.		Open
URC-013	Rejected costs	SPT Annex - 3.9	Interpretation	Section 3.9 states that they are proposing to remove £47m because the needs cases are not justified. We are not able to reconcile the £47m. Is it possible to know which projects are they referring too here?	16/07/2020	14/08/2020	Under review.		Open
URC-014	Allowances/Permitted Schemes	SPT Annex tables 20 and 28	Error/Interpretation	Allowances for Pre-Engineering in table 20 and ECU2 and HNNO in table 28 do not align with LRE_Ofgem_View table.	16/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-015	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Interpretation	Ofgem State that engineering/cost assessment teams can mark an entire scheme under the following methodology: "mark a scheme as high or lower confidence for the BPI mechanism which then overwrites any other cost classification by cost subcategory within the scheme" Can get clarification would this then move High Confidence costs submitted within an Overall Low Confidence scheme would be marked as Low Confidence?	28/07/2020	14/08/2020	Yes, if a scheme is marked as lower confidence, all costs within that scheme will be classed as lower confidence. This is because where we don't have confidence in the scheme's proposed solution, we don't have confidence in our ability to independently estimate the actual cost to deliver the stated output.		Open
URC-016	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error	Lead and civils cost not included in Ofgem determined project cost. This is possibly due to no volumes associated with scheme (outlined in the BPOT Commentary).	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-017	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error	Schemes were assets have an H1 A1 split but only 1 corresponding volume - the apartmentment the volume is not associated with has not been given any allowance in the calculations tab. Under if this has been added back in elsewhere but its not included in the unit cost for the asset. This issue has been raised with Ofgem previously.	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-018	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error	Volumes and unit costs associated with Civils on the model within tabs "B4.5 Scheme Asset Breakdown" and "B4.5a Scheme Asset breakdown" does not align with the volumes and units costs included on those tabs. In the latest version of the BPOT i.e. "H10_T2_BPOT_SPT_Dec_v3.07" it seems that a previous version of the BPOT has been used by Ofgem as an input for the LRE calculations. As a consequence the majority of the Civils associated with Platform creation, site access, and civils other haven't passed through and there is no allowance given to them.	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-019	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error	Other (Direct) costs have been completely removed from 27 of the Load schemes. (SP7200104, SP720067, SP7200920, SP720012, SPT20014, SPT20016, SPT20024, SPT20028, SPT20034, SPT20038, SPT20051/52, SPT20054/55, SPT20057, SPT20066, SPT20070, SPT20071, SPT20072, SPT20076, SPT20084, SPT20082/93, SPT200101, SPT200102, SPT200171, SPT200173/74, SPT200176, SPT200178/79, SPT200191).	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-020	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error	Some Volumes and unit costs referring to additions/disposals on the model within tabs "B4.5 Scheme Asset Breakdown" and "B4.5a Scheme Asset breakdown" does not align with the volumes and units costs included on those tabs in the latest version of the BPOT i.e. "H10_T2_BPOT_SPT_Dec_v3.07". Ofgem may not have used the last version submitted of the BPOT. Examples of shemes with wrong additions/disposal volumes are SPT200143/144, SPT20098, SPT200196 together with the crossover schemes.	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-021	Allowances/Permitted Schemes	SPT Annex - Table 20	Interpretation	Brandon has been rejected due to timing uncertainty and on the basis that UM are available. However, the project (£93.3m total) is below the LOTT threshold and is not a NOA project. For a MSP submission, we would have to wait for the MSP reopening window in January 2024. This is too late to connect Seagreen Phase 2 (contracted, 1400MW) in 2026 and the Eastern Link in 2027.	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - resolution will be subject to evolution of MSP policy for FDs		Open
URC-022	Allowances/Permitted Schemes	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Interpretation	According to 3.21, table 18 and footnote 35 on p.43, Charlotte Street (SP720066/67/68) has not been rejected. However, this project has been rejected in the PAM	28/07/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-023	Cost Assessment	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Interpretation	Could further detail on how the "133kV Pole" unit cost has been derived be provided? It seems the unit cost used in the model might not have been calculated on the same basis as th volumes in B4.5 Scheme Asset Breakdown, which means that it may not be representative. Volumes included in B4.5 are based on "Pole Location" instead of "Individual Pole Count". This was explained in the response to SQ_CA_57 submitted on 07/05/2020	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree to provide requested detail		Open
URC-024	BPI	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Error	ECUP (SP7200110/1) and DWN0 (SP7200106/7) should both be exempt from BPI. See 3.21-3.22 of installation. However, ECUP has not been marked as exempt in the tables.	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to consider - will be reviewed for FDs		Open
URC-025	BPI	LRE_Project_Assessment_Model	Interpretation	Risk & Contingency costs have effectively been benchmarked by the assessment model and so should be considered high confidence, removing them from the BPI penalty.	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to consider - will be reviewed for FDs		Open

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type		Date issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status
			Mathematical Error/Interpretation/Methodology/Di	saqreement					Open/Closed
NARM-001	Data import	NARM Annex - Appendix 3	Error	Volumes for CV table appear to have been copied from a previous version of the BPDT pack. Latest version submitted is version 9	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address. Ofgem will pick up during FD development.		Open
NARM-002	Risk output- Target	NARM Annex - Appendix 3	Interpretation	Ofgem assumption for risk target to be the long term risk outputs for A1 projects under N1.3 NARMS BPDT. SPT assumption is that N3.99 long term risk benefit outputs would form the target, these don't include consequential interventions. Pleaser refer to attached spreadsheet 'SPT Consequential interventions- Risk outputs LR' for further detail.	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address. Ofgem will pick up during FD development.		Open
NARM-003	CV-NARM volume reconciliation	NARM Annex - Appendix 3	Interpretation	Risk outputs have been disallowed due to assumptions made in the analysis when comparing removal volumes for CV against additions for NARM and when mapping intervention types classified differently under NARM/ CV tables. Spacer replacement and tower painting are principle examples.	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address. Ofgem will pick up during FD development.		Open
NARM-004	Risk Output calculation using unit risk and volume scaler	NARM Annex - Appendix 3	Methodology	Proposed approach for DD not fully aligned with T NOMS. Common undertanding of work to be done to avoid this methodology in the FD	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address. Ofgem will pick up during FD development.		Open
NARM-005	Schemes 'not approved' with risk output	NARM Annex- NARMS workbook	Error	There is at least one scheme not approved but showing a risk output, SPNLT20114 Tower Painting Programme	04/08/2020	17/08/2020	Agree there is an issue to address. Ofgem will pick up during FD development.		Open

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type Mathematical Error/Interpretation/M ethodology/Disagree ment	Issue Description	Date Issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status Open/Closed
NOCX-001	Cost Assessment	SPT Annex Cl. 3.75 & Atkins Report Table 5.1	Error	Reference is made to an approved project, 'intergrating new technologies and enabling digitlisation' in Cl. 3.75. This does not map to any project listed in Atkins IT&T Report (10.06.20). Atkins, instead, refer to, 'Power Systems Analysis Software' as being the fourth approved project.	04/08/2020	14/08/2020	Ofgem will arrange for further clarity from Atkins		Open
NOCX-002	Cost Assessment	Atkins Report Table 5.2 & Conclusions	Interpretation	Further clarity required on reference to % changes between T5.2 and Conclusions (Cl. 5.4)	04/08/2020		Ofgem will arrange for further clarity from Atkins		Open
NOCX-003	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex Cl. 3.76 Table 34 & Atkins Report Table 5.2	Interpretation	Atkins report makes reference to an, 'Excel workbook tool' that is used to establish the basis of the Cost reductions (c£0.4m (c18%)) for 'approved projects'. It does not appear that this has been provided as part of the cost models.	04/08/2020		This is an internal Atkins tool - was not intended for general release. Mode of operation is described in report. We can arrange for further detail from Atkins if required.		Open
NOCX-004	Cost Assessment	Atkins Report Cl. 5.3 & Table 5.1	Interpretation	SPT are the only ETO to have a project, 'Network Asset Design Tool' to score a Red under the, 'Justification for project' category in table 5.1. No further reference is made to this in Atkins findings. It would be helpful to get some clarity on why this project was scored so poorly.	04/08/2020		Ofgem will arrange for further clarity from Atkins		Open

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type	Issue Description	Date Issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status
			Mathematical Error/Interpretation/Methodology/Discagreement						Open/Closed
NOP-001	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex Table 35 Legal and Safety	Methodology	Legal and safety costs have been reduced due the comparison of T1 opex to T2 opex and capex. EJP for Capex expenditure approved by Ofgem	04/08/2020		Agree on issue - resolution subject to Ofgem internal review		Open
NOP-002	Rejected Costs	ET Sector Annex 3.43	Methodology	Ofgem have used EJP to assess Network Operating Costs, however these are for Capex programmes only and therefore not submitted for NOC by SPT. The BPDTC guidance clearly states that the BPDTC Commentary should be used to explain the contents of the tables and any variances from historical costs. SPT have followed the guidance and our commentary is included in the BPDTC, however this appears to not have been considered during assessment	04/08/2020		EJPs applied where appropriate (e.g capex costs within NOCs) for all companies including SPT, e.g. site security EJP above to be considered for review in within the Legal and safety costs. BPDTC commentary to be reviewed in line with sign posting provided in 24 July meeting and address comments and issues as applicable.		Open
NOP-003	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex Table 35 Faults	Methodology	All network operating costs have been considered on an asset type basis when carrying out unit cost assessment, with the exception of costs in Table C2.20 Faults. In this table costs have been rolled up into substation, overhead line and cable although costs were submitted on an asset type basis. This approach, inconsistent with other tables, has led to SPT's draft allowance of £12.3m rather than £15m if the allowance was determined on a assets type basis.The attempt to benchmark historical (actual) costs with forecast costs on a unit cost basis is not possible as the number of faults which may occur in the future cannot be accurately predicted. While it was noted that the cost assessment process was not subject to a	04/08/2020		Agree on issue - resolution subject to Ofgem internal review		Open
NOP-004	Rejected Costs	SPT Annex Table 35 Faults	Methodology	Civil works sites at 132, 275 and 400kV. Ofgem allowance is calculated using an annualised figure as no volumes have been presented. The table design does not allow for volumes to populated therefore the analysis does not take into account an increased number of substations requiring maintenance in RIIO-T2 compared to RIIO-T1. The allocation of costs associated with LVAC and black start generators being in this category, in line with the RIGS, does not take account of the significantly increased maintenance costs in RIIO-T2 associated with black start generators installed during RIIO-T1	04/08/2020		Agree on issue - resolution subject to Ofgem internal review		Open

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type Mathematical Error/Interpretation/Methodology/Di saqreement	Issue Description	Date Issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status Open/Closed
1	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Sharing Factor for SPT in LiMo should be 39.1 per DD SPT Annex page 10 (Cell I 1196 in SPTL Tab)	14/07/2020	22/07/2020	Highlevel reconciliation provided, however differences attributed to other or misc entries. Follow up required (Issue 8 below)	Yes there is a difference and the sharing factor in the DD SPT is correct. The model does not reflect the latest position because the model was run at a certain 'cut-off point' afterwhich the assumption was updated.	Closed
2	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Capitalisation for SPT UM should be 98% per DD document (Cells AP:AT 147, SPTL tab)	14/07/2020		Not an issue when the model is set to the 'Ofgem illustrative totex (revenue)' Scenario SPT displays a UM CapRate of 98%	Agreed, however as per cost assessment x% of UM spend is opex related and as such should be reflected in model.	Open
3	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Cannot reconcile total Totex in LIMO of £1.01bn to £0.969bn in DD (Cells AP10:AT15, SPTL Tab). Please provide reconciliation by category	14/07/2020		Reconciliation provided to ENA on 21 July	Most major elements have been provided such as OE & Cap Indirects . However there still remains minor differences between files , with Ofgem to provide the reasoning from an assurance point of view. Furthermore, Ofgem have requested additonal information to allow them to allocate cap indirects correctly within the LiMo which SPT will provide in due course.	Open
4	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	CPIH Inflation values do not match assumptions provided on page 8 of finance annex (Cells AP126:AT126 , SPTL Tab)	14/07/2020	N/A	N/A	No longer required as difference has been reconciled.	Closed
5	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	RPE allowances are currently split between load (66%) & Indirects (34%) , what is the basis of the split provided?	14/07/2020		This is a approximation and these splits mainly impact tax. These allocations will be refreshed ahead of FD and more generally evolve per the tax updates that will be made ahead of FD	Happy to provide any assistance as required to help arrive at the correct allocation	Closed
6	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Value of BPI in LiMo (£13.5m Cell AP1067) does not match the value quoted in DD (£15m Page 10 of SPT Annex)	14/07/2020		Yes there is a difference and the BPI in the DD doc is correct. The model does not reflect the latest position because the model was run at a certain 'cut-off point' afterwhich the assumption was updated.		Closed
7	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	19/20 Inflation value is inccorect (Cell AN120) , Should be 290.642 , Also forecast value for 20/21 does not match recent regulatory templates (RFPR)	16/07/2020		Yes we will update the 19/20 inflation per actual values ahead of FD		Closed
8	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Further clarity required to reconcile the BP Totex figure of £1388m as we do not recognise this. BP document and LiMo contained Totex values of £1374.8m for SPT across RIIQ-2. We believe that the difference may be in treatment of customer contributions of £13.6m. Can this be confirmed?	22/07/2020	17/08/2020	Yes, you are correct, the difference is the treatment of the customer contributions amount	Will this be trued up for the FD?	Open
9	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Differences between the DD document and DD LiMo are explained by RPE's allowance of £39.2m and Misc of £2.1m. Can further detail be provided on the "Misc" element i.e. nature/cost category/annual profile?	22/07/2020	17/08/2020	The Misc element arose due to a late change(increase) in the Indirects allowance for SPT. Rather than having to rerun the finance model, this £2.1m uplift was inserted. It will be revised for final determinations runs. The profiling effect should be evident through comparing the profile for indirects in the attached file against the current LiMO profile on indirect opex.	As with response to Issue 3, outstanding action on Ofgem to provide final reconciliation of minor outstanding values	Open
10	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Further detail is required on how Ofgem have arrived at the Oncosted view of Totex in the LiMo and how it compares to the "prime/indirect" view in the DD documents	22/07/2020	17/08/2020	As discussed, the translation of cost team output into LiMO input was done using the capitalisation rates provided by SPT in the attached workbook provided by Paul D on 11/8 . This has three tabs: the capitalisation rates by RIIQ2 year for each cost category within the Business Plan Data Template, the outputs of the cost assessment process, and the conversion of cost outputs into LiMO inputs. Happy to discuss further if you have any follow-up queries.	As with response to Issue 3 , SPT will provide further detail on proposed allocation of cap indirect across prime activity (Load/Non Load etc) in due course to aid Ofgem in LiMo population.	Open
11	Calculatio n	ET	Accuracy	Non core Net debt transfer not taken into account at start of price control (£7.1m nominal) , Treatment of Non core is not correct at T1/T2 boundary	31/07/2020		On 10/8 Ofgem requested workbook showing how the 7.1m is determined and await this file	Workbook attached showing the calculation of Non core transfer based on T1 PCFM data. "Non-Core T1 Populated"	Open
12	Calculatio n	ET	Accuracy	RPE allowances are currently split between load (66%) & Indirects (34%) , what is the basis of the split provided?	31/07/2020		Per earlier response, this is a approximation and these splits mainly impact tax. These allocations will be refreshed ahead of FD and more generally evolve per the tax updates that will be made ahead of FD		Closed
13	Calculatio n	ET	Accuracy	Statutory Depreciation values will need to be restated based on updated Totex per Ofgem's DD	31/07/2020		Agreed. Will be updated ahead of FD		Closed
14	Calculatio n	ET	Accuracy	Incentives values used in RoRE calculation do not take account of Tax that would be required on such payments therefore are overstated.	31/07/2020		There is a tax allowance given for all ODI(f) incentives for RIIQ2 which form part of the PCFM revenue so therefore we believe the RORE is correct	Agreed after further review of the LiMo	Closed
15	Data Inputs	ET	Accuracy	Tax pool allocations require a refresh to take account of Ofgem DD adjustments	31/07/2020		Agreed. Will be updated ahead of FD		Closed

Issue Reference	Topic	Draft Determination Reference	Issue Type		Date Issued to Ofgem	Response Received Date	Ofgem Response	Response Comment	Status Open/Closed
			Mathematical Error/Interpretation/Methodology/Disagreement	Issue Description					
UM-001	Pre-Construction	ET Annex, page 72	Interpretation	Baseline pre-construction reduced with no justification or understanding of what schemes were reduced. Allowed funding does not correlate with any project that made up the total allowance. Please provide clarification	07/08/2020				Open
UM-002	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Linked with LRC-019 - Other (Direct) costs have been completely removed from 27 of the Load schemes. (SPT2003/04, SPT2006/7, SPT2009/10, SPT20012, SPT20014, SPT20016, SPT20024, SPT20028, SPT20034, SPT20038, SPT20051/52, SPT20054/55, SPT20057, SPT20069, SPT20070, SPT20071, SPT20072, SPT20076, SPT20084, SPT20092/93, SPT200101, SPT200102, SPT200171, SPT200173/74, SPT200176, SPT200178/79, SPT200191). Additionally the Uncertain Schemes provided as part of SQ_CA_47 (SPT200197 - SPT200259) and included in the model have Other (Direct) Costs removed. This has a material impact on the model as full project costs are not considered in the regression	07/08/2020				Open
UM-003	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Incorrect cable volume used for scheme SPT200200-22 Scoop Hill Wind Farm in BPDT_Recut_DDs (Cell H90). Pilot wire should not be added to overall cable volumes.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-004	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	All volumes incorrect for schemes SPT200230-231, SPT200232-233, SPT200234-235, SPT200236-237, SPT200238-239, SPT20040-241, SPT20042-243, SPT20044-245, SPT200246-247, SPT200248-249, SPT200250-251, SPT200252-253, SPT200254-255, SPT200256-257, SPT200258-259. Cells are referencing volumes from the provided B4.5 table for SQ_CA_47 but refer to a cell two places higher. This has a material impact on the regression for costs for s/s and linear elements	07/08/2020				Open
UM-005	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	In BPDT_Recut_DDs all schemes have A1 and H1 costs combined to create a total project costs which has been used for analysis. A1 costs should not form part of volume driver equations as this is funded by the customer. These costs were broken out in the BPDT submitted in December and the treatment of these were discussed with OfGEM at numerous bilaterals prior to this to ensure agreement and understanding. This will impact volume driver as A1 costs are generally non-lead assets of lower value (such as 33kV overhead lines) and will lead to distortion of regression equation.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-006	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Baseline only projects have been used to inform volume driver rates. All projects (baseline and uncertain) should be used to ensure as wide a data set as possible. Uncertain schemes will be the ones funded via the mechanism and need to form part of the analysis.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-007	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	No methodology or Process Map provided to understand UM Model. Urgently required. Several tabs in Model seem redundant and do not feed in to overall analysis. Numbers hardcoded and difficult to follow.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-008	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Total costs incorrect for all Uncertain Schemes SPT200197 - SPT200259 in BPDT_Recut_DDs and 4.1_PAM_Ofgem_Summary. This has caused material impact on regression analysis	07/08/2020				Open
UM-009	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Cost data missing for all Uncertain Schemes SPT200197 - SPT200259 in BPDT_Recut_DDs and 4.1_PAM_Ofgem_Summary. This has caused material impact on regression analysis	07/08/2020				Open
UM-010	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Data cleanse check incorrect. All fields in Data Cleanse (AE8-A0114) incorrect. Equation only looking for costs greater than £1m. What is the purpose of this data cleanse?	07/08/2020				Open
UM-011	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Error	Total costs incorrect for uncertain schemes SPT200197 - SPT200259 in Regression Tab. This data is used for regression analysis therefore outputs will be incorrect and not cost reflective.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-012	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Interpretation	Regression analysis cannot be recreated using Ofgem's data. Further clarification required on the data set used to inform regression summary output.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-013	Generation and Demand Connections	OfGEM UM Model	Interpretation	Further clarification required in where the rates referenced in SPT Annex: Table 39 have come from. Substation and Cable rates cannot be found in Regression Tab.	07/08/2020				Open
UM-014	Generation and Demand Connections	UM Model Version 2 and 3	Error	Projects: Sandy Knowe, Dalquhandy, Chirmorie Wind Farm, Newto Stewart GSP, New Cumnock Transformers SGT1C and SGT3C, 132kV Newton Stewart Upgrading, 275kV New Cumnock SGT2B, Stranoch Wind Farm, Harting Rig Wind Farm, GSP Charlotte Street New SGT1, GSP East Kilbride Fault Level Mitigation, Cumberhead Wind Farm, Lorg Wind Farm, Kennoxhead Extension Wind Farm, U and AT Route Upgrading, Scoop Hill wind farm, Kennoxhead Wind Farm, Hagshaw Hill Wind Farm, Troston Wind Farm, Knockodhar Wind Farm, Greenburn Wind Farm, Broken Cross Wind Farm, Sanguhar II Wind Farm all missing civils costs. Civils costs do not align with those submitted	09/03/2020				Open
UM-015	Generation and Demand Connections	UM Model Version 2 and 3	Error	Projects: Sandy Knowe, Dalquhandy, Chirmorie Wind Farm, Newto Stewart GSP, New Cumnock Transformers SGT1C and SGT3C, 132kV Newton Stewart Upgrading, 275kV New Cumnock SGT2B, Stranoch Wind Farm, Harting Rig Wind Farm, GSP Charlotte Street New SGT1, GSP East Kilbride Fault Level Mitigation, Cumberhead Wind Farm, Lorg Wind Farm, Kennoxhead Extension Wind Farm, U and AT Route Upgrading, Scoop Hill wind farm, Kennoxhead Wind Farm, Hagshaw Hill Wind Farm, Troston Wind Farm, Knockodhar Wind Farm, Greenburn Wind Farm, Broken Cross Wind Farm, Sanguhar II Wind Farm all missing others direct costs. Others (direct) costs do not align with those submitted	09/03/2020				Open
UM-016	Generation and Demand Connections	UM Model Version 2	Error	The UM model does not include the Shared Use infrastructure projects submitted as part of SQ_CA_47. Uncertain schemes only include sole use schemes. All uncertain schemes to be used as part of analysis.	09/03/2020				Open
UM-017	Generation and Demand Connections	UM Model Version 3	Error	The UM model has no lead and non-lead costs for uncertain schemes (SPT200197-SPT200259)	09/03/2020				Open
UM-018	Generation and Demand Connections	UM Model Version 3	Error	Civils costs missing for SPT200239, SPT200249, SPT200255	09/03/2020				Open