|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Draft Determination Publication** | |
| **Network Queries** | |
| **Network Reference number** | SGN\_DDQ\_Q78 |
| **Licence** | SGN |
| **Topic/Activity:** | Tier 1 Iron Disallowed Workload Discrepancy (Southern and Scotland) |
| **Question:** | Relating to draft\_determinations\_-\_sgn\_annex.pdf (Sc - Table 13 - pg15 & Table 29 - pg 41, So - Table 13 - pg15 & Table 29 - pg 41)  In our previous queries SGN-DD-Q08 and SGN-DD-Q09, we asked if you could confirm the reasoning as to why SGN's T1 iron lay to abandonment ratio has been adjusted in the draft determination and the methodology used to come to the revised figure.  Further to these two queries, we've carried out some additional analysis on the T1 allowed workloads in the draft determination and have identified a discrepancy in the disallowed lay and decommissioning workloads for both Southern and Scotland.  In Southern the T1 lay lengths have been reduced by 182km over GD2 (5.8% reduction) and decommissioning by 58km (1.8% reduction). In Scotland the T1 lay lengths have been reduced by 100km over GD2 (9.5% reduction) and decommissioning by 27km (2.4% reduction). These details are shown in the supporting spreadsheet 'SGN-DD-Q78 - T1 Lay to Abandonment Ratios'  We would also like to highlight that SGN is the only GDN to have their T1 disallowed workloads reduced at an uneven rate in the draft determinations.  Please can you confirm why SGN's T1 lay and decommissioning workloads have been reduced at a disproportional rate?  We have provided some supporting information in the form of a spreadsheet titled ‘SGN\_DDQ\_Q78 T1 Lay to Abandonment Ratios’. |
| **DDQ raised by** | Danny Symes |
| **Date query raised** | 27/07/2020 |
| **Expected response date** | 03/08/2020 |
| **Ofgem Response:**  Please refer to responses to SQN\_DDQ\_7 and SQN\_DDQ\_8. | |
| **Attachments:** | |