|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Draft Determination Publication** | |
| **Network Queries** | |
| **Network Reference number** | SGN\_DDQ\_Q59 |
| **Licence** | SGN |
| **Topic/Activity:** | Repex category decision making |
| **Question:** | Relating to Draft Determinations - draft\_determinations\_-\_gd\_sector.pdf - Section 3, Table 25 on Page 105  Several elements of our Repex programme was covered by a single CBA per network. For SGN Repex - 007 SteelSo - CBA Dec19.xlsx and SGN Repex - 008 SteelSc - CBA Dec19.xlsx this notably covered the mains and services workload elements of >2" Steel, Iron >30m and Other policy and condition.  Table 25 notes that different elements of this single CBA have been assessed in different ways and that one workload element was not supported by a CBA. The draft\_determinations\_-\_sgn\_annex.pdf, page 44, makes reference to the workload not supported by a CBA. However, the workload, like that allowed in Scotland, was included in SGN Repex - 007 SteelSo - CBA Dec19.xlsx submitted in the December pack.  Please explain the rationale used to determine the mix of allowed and disallowed workload, whilst considering it was contained within a single CBA, and the statement given is "not supported by CBA"? |
| **DDQ raised by** | Danny Symes |
| **Date query raised** | 23/07/2020 |
| **Expected response date** | 30/07/2020 |
| **Ofgem Response:**  Thank you for bringing this to our attention. As discussed in the engineering bilateral meetings a number of the CBAs included information at an aggregate level for programme of works and this made comprehensive assessment of the underlying workloads challenging. | |
| **Attachments:** | |