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## 

## Answer (please retain document formatting and do not exceed 2 pages unless otherwise agreed with Ofgem)

A key benefit of QUEST is that it “boosts” the performance of existing voltage management techniques, thereby providing additional capacity release and benefits to customers. Currently, we could only obtain the equivalent amount of “boosted” capacity released by QUEST from our use of traditional reinforcement and flexible services, and therefore it is entirely appropriate to use these as the Base Case for QUEST.

However, it is correct that existing voltage management techniques, such as CLASS, do provide benefits to customers already, and that in assessing the value of QUEST due consideration of these benefits must be made. Given this, we have accounted for these existing techniques by appropriately discounting the Method case benefits of QUEST by the amount gained from existing voltage management techniques.