

Question No.	Proforma section	NIC Criteria	Topic	Question	Date question asked	Date response required	Date received	Follow up to Question #
1	p29	e) Partners and ext. funding	GDN support	Text notes 'all DN's have offered support to this project'. Appendix G does not provide letters support from all DNs.	20 August 2015	24 August 2015	24 August 2015	26
2	2.2	b) Value for money	Benefit Modelling	The project aims to reduce costs to £1million (page 8) with timescales less than 1 year. How has this target been set what evidence is there that it is achievable?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
3	2.2	g) Robust methodology/ready to implement	Benefit Modelling	Enhanced connection/hub solution (page 9): Have any sites and customers been identified for this? Maybe this is only worth investigating if a demand exists? Are there likely to be any flow rate issues if multiple customers use the same connection point.	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
4	3	e) Partners and ext. funding	Benefit Modelling	Large parts of the demand for connections of the NTS are from biogas which is dependent on RHI tariffs. These are due for review in April 2016. The tariff is also subject to a quarterly digression which is proportional to the number of connections. Could a high number of connections reduce the feed in tariffs and therefore reduce the viability of connecting to the NTS?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
5	3	b) Value for money	Benefit Modelling	If the predicted connections are achieved is it possible to quantify the potential savings to the gas customer?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	28
6	3	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Project Logistics	Is there a flow rate limit for the NTS (during low demand)? Are any potential customers likely to exceed this?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
7	4	g) Robust methodology/ready to	Project Logistics	New gas quality measuring equipment (page 21) may require changes to industry standards before utilisation. What changes are these? How likely are the changes to occur?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	29
8	4	g) Robust methodology/ready to implement	Project Logistics	Do off the shelf components exist for these applications (page 21)? Which areas are custom components needed?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
9	4	g) Robust methodology/ready to	Benefit Modelling	Three connections will be designed but one will be built. How well will building one demonstrate the capability of the other three?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
10	3d	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Benefit Modelling	The business case is based on projections for the potential of shale gas of 32 bcm p.a. in 2035. This is consistent with the most optimistic scenario from the Future Energy Scenarios ('consumer power'). This is in contrast with other FES scenarios: in No Progression the estimate for 2030 is 16bcm, for the other two scenarios the estimate for shale gas in 2030 is zero. Please can you provide additional explanation on why this is the most appropriate scenario?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
11	3d	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Benefit Modelling	The Future Energy Scenarios (FES) estimates that the scenario with 32bcm p.a. in 2035 would require 100 shale gas connections. This business case assumes that 50 of those will/could be to the transmission network. Please could you provide additional justification on why this is assumption is appropriate (ie 50/50 split for connections between transmission and distribution networks)?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
12	4	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Benefit Modelling	The business case assumes 100 connections in total: 50 from shale gas and 50 from biogas/vehicle projects. One of the rationales for increasing demand from biogas discussed in the document is because of the generous government support. Does this assumption consider the recent DECC announcements on renewable subsidies which may mean less government support for renewables?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
13	4	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Benefit Modelling	The calculation of the carbon savings is based on shale gas having a saving of 5g CO2e/mj of natural gas. This saving depends on assumptions about the methane in shale gas. From the source document there are two assumptions about the carbon content of shale: the 5g assumption is consistent with a low methane assumption, but with a higher methane content there is not much difference in the carbon content of shale gas vs LNG. Please can you provide additional information on your choice of assumption?	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	

Question No.	Proforma section	NIC Criteria	Topic	Question	Date question asked	Date response required	Date received	Follow up to Question #
14	3d	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Benefit Modelling	To calculate the carbon savings of 6 million tonnes of CO2e in 2035, you appear to have applied the 5g saving assumption to the whole of the potential shale gas production of 32bcm. Is this consistent with the assumption that is used elsewhere, that only about half (50 of the 100 shale gas connections) could be applicable to this project.	25 August 2015	27 August 2015	27 August 2015	
15	1.4.4	d) Is innovative	Benefit Modelling	Why would costs for connecting new unconventional sources not reduce over time as part of NGG's business as usual approach to running an efficient an economic network?	27 August 2015	02 September 2015	02 September 2015	
16	General	d) Is innovative	Proof of Innovation	What is the project risk that the innovation funding is going to address? Under current arrangements when customers ask to be connected, the network company has to respond and innovate to satisfy the needs of different (and new) classes of customers.	27 August 2015	02 September 2015	02 September 2015	
17	General	b) Value for money	Proof of Innovation	Has any relevant work been done through the NIA in relation to this project?	08 September 2015	11 September 2015	11 September 2015	
18	General	b) Value for money	Proof of Innovation	Has the project team considered using the NIA to fund this project or parts of it?	08 September 2015	11 September 2015	11 September 2015	
19	1.4.4	a) Enviro+consumer bens	Benefit Modelling	Please can you clarify how the £1m connection costs savings identified in this project are realised? For example, what is technological innovation and what is process innovation?	08 September 2015	11 September 2015	11 September 2015	
20	General	d) Is innovative	Proof of Innovation	Please can you explain why you consider this project is not 'business as usual' for National Grid?	08 September 2015	11 September 2015	11 September 2015	