

DCP 313 'Eligibility Criteria for EDCM Generation Credits' – Impact Assessment Working Group comments/questions

Paragraph Number	Comment/Question
General Comment	We need to be careful with the terminology used as there will be variances on people's understanding in this area.
General Comment	Paragraph numbers would be helpful throughout, so the group can reference specific paragraphs.
General Comment	Could the LRIC, FCP and NUF have a consistent approach when detailing the impacts?
Section 2 – Paragraph 1	The report refers to "(off-peak, charge 2)" Need to clarify that only charge 1 is used in the EDCM model and so is not relevant for this change.
Section 2 – Paragraph 1	A description of the growth rate assumptions would be helpful, i.e. years to reinforcement is calculated as the number of years of 1% demand growth which can be experienced before an asset reaches its rating.
Section 2 – End of last paragraph	Could we give a similar high-level description of contingency analysis? We use the term 'post contingency' in section 2.1.1 but haven't given the background.
Section 2.1 – Paragraph 1	Add "than under the minimum demand scenario after "...and hence the corresponding branch incremental cost (charge 1) will always tend to be higher."
Section 2.1 – Paragraph 1	The report states "...will always tend to be higher." Is it always higher or does it tend to be higher?
Section 2.1 – Paragraph 2	The report refers to "Attachment 1" when the section is called Annex 1.
Section 2.1.1 – Paragraph 1	Could we describe the methodology in words here, e.g. An example Grid Supply Point (GSP) has been considered which incorporates two 132kV/EHV (Bulk Supply Points or BSPs) substations connected on a 132kV ring, each with a single EHV/HV (Primary or PRY) substation connected by double circuit EHV lines. The impact on the time to reinforcement has then been considered for a generator connected to the GSP, to 132kV circuits, to each of the BSPs, to EHV circuits or to each of the PRYs. In all cases except for that labelled PRY1* the new generation connected has been assumed to not be sufficiently large to reverse powerflows in any assets.
Section 2.1.1 – Paragraph 2	Can this paragraph be moved to section 2.1.2 – we have a paragraph which starts "Apart from generator locations..." – this section would sit nicely with this list of other factors.
Section 2.1.1 – Paragraph 3	Would this likely result in branch incremental cost being higher in the minimum demand scenario and so the cost not included maximum demand scenario? If so, under the example we are considering of a generator changing from zero F Factor to non-zero F Factor, such a generator would already have output in the minimum demand scenario and so the branch would likely already have higher cost in the minimum demand scenario and so the change in F Factor would have no impact?
Figure 2-1	Could we either colour code or label by voltage to be absolutely clear?

Table 2-1	<p>Figure 3-2 is much easier to interpret when looking at the locations of generators and giving each a letter label – can we replicate here with hypothetical generators added to figure 2-1 as a new figure before this table?</p> <p>The description in words on the NUF impact (section 4.1.1) is helpful – can an equivalent section be included detailing the reasoning behind the impacts in this table.</p>
Section 2.1.2 – Paragraph 2	Can we add “...under all scenarios except GSP or PRY1*” at the end of the second sentence and add “...and/or if the demand in question is connected in a lower network level group” after the third sentence.
Section 2.2	<p>Is this ‘extreme scenario’ where all branches have higher branch incremental cost in the minimum demand scenario than in the maximum demand scenario? If so, we should spell this out.</p> <p>Presumably with some assets having higher cost in the minimum demand scenario and so not considered in the calculation of charge 1, the impacts here will be smaller than in the maximum demand scenario? If so, we should describe this.</p> <p>Can a summary also be included at the end of this section.</p>
Figure 3-2	In the LRIC analysis we considered a generator which reverse power flow and drives shorter time to reinforcement – has this been considered here?
Section 3.1.1 – Paragraph 2	This is potentially confusing – we are referring to a generator shown on figure 3-2 and a network group shown on figure 3-1. Could we show the network groups again on figure 3-2?
Table 3-1	This format makes comparison to LRIC difficult. LRIC should follow the same process of generators labelled by letter (rather than by POCC), and one of the tables should be transposed so they are consistent with either generators as rows and assets as columns (as here) or generators as columns and assets as rows (as in LRIC)
Section 4 – 2nd calculation	Better description of ‘base flow’ and ‘base flow load’ needed
Section 4.1.1 – Paragraph 3	This is difficult to follow. The method used for LRIC (where each asset was labelled) was easier to interpret.
Section 4.2.1 – 4th bullet point	I don’t follow why the generator at location B increases base flow in this asset but the generator at location C decreases the base flow