Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on?
(Rank in order of preference)

Number of responses: 13

Cumulative ranking from all responses:

Up to 3 years	3.3
Up to 5 years	**2.4**
Up to 7 years	2.9
Up to 10 years	2.9
Up to 15 years	4.1
Up to 20 years	5.0

Q1: Name

Andy Vaudin

Q2: Organisation
EDF Energy

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Respondent skipped this question

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)

Up to 3 years	6
Up to 5 years	5
Up to 7 years	4
Up to 10 years	3
Up to 15 years	2
Up to 20 years	1

Q5: Please provide your justification
Banding should be based on mid/long term scenarios. This will improve the outlook for system operability and provide more certainty to generators.

Q1: Name

Joe Duddy

Q2: Organisation
RES

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
not an official representative of any stakeholder group

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Respondent skipped this question

Q5: Please provide your justification
This questionnaire is seeking to set the parameters for an procedure which has not been adequately described or discussed. Therefore I cannot provide an answer. it is possible that information was provided which I have not seen. The first I knew of this survey was Richard's presentation to GC0048 on 18th August I recommend that NG should use FES to confirm in each year (1) how much frequency response they will need (compare with how much they presently use), (2) how much frequency response is available from currently mandated source (3) identify if/when and how gaps will emerge and therefore when and what they need to do in advance to mitigate

Q1: Name
Alastair Frew

Q2: Organisation
ScottishPower Generation

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Large Generators

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)

Up to 3 years	2
Up to 5 years	1
Up to 7 years	3
Up to 10 years	4
Up to 15 years	5
Up to 20 years	6

Q5: Please provide your justification
Market conditions change due to energy policies and trying to look too far into the future will potentially set criteria which will out of date by the time the next review is required

1: Name
Campbell McDonald

Q2: Organisation
SSE Generation

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Generators

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)

Up to 3 years	1
Up to 5 years	2
Up to 7 years	3
Up to 10 years	4
Up to 15 years	5
Up to 20 years	6

Q5: Please provide your justification
GB generation needs to be on the same cost base as their European competitors. Building in second guessed costs beyond a 3 year period would limit the ability of GB based generators to complete in the market.

Q1: Name
Chris Whitworth

Q2: Organisation
AMPS

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
UK Generating set industry (<10MW)

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 1
Up to 5 years 2
Up to 7 years 3

Q5: Please provide your justification
Having common Banding Thresholds across the largest possible area of the EU greatly aids a common approach for generator design, manufacturing and compliance certification processes. During the first stage (3<5yr) period any thresholds issues will become apparent and well understood. Particularly important to allow FES deliberations to develop.

Q1: Name
Nik Perepelov

Q2: Organisation
RenewableUK

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Wind, wave, tidal generators

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 1
Up to 5 years 2
Up to 7 years 3
Up to 10 years   4
Up to 15 years   5
Up to 20 years   6

Q5: Please provide your justification
Solar situation highly uncertain so worth review within lifetime of first banding. Longer term modelling thereafter to provide stability, assuming greater visibility of post 2020 policies

Q1: Name
Mick Barlow

Q2: Organisation
S&C Electric Company

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Manufacturer

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 4
Up to 5 years 1
Up to 7 years 2
Up to 10 years 3
Up to 15 years 5
Up to 20 years 6

Q5: Please provide your justification
It is difficult to predict a long way into the future with so many changes in the industry. 5 years allows of 2 years for implementation and the 3 years before a change would be allowed.

Q1: Name
Peter Thomas

Q2: Organisation
Nordex UK

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Wind Generation

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 5 years 1

Q5: Please provide your justification
The Period of a UK Parliament

1: Name
Mike Kay

Q2: Organisation
Acting on behalf of ENA

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
DNOs

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years   6
Up to 5 years   5
Up to 7 years   2
Up to 10 years   1
Up to 15 years   3
Up to 20 years   4

Q5: Please provide your justification
We want to get this right for the long term, so we need to base this on long term projections. However beyond 10 years is pretty flakey

---

Q1: Name
David Spillett

Q2: Organisation
Energy Networks Association

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
DNOs & IDNOs

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 2
Up to 5 years 1
Up to 7 years 4
Up to 10 years   3
Up to 15 years   5
Up to 20 years   6

Q5: Please provide your justification
I think 5 years is a reasonable time period for future data predictions.

Q1: Name
Rob Wilson

Q2: Organisation
National Grid

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
TSO

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 6
Up to 5 years 5
Up to 7 years 3
Up to 10 years   1
Up to 15 years   2
Up to 20 years   4

Q5: Please provide your justification
Carrying out the banding work is very time consuming so we need to make it as future proof as possible. I think this also helps to give industry future certainty and gives a more level playing field than having to come back and make adjustments in just a few years. There is also a risk here of retrospectively that is better avoided. However, there is a need for balance and an understanding of the accuracy of forecasts and likely generator lifespans. For these reasons I think trying for a 10-15 year window of data is the right timeframe to consider. We need to try to get this right rather than signing up to redoing the work almost as soon as we finish.

Q1: Name
Jawad Al-Tayie

Q2: Organisation
Cummins

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
AMPS

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 3

Q5: Please provide your justification
I think three years is a good period to give just enough time to assess and then it is not that long to make needed changes if any.

Q1: Name
Alan Creighton

Q2: Organisation
Northern Powergrid

Q3: Which stakeholder group do you represent?
DNO

Q4: Which duration of future datasets should GC0048 base the initial setting of RfG banding thresholds on? (Rank in order of preference)
Up to 3 years 4
Up to 5 years 1
Up to 7 years 2
Up to 10 years 3
Up to 15 years 5
Up to 20 years 6

Q5: Please provide your justification
No qualified justification. 20 years seems unrealistically long and 3 years too short. Between 5 and 7 years seems to be a compromise that is reasonable to forecasts/ estimate whilst still giving reasonable certainty for generators