

| Response to NETS SQSS Review Consultation | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Name | Nicola Barberis Negra |
| Job Title | Lead Grid connection Specialist UK |
| Organisation | Ørsted |
| Contact Details | nibne@orsted.com |
| Q1. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Section 3.1 Offshore Transmission System. | |
| <p>Yes, we agree that reviewing the loss of infeed risk for offshore DC converter should be considered and potentially Increased to 1800MW. We believe that similar considerations and review should be applied to onshore DC converters and their loss of Infeed risk</p> <p>We are also supportive to keep monitoring the progress of the ongoing offshore coordination work and incorporate the necessary recommendations in the NETS SQSS.</p> | |
| Q2. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Section 3.2 Demand Connection Criteria. | |
| No comments | |
| Q3. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Section 3.3 Generation Connection Requirements. | |
| We are supportive of this review and agree that it would be beneficial to make explicit In the SQSS any requirements for Interconnectors and storage systems | |
| Q4. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Section 3.4 Main Interconnected Transmission System. | |
| We are supportive of this review and agree that it would be beneficial to ensure that the design criteria applicable to the main interconnected transmission system are kept up to date | |
| Q5. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Section 3.5 Operational Standards in England and Wales. | |
| We believe it would be beneficial to investigate the pros and cons of relaxing the operational standard in England&Wales. However, it will be Important to ensure that a detailed assessment is performed to avoid unwanted outcomes following any modification of Chapter 5 of the SQSS | |
| Q6. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Sections 3.6 Introduction of CATO. | |
| We believe it would be beneficial to ensure the SQSS is aligned with future development and requirements of CATO. However, it will be Important to ensure that a detailed assessment Is performed to avoid unwanted outcomes following any modification of the SQSS, as well as ensure that any changes proposed in the review are future proofed to align with the outcomes of the OTNR. | |
| Q7. Please provide your comments/feedback and suggestions related to the topics raised in Sections 3.7 Governance. | |
| <p>We agree that a more dynamic and fit-for-purpose way to manage SQSS modification Is required. However, it needs to be ensured that the correct level of Industry feedback and review Is achieved as part of the process.</p> <p>Also, it would be beneficial to have an overall review of the way the SQSS should be updated following the progress of the electricity network: currently the SQSS for offshore network</p> | |

(chapter 7) Is based on studies and analyses from 2008. The way offshore networks have developed and evolved in the last 14 years Is beyond many of the assumptions that were used to define the SQSS In 2008. A way to ensure future updates of the code could be made more quickly to ensure a better alignment with the development of the market should be Identified as part of this review workstream

Q8. Which of the proposed modifications will have the most significant impact on your operations/investment plan? To what extent would that impact be?

Item 1a and 1b are the ones which will have a larger impact for offshore wind farms.

Q9. Are there any other areas that require review and may act as a barrier for net zero in NETS SQSS?

The risk of loss Infeed should also be clarified with respect to DC bipole solutions as well as consideration on the assumptions used in 2008 for the definition of design requirements In Chapter 7

Q10. Do you agree with the priorities and the delivery timescales described in Section 4? If not, please provide additional information that could allow us to revise the priorities.

Yes, we agree with the current programme

This consultation is available online here: [NETS SQSS Consultation](#)

Please return responses to box.SQSS.Review@nationalgrideso.com before 5pm on 9th March 2022.