

Grid Code Alternative and Workgroup Vote

GC0141: Compliance Processes and Modelling amendments following 9th August Power Disruption

Please note: To participate in any votes, Workgroup members need to have attended at least 50% of meetings.

Stage 1 - Alternative Vote

If Workgroup Alternative Requests have been made, vote on whether they should become Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modifications (WAGCMs).

Stage 2 - Workgroup Vote

2a) Assess the Original and WAGCMs (if there are any) against the Grid Code objectives compared to the baseline (the current Grid Code).

2b) Vote on which of the options is best.

Terms used in this document

Term	Meaning
Baseline	The current Grid Code (if voting for the Baseline, you believe no modification should be made)
Original	The solution which was firstly proposed by the Proposer of the modification
WAGCM	Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modification (an Alternative Solution which has been developed by the Workgroup)

The Applicable Grid Code Objectives:

- a) To permit the development, maintenance and operation of an efficient, coordinated and economical system for the transmission of electricity
- b) Facilitating effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity (and without limiting the foregoing, to facilitate the national electricity transmission system being made available to persons authorised to supply or generate electricity on terms which neither prevent nor restrict competition in the supply or generation of electricity);
- c) Subject to sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii), to promote the security and efficiency of the electricity generation, transmission and distribution systems in the national electricity transmission system operator area taken as a whole;
- d) To efficiently discharge the obligations imposed upon the licensee by this license and to comply with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency; and
- e) To promote efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Grid Code arrangements

Workgroup Vote

Stage 1 – Alternative Vote

Vote on Workgroup Alternative Requests to become Workgroup Alternative Grid Code Modifications.

The Alternative vote is carried out to identify the level of Workgroup support there is for any potential alternative options that have been brought forward by either any member of the Workgroup OR an Industry Participant as part of the Workgroup Consultation.

Should the majority of the Workgroup OR the Chairman believe that the potential alternative solution would better facilitate the Grid Code objectives than the Original proposal then the potential alternative will be fully developed by the Workgroup with legal text to form a Workgroup Alternative Grid Code modification (WAGCM) and submitted to the Panel and Authority alongside the Original solution for the Panel Recommendation vote and the Authority decision.

“Y” = Yes

“N” = No

“-“ = Neutral

Stage 1 Vote done as separate exercise – see Annex 6a.

Stage 2a – Assessment against objectives

To assess the Original and WAGCMs against the Grid Code objectives compared to the baseline (the current Grid Code).

You will also be asked to provide a statement to be added to the Workgroup Report alongside your vote to assist the reader in understanding the rationale for your vote.

AGCO = Applicable Grid Code Objective

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Afshin Pashaei – National Grid Electricity Transmission						
Original	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 2	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 3	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 4	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 5	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 6	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 7	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 8	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 9	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 10	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 11	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 12	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 13	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
WAGCM 14	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain

Voting Statement:

NGET believe this voting method is not efficient and will not achieve any objective because of too many options, which in turn makes it impractical for GCRP and the Authority to achieve an optimum solution for industry.

NGET propose that the options for all seven subjects to be discussed in detail by the industry experts in the WG until reaching common grounds and then voted individually.

Please do not consider blank response as neutral in the above Table.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Alastair Frew – Drax Generation Enterprise Ltd						
Original	N	N	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 1	N	Y	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 2	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y
WAGCM 3	N	N	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 4	Y	Y	N	-	-	N

WAGCM 5	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y
WAGCM 6	N	Y	Y	-	-	N
WAGCM 7	N	Y	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 8	Y	Y	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 9	N	N	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 10	N	N	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 11	Y	N	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 12	Y	N	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 13	Y	Y	N	-	-	N
WAGCM 14	Y	Y	N	-	-	N

Voting Statement:

This approach makes it very difficult for an independent reader to understand this but there is a more detailed explanation of the thinking in the WAGCM2 alternative form.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Arnaldo Rossier – National Grid ESO						
Original	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 2	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 4	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 5	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 6	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 7	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 8	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 9	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 10	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 11	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 12	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 13	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 14	N	N	N	N	N	N

Voting Statement:

Proposal considering the Baseline option for the sharing for SSTI//SSCI, FRT definition & retrospectivity, RMS & EMT models, Enhanced FRT and Compliance Repeat do not better facilitate the applicable Grid Code objectives.

Proposal considering alternatives options for Compliance Repeat and provision of Torsional Data on request do not better facilitate Grid Code Objectives

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Ben Marshall – HVDC Centre						

Original	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 1	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
WAGCM 2	N	N	-	-	N	N
WAGCM 3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 4	N	-	Y	Y	N	N
WAGCM 5	N	-	Y	Y	-	N
WAGCM 6	N	N	-	N	N	N
WAGCM 7	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
WAGCM 8	N	N	-	N	-	N
WAGCM 9	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 10	Y	Y	-	Y	-	N
WAGCM 11	Y	Y	-	Y	-	N
WAGCM 12	N	N	-	N	N	N
WAGCM 13	Y	N	-	Y	Y	N
WAGCM 14	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

The objectives of the work group are to address the 9th August 2019 investigations with practical and deliverable improvements to definitions, data exchange compliance and analysis. In the SSE and National HVDC centres view is whilst neither the Original nor the WAGMs offer a panacea solution, nor do they cover the entirety of the workgroup discussed options- there is a need to make progress with foundational changes to the code that can then be improved upon over time.

For us whilst some options including the original are superior to the baseline, WAGM 3 represents the most pragmatic approach to delivery of the requirements, as it provides greater flexibility for overcoming where the Original proposal might encounter barriers, particularly in respect of data sharing and delivery of new Independent Engineer duties, (which are in our view best placed within the new FSO duties to achieve, supported in specialist areas by others outside of the FSO as required; but do need to be recognised as new duties for which codification helps). Both the original and WAGM13 (workgroup consensus from previous workgroup voting on sub-options that reflects original proposal requirements on torsional data) also represent acceptable compromise positions to make progress.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
	Christopher Smith – National Grid Ventures/National Grid Interconnector Holdings Ltd					
Original	N	N	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 1	N	Y	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 2	Y	Y	N	N	-	Y
WAGCM 3	N	Y	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 4	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 5	Y	N	Y	N	-	Y
WAGCM 6	Y	N	N	N	-	Y
WAGCM 7	Y	N	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 8	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y

WAGCM 9	N	N	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 10	N	N	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 11	N	Y	Y	N	-	Y
WAGCM 12	N	Y	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 13	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 14	Y	N	Y	Y	-	Y

Voting Statement: As a result of the complexity of the solutions every option has positive improvements to the Grid Code. However, I believe **WAGCM4** offers the best of all options.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Colin Foote – SP Energy Networks						
Original	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 1	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 3	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 4	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
WAGCM 5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 6	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 7	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 8	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 9	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 10	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 11	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 12	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 13	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 14	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

The Original and all Alternatives offer improvement on objective AGCO (a).

Only those that provide for the sharing of models offer improvement on objective AGCO (b).

The Original and all Alternatives offer improvement on objective AGCO (c).

Those that expand the Independent Engineer role or require all users to submit torsional data add unnecessary costs so do not offer improvement on objective AGCO (d).

The Original and all Alternatives offer improvement on objective AGCO (e).

All those that are considered to offer improvement on all five objectives are considered to offer an overall improvement.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Isaac Gutierrez – Scottish Power Renewables (UK) Limited						
Original	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 1	N	N	N	N	N	N

WAGCM 2	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 3	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 4	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 5	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 7	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 8	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 9	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 10	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 11	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 12	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 13	N	N	N	N	N	N
WAGCM 14	N	N	N	N	N	N

Voting Statement: SPR believe that no FRT requirement should be retrospective as this could affect current FON status of generating plant. Most of the WAGCMs support this change hence SPR is not supportive of any other WACM apart from WACM6. SPR believes that there is room for improvement to some of the suggested changes.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
	Marko Grizelj – Siemens Energy Ltd					
Original	N	-	Y	-	N	N
WAGCM 1	Y	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 2	Y	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 3	N	-	Y	-	N	N
WAGCM 4	N	-	N	-	Y	N
WAGCM 5	Y	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 6	N	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 7	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y
WAGCM 8	N	-	N	-	Y	N
WAGCM 9	N	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 10	N	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 11	N	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 12	N	-	N	-	N	N
WAGCM 13	N	-	Y	-	Y	N
WAGCM 14	N	-	Y	-	Y	Y

Voting Statement:

The alternative proposals (specifically WAGCM 7) would facilitate a more robust transfer of information between Users and Company and prevent additional inefficient burdens being placed on Users for the purposes of grid code compliance.

Additionally, a more prescribed process for information and model exchange, coupled with a clearer model development and validation process will make implementing grid code arrangements more straightforward.

The clarity on the exchange of important information on the Users Plant and Apparatus will promote a more secure and efficient operation of the electricity system. This is supported by

the obligation on Users to supply, retroactively, torsional data of existing plant in order to increase the speed and efficiency in discharging grid code obligations.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Martin Aten – Uniper Technologies Limited						
Original	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 1	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 2	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 3	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 4	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 5	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 6	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 7	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 8	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 9	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 10	N	-	Y	N	N	N
WAGCM 11	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 12	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 13	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 14	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y

Voting Statement: The original Proposal creates some inefficiencies with regards to: (i) demanding an Independent Engineer, introducing unnecessary delays and costs, whilst responsibility for compliance remains with the User. Employing an Independent Engineer would be better suited on a voluntary basis where circumstances warrant this. (ii) the 5 year compliance repeat plan is superfluous because its purpose is already covered by the annual week 24 data submission process, which can be applied better to achieve the same purpose (iii) a blanket requirement to retrospectively demand specialist torsional data from all older plant is unnecessary and unreasonable as it can be very difficult and costly to obtain. The alternative proposal is more effective in that this data only needs to be provided on request, if a power plant is screened to be actually at risk of torsional interaction. Historically, this data was not required to be collected, and if this cannot be made available for older plant (e.g. because the OEM no longer exists) then this could lead to non-compliance and need for derogation.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

	Michael Smailes – Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult					
Original	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 1	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
WAGCM 2	N	N	-	-	N	N
WAGCM 3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 4	N	-	Y	Y	N	N
WAGCM 5	N	-	Y	Y	-	N
WAGCM 6	N	N	-	N	N	N
WAGCM 7	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
WAGCM 8	N	N	-	N	-	N
WAGCM 9	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 11	Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y
WAGCM 12	N	N	-	N	N	N
WAGCM 13	N	N	-	N	N	N
WAGCM 14	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y
Voting Statement:						

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
	Nicola Barberis Negra - Orsted Hornsea Project Three UK Ltd					
Original	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 1	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 2	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 3	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 4	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 5	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 6	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 7	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 8	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 9	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 11	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 12	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 13	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 14	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Voting Statement: My main concern is that the current proposal and alternatives for SSTI and CI studies are discharging the SO and TOs of their responsibility to maintain and operate safely the transmission network. By asking Users that have no or limited visibility of the entire network and of its operability, but still perform all studies, the SO and TO is effectively asking others the take charge of their Licencee's requirements. This is standard practise in many other countries and we see no reasons why this approach could not be applied in the UK. Hence my vote here. This is why I don't believe that the original proposal and alternatives meet the Grid Code objectives a) and d)						

--

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
	Pukar Mahat – Siemens Gamesa Renewables					
Original	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
WAGCM 1	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 2	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 3	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 5	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 6	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 7	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 8	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 9	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 11	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 13	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 14	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Voting Statement:						

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
	Sigrid Bolik - Siemens Plc					
Original	Y	Y	Y	-	N	Y
WAGCM 1	Y	Y	Y	-	N	Y
WAGCM 2	N	N	N	-	Y	N
WAGCM 3	N	N	Y	-	N	N
WAGCM 4	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N
WAGCM 5	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N
WAGCM 6	N	N	N	-	Y	N
WAGCM 7	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N
WAGCM 8	N	N	Y	-	Y	N
WAGCM 9	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
WAGCM 10	N	N	N	-	Y	N
WAGCM 11	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
WAGCM 12	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
WAGCM 13	N	N	Y	-	Y	N
WAGCM 14	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N
Voting Statement:						

All shown WAGCM with overall Yes vote are considered to fulfil the ask of the working group and to be viable options. Preference is WAGCM 12.

Workgroup Member	Better facilitates AGCO (a)	Better facilitates AGCO (b)	Better facilitates AGCO (c)	Better facilitates AGCO (d)	Better facilitates AGCO (e)	Overall (Y/N)
Tim Ellingham – RWE Supply and Trading						
Original	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 1	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 2	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
WAGCM 4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 5	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
WAGCM 6	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 7	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 8	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WAGCM 9	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 10	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
WAGCM 11	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
WAGCM 12	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
WAGCM 13	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y
WAGCM 14	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Voting Statement: Many of the options improve on the baseline but some perform better than others in respect of the goals. The main concern are costs and delays arising from independent engineer and system studies.						

Stage 2b – Workgroup Vote

Which option is the best? (Baseline, Proposer solution (Original Proposal), WAGCM1 or WAGCM2)

Workgroup Member	Company	BEST Option?	Which objective(s) does the change better facilitate? (if baseline not applicable)
Afshin Pashaei	National Grid Electricity Transmission	WAGCM1	All
Alastair Frew	Drax Generation Enterprise Ltd	WAGCM2	a, b, c
Arnaldo Rossier	National Grid ESO	Original	c
Ben Marshall	HVDC Centre	WAGCM3	All
Christopher Smith	National Grid Ventures/National Grid Interconnector Holdings Ltd	WAGCM4	a, b, c, d

Colin Foote	SP Energy Networks	WACGM5	All
Isaac Gutierrez	Scottish Power Renewables (UK) Limited	WACGM6	All
Marko Grizelj	Siemens Energy Ltd	WAGCM7	a, c, e
Martin Aten	Uniper Technologies Limited	WAGCM8	a, c, d, e
Michael Smailes	Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult	WAGCM9	All
Nicola Barberis Negra	Orsted Hornsea Project Three UK Ltd	WAGCM10	All
Pukar Mahat	Siemens Gamesa Renewables	WACGM11	All
Sigrid Bolik	Siemens Plc	WACGM12	a, b, c, e
Tim Ellingham	RWE Supply and Trading	WACGM13	a, b, e

Of the 13-14 votes (note one voter abstained from voting on 13 of the WACGMs), how many voters said this option was better than the Baseline.

Option	Number of voters that voted this option as better than the Baseline	Number of voters
Original	5	14
WAGCM1	4	14
WAGCM2	5	13
WAGCM3	4	13
WAGCM4	4	13
WAGCM5	5	13
WAGCM6	2	13
WAGCM7	3	13
WAGCM8	4	13
WAGCM9	5	13
WAGCM10	5	13
WAGCM11	5	13
WAGCM12	5	13
WAGCM13	5	13
WAGCM14	7	13