

GC0117 – NGESO Estimated Delivery Timeframes and Costs for Proposed solutions

Option	Overview of changes required	Assumptions / Issues	NGESO estimated Delivery Timelines	NGESO estimated high-level costs
Original Proposal: Threshold Changed to 10MW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several IT systems would need to be updated to handle the order of magnitude higher volumetrics of BMUs (given assumptions, the number of BMUs would more than double within a year under this option). Several manual business processes would need to be automated, to account for the increased number of BMUs. Increased visibility and control would be needed within the ENCC, to enable engineers to manage the number of additional BMUs. 	<p>Assumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the assumption of ~650 new BMUs per year under this option. <p>Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some NGESO audit timescales may need to be revised, due to the increased complexity and number of such activities expected under this option. Issue: The change requires waiting for parts of NGESO's digital transformation to be complete, as several legacy systems would be unable to cope with the anticipated number of new units. Timelines are dependent on the outcome of the Balancing Transformation Strategic Review. 	Earliest possible implementation is 2027, pending the outcome of the Balancing Transformation Strategic review.	<p>Balancing: 2-5m depending on Future of Balancing delivery roadmap.</p> <p>Commercial Systems: 8-10m</p> <p>Networks: 1-2m</p> <p>Total: 11-17m</p>
WAGCM1 Large/Medium/Small Power Station thresholds in E&W applied to Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This reduces the number of BMUs in NGESO's internal systems; from an IT perspective, the changes necessary are minimal. 	<p>Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is very likely that there would be significant power system security issues with this option, such as new ancillary services potentially needed to be developed to increase market liquidity, leading to consequential IT and business costs. 	N/A	None at the outset, potential costs in the future. (see issue)

GC0117 – NGESO Estimated Delivery Timeframes and Costs for Alternative Requests

Option	Overview of changes required	Assumptions / Issues	NGESO estimated Delivery Timelines	NGESO estimated high-level costs
Alternative Request 2: Threshold Changed to 100MW	<ul style="list-style-type: none">This reduces the number of BMUs in NGESO's internal systems; from an IT perspective, the changes necessary are minimal.	Issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none">It is very likely that there would be significant power system security issues with this option, such as new ancillary services potentially needed to be developed to increase market liquidity, leading to consequential IT and business costs.	N/A	None at the outset, potential costs in the future. (see issue)
Alternative Request 3: LEEMPS Plus for 10MW+	<ul style="list-style-type: none">From an IT perspective, this option carries the same implications as the Original Proposal, as the number of new units - and associated changes - would remain the same.The only additional cost would be around the interfaces to DNOs - if an existing or planned interface can be reused then there would be minimal additional cost, whereas if a complicated, bespoke new interface is required, then the cost could be significant. We have not attempted to estimate the cost here, as we would require further detail from the workgroup about what would be acceptable.	As Original Proposal	Earliest possible implementation is 2027, pending the outcome of the Balancing Transformation Strategic review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Balancing: 2-5m depending on Future of Balancing delivery roadmap.Commercial Systems: 8-10mNetworks: 1-2mDNO interface: TBC Total: 11-17m
Alternative Request 4: Utilise RDP for 10MW+	<ul style="list-style-type: none">From an IT perspective, this option carries the same implications as Original Proposal, as the number of new units - and associated changes - would remain the same.There would be an interface required to communicate with the DSOs, but this would be developed within the scope of the RDP project.	As Original Proposal Also: Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none">If an RDP interface to the DSO is in existence then it can be reused for GC0117.	Earliest possible implementation is 2027, pending the outcome of the Balancing Transformation Strategic review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Balancing: 2-5m depending on Future of Balancing delivery roadmap.Commercial Systems: 8-10mNetworks: 1-2m Total: 11-17m
Alternative Request 5: Hybrid solution of Alternative Request 3 & 4 RDP solution less than 50MW and LEEMPS Plus solution for between 50 – 100MW	<ul style="list-style-type: none">From an IT perspective, this option carries the same implications as Original Proposal, as the number of new units - and associated changes - would remain the same.There would be an interface required to communicate with the DSOs, but this would be developed within the scope of the RDP project.Potential additional cost for the interfaces to DNOs - if an existing or planned interface can be reused then there would be minimal additional cost, whereas if a complicated, bespoke new interface is required, then the cost could be significant. We have not attempted to estimate the cost here, as we would require further detail from the workgroup about what would be acceptable.	As Original Proposal Also: Assumption: <ul style="list-style-type: none">If an RDP interface to the DSO is in existence then it can be reused for GC0117.	Earliest possible implementation is 2027, pending the outcome of the Balancing Transformation Strategic review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Balancing: 2-5m depending on Future of Balancing delivery roadmap.Commercial Systems: 8-10mNetworks: 1-2mDNO interface: TBC Total: 11-17m