Station Name: Siadar Wavegen

Connection Site/GSP: Siadar

Company Name: Lewis Wave Power Ltd

MITS Substations: Beauly

Derogation Report Ref: 12-DR-286-B4-Rev1

Part 1: Technical Description of Non Compliance [To be completed by the relevant Transmission Owner.]

Relevant			Initial Co	nditions			
Paragraph(s) of NETS Security and Quality of Supply Standard	Cause	Part of System Affected	System Intact	Circuit Outage	Interim Operational Solution	Long Term Solution, to include brief description of access requirements.	Derogation Expiry Date
NETS SQSS Section 4 Clauses 4.4 – 4.10	Trip of Alyth – Kincardine 400kV double circuit line Trip of Beauly Denny double circuit line	Overload of Tealing – Westfield/Kincardine 275kV circuits Overload of Errochty 132kV network	System intact at ACS peak demand System conditions expected to arise in the course of a year	None Typical planned outage pattern	NETSO operational measures in operational timescales in accordance with Section 5 of the NETS SQSS	SHETL to develop and construct the following transmission reinforcements: i) SHETL-RI-025b: Peterhead – Hawthorn Pit HVDC Link ii) SHETL-RI-033: Second East Coast HVDC link from Peterhead to England iii) SHETL-RI-038: Errochty 132kV Reconfiguration Completion dates subject to consents and regulatory approval	Derogation is sought until completion of listed long-term reinforcement solutions. Derogation triggered by advancing generator connections via connect and manage arrangements

See 2011 Seven Year Statement Figure C.1.7 – "SHETL Forecast Power Flows at Winter Peak, 2017/18" for network configuration

Station Name: Siadar Wavegen

Company Name: Lewis Wave Power Ltd

Derogation Report Ref: 12-DR-286-B4-Rev1

Connection Site/GSP: Siadar MITS Substations: Beauly

Part 2: Expected Consequence of Non -Compliance. [To be completed by the System Operator, with reference to appropriate Transmission Owner.]

Value of Carbon Benefit (£k), (including time period over which cost benefit is calculated).	
Summary of proposed System Operator actions to manage non- compliance. To include: pricing assumptions. Description of diversity within the group (not to include reference to particular projects) User agreements for services such as energy management or intertrips. Contribution of project to wider non compliance at boundary level.	
Estimated range of costs to manage non compliance (£k). To include time period over which costs are assessed.	
Description of risk due to network non compliance. e.g. constraint increase due to project delay	