NATIONAL GRID ESO Mid-Term 25/26 EOI Query Log Mid-Term Stability Market

| Tender Reference | Mid-Term 25/26 - EOI Stage |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| Date | 29-Nov-23 |
| Version Number | V2 |

| TQ Date (dd/mm/yy) | Do you class this | Technical/ | Tender Stage (Pre- | Document | Question Reference (if | Query | Received Attachments | Query Response | Associated Attachments (if | Open or Closed? | Date Response |
|--------------------|--|------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 30 | Tender Query as Confidential (Yes/No) | Commercial Query | tender, RFI, EOI, ITT, Contract Award) | Reference (if applicable) | applicable) | | | | applicable) | | Issued |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | As you will at times procure SCL and inertia in different quantities, can providers also elect to provide only one or the other? This would maximise the diversity of provision, increase competition and reduce costs. | none | Round 1 of the Stability Mid-Term (Y-1) Market will procure inertia only as the primary product. We may consider procuring additional SCL in later years/ rounds based on whether our studies indicate a need. Any rules regarding the procurement of SCL and any iteractions with inertia would be released at that time. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Question concerning stacking other services: As a developer of stability unit am I not allowed to stack inertia response with, e.g. Dynamic Containment in one generating unit or in the same "MW" that I bid in? In other words, if I have BESS unit of 100 MW rated capacity can I bid with 50 MW in inertia and 50 MW in Dynamic Containment service? | none | Generally - stacking is permitted under this contract, but please review the details in the tender documents. You can contract in dynamic frequency response services as long as sufficient capability is reserved to delive contracted stability services at all times. In your example, you will not be allowed to contract 100MW for both services simultaneously but you can do 50MW equivalent inertia and 50MW DC. As a reminder, stacking rules been published to clarify what is permitted with regards to Frequency Response, Reserve, Reactive Power, Capacity Market, Restoration, the Constraint Management Intertrip Service, the Balancing Mechanism and the Wholesale market. Of that list the only service where stacking is not permitted if the Constraint Management Intertrip Service. How exactly a bidder chooses to stack based on their technology type is at their discretion. | | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Follow up to TQ2 row above: Just to clarify: I understand that we do not bid with MW, but MWs, but to declare certain value of MWs I need to dedicate some MW for this service. | none | Please refer to the above response to TQ2. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Could you clarify the extension of contract rule, i.e. will you be offering an extension to all providers at the same time or selective individual providers? (The Company may invite each Provider to extend the term of its Stability Contract for the next Stability Year following the date of expiry of the Stability Contract) | none | At the moment the contract is drafted to allow extensions for all providers. This would need to be agreed by both the provider and ESO but in principle, all providers would be offered an extension if ESO deem this necessary. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | | | Do you know yet the expected proportion of time a 0 MW provider will be dispatched to provide inertia? (i.e % of year you expect to dispatch the provider for inertia) | | In our EOI documents we have stated that indicative utilisation information would be provided later in the process at ITT stage. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinal | Commercial webinar | Regarding the economic optimisation, could you clarify that providers will only submit 1 final offer to then be considered? i.e. there are no multiple bids or bidding rounds etc. | none | Providers will have up until the tender submission deadline to revise their bids. In our instructions to tenderers document (https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/289611/download Section 14) we have stated that our intention is to allow bidders to submit multiple bids of the same unit (perhaps at different capacity levels at different price points) per provider and all those bids will be considered as mutually exclusive. Bidders with multiple assests with seperate connection costs should be submitting those as seperate solutions and it will be treated individually in the economic assessment. With regards to whether there would be a 'BAFO' or 'negotiation' stage - please refer to Section 21 of the instructions to tenderers document for the time being (https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/289611/download). | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Availability vs unavailability- if a unit is charging/discharging or pumping/generating, is it considered available or unavailable, i.e. whether unavailability that is due to generation/pumping counts towards the 90% availability requirement. | none | A unit is treated as available if it can provide the service at any particular point. Regarding your specific point around pumping/ discharging >0MW, we would not penalise the provider by applying extra penalties or declaring them unavailable, but no stability monies will be paid when generating >0MW for the purpose of the payment formulas. All assets must be expected to deliver a minimum availability of 90%. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | What happens if solutions are late due to delays in the grid-connection? Will they simply forego revenue or will there be extra penalties applied? | none | Our understanding of this question is that it is about what happens if a bidder is unable to meet their contracted service start date, specifically due to grid-connection delays. If a provider is late against their contracted service start dates then the liquidated damages at the LAD rate would apply for each day of delay. Furthermore, as the provider would not be available to provide the contracted service, then under the availability declaration process the provider would not receive any payments. The only case where liquidated damages may not be incurred is in the case of Delay Event as defined by the contract. We encourage you to review the contract for exact definitions. If you have feedback on the drafting of the contract please provide this through the consultation proforma by the consultation deadline, where bidders are able to proposed alternative drafting for ESO to consider when finalising the contract at ITT. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Acceptable security is considered to incl. a guarantor with an A- S&P rating or A3 Moody's. Do you think it is a reasonable requirement given that you will have solutions of smaller sizes as well? | none | This is our draft requirements at this stage based on ESO requirements and previous similar procurement events, but it will be finalised at ITT. If you have feedback on this topic specifically we encourage you to provide this through the consultation proforma for us to consider when we finalise the assessment methodology. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | If the contracts are extended for an additional year, would the availability and utilisation prices be indexed to CPI then? | none | At this time, no indexation is being applied in this contract even in the event of an extension. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | How would grid outages be treated in availability calculations? | none | Under the contract the solution would be treated as unavailable during any Planned NETS or DNO Outage. Please see clause 5.15 in the draft contract. If you have feedback on the draft contract please provide this through the consultation proforma by the consultation deadline, where bidders are able to proposed alternative drafting for ESO to consider when finalising the contract at ITT. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Follow up to TQ11 row above: And what about unplanned outages like faults? | none | Under the contract the solution would be treated as unavailable during any Planned NETS or DNO Outage. Please see clause 5.15 in the draft contract. If you have feedback on the draft contract please provide this through the consultation proforma by the consultation deadline. ESO will consider articulating the impact of unplanned outages more clearly in the ITT version of the contract. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |

| 13 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Is it fair to deem assets unavailable if there are grid outages? Is it consistent with other services rules? Can you confirm that no payments will be made in that case? "The Facility shall be treated as Unavailable if at any time by reason of a Planned NETS Outage and/or Planned DNO Outage, it is not possible to Synchronise the Facility" | none | At this time the contract is drafted in a way that assets would be treated as unavailable during any Planned NETS or DNO outage where it would not be possible to synchronise the asset. By being treated as unavailable no availability/utilisation payment would be payable for this impacted settlement periods. However, as we are at consultation stage market participants are able to provide feedback and propose alternative drafting for ESO to consider when finalising the contract at ITT. If you have feedback on this aspect | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
|----------------|----|------------|-----|--------------------|--------------------|--|--------|--|------|--------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | | of the draft contract please can we encourage you to submit this through the consultation proforma by the consultation deadline. | | | |
| 14 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Is there a specific volume of inertia being procured in this tender? | none | The initial inertia volume is currently 7GVA.s in this round. In the documents published so far ESO have the right to buy above or below this volume depending on the submitted solutions and the assessment methodology. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Are there any updates about introduction of Long-Term Market? Will that be after October 2026, so after the first year of Mid-Term? | none | The point at which we may introduce a long-term (Y-4) Stability Market will be driven by our system requirement studies. At present, we do not foresee an immediate need for long-term procurement, particularly for inertia services. We will continue to articulate our future system requirements through the Operability Strategy Report and in future, the Centralised Strategic Network Plan. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 16 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Is there a more detailed methodology on how you calculate the cost of the counterfactual (BM) solution? | none | At this stage we have only published a draft assessment methodology. At the ITT stage we plan to finalise this with more details. In the interim we encourage bidders to review the draft methodology at this stage, and provide feedback through the consultation, so that we can consider this feedback when finalising the assessment methodology at the ITT stage. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 17 24-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Commercial webinar | Commercial webinar | Your need is 7GVA.s however how much in total did you get back from all the RFI's you received? | none | At this time we will not be publishing the details of the RFI responses, but in our webinars we have provided a summary of what has been done as a result of the RFI responses with regards to the design of the tender process for the Mid-Tem (Y-1) Stability Market. The volumes from the RFI are not firm yet and may not apply to the first, some or all delivery years - this will be established at the ITT stage when these solutions are confirmed as real. Releasing speculative information about the market size may not aid the efficiency of this tender in the first instance, however we will look to provide as much transparency as possible. | none | Closed | 24-Oct-2023 |
| 18 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Will my solutions SCL capability or reactive capability be valued as part of the tender assessment? | none | This first round of the Mid-Term Stability Market is aiming to procure inertia only. When it comes to the assessment methodology for this first round, the intention is that we will be valuing inertia capability on this basis, rather than reactive power capability or short circuit level capability. However, we may expand future markets to value these other stability products in the future. At this time we have only published the draft assessment methodology, at ITT stage we will publish the | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| | | | | | | | | finalised assessment methodology which will detail exactly what is being assessed/valued in this first round. | | | |
| 19 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Why do GBGF-S solutions also need to submit EMT Models? | none | There has been a recent Grid Code modification GC0141 which requires all parties to submit EMT and RMS models. Further to this the ESO is increasing our EMT modelling capabilities, an imperative part of this is to get EMT models of generators to enble us to carry out detailed EMT studies. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | When do I need to have a connection agreement by? | none | Under the eligibility criteria solutions must have an existing connection agreement (whether that is for an asset that is already connected and operational or for an asset that is due to be connected and operational in time for service start). This connection agreement will need to be evidenced as part of the tender submission, so at the latest by the tender submission deadline. Please note your connection agreement must enable the solution in full - any required modapps should not be outstanding. | | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 21 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Can the slides be provided after the session please. Thanks | none | A copy of both the slides and the recording of this webinar will be made available on the ESO website shortly. We will send an email to everyone who has attended these mid-term market webinars to confirm when these have been published. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 22 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | How does this service sit alongside a Mandatory Services Agreement (MSA). | none | Our understanding of this question is about reactive power MSAs so our answer is on this basis - please follow up if this understanding is incorrect! Generally - stacking is permitted under this contract. Stacking rules been published to clarify what is permitted with regards to Frequency Response, Reserve, Reactive Power, Capacity Market, Restoration, the Constraint Management Intertrip Service, the Balancing Mechanism and the Wholesale market. Of that list the only service where stacking is not explicitly permitted is the Constraint Management Intertrip Service. How exactly a bidder chooses to stack based on their technology type is at their discretion, but they must be able to deliver the contracted stability service at all times. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | How will you assess the relative economic merit of providers if you don't know the expected utilisation? For example some providers may have low availability prices but high usage prices whereas others may have high availability prices but low usage prices, so isn't an expectation of the utilisation needed? | none | In our EOI documents we have stated that the indicative utilisation information would be provided later in the process at ITT stage. At this same stage we will be publishing an updated version of the draft assessment methodology and our intention is this update will explain how exactly bidders would be assessed with regards to availability and utilisation. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 24 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Will GBGF-I providers need to confirm their capability by modelling their maximum inertial response at different power factors (similar to the Stability Phase 3 modelling)? | none | Further detail with regards to feasability studies will be published at the ITT stage of the tender. These tests will be very similar to previous pathfinders and users should be expecting to demonstrate their capability through simulations as part of the tender process | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Each Grid Forming Plant Owner is required to confirm about their repeated ability to supply Active Inertia Power in the event of successive frequency events - is that one of the parameters based on which the providers will be selected? If yes, how it will be included in the providers classification? | none | Providers will be required to confirm the grid forming plant's ability to support successive frequency events. The selection of bidders will be based on the assessment methodology and corresponding assessment criteria. At this stage we have published a draft assessment methodology document (titled Contract Award Criteria), this will be finalised at ITT and published with the detailed criteria. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | The inertia equation in the draft EoI is the swing equation where delta P = Active Inertia Power. Please could you confirm by means of a diagram whether the Power increase is either the AVERAGE power change over the ROCOF period or the magnitude of the largest instantaneous power change over the ROCOF period. | d none | We would require the average power change to be calculated over the entire ROCOF period, which would be the average power change rather than the magnitude of the instaneous power change. This will be explained in the feasibility study guideline at ITT. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | you're looking for 7GVA.s however how much did you get in total from the recent RFI and are you able to state if any Windfarms said they could produce inertia/ would be interested in participating? | none | At this time we will not be publishing the details of the RFI responses, but in our webinars we have provided a summary of what has been done as a result of the RFI responses with regards to the design of the tender process for the Mid-Term (Y-1) Stability Market. The volumes from the RFI are not firm yet and may not apply to the first, some or all delivery years - this will be established at the ITT stage when these solutions are confirmed as real. Releasing speculative information about the market size may not aid the efficiency of this tender in the first instance, however we will look to provide as much transparency as possible. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Are the suppliers also required to carry out studies including interaction studies with the network | none | Providers will be required to carrry out feasibility studies which will be published at the ITT stage. This will be similar to previous Stability Phase 2 & and Stability Phase 3 tenders. Interaction studies are not requited for tender participation. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | When you are saying Physical test, does it mean the HIL test or has to be the Site test? If it's the site test, how will you do the test on site? | none | Providers will be expected to undergo proving and complaince test before the solution is commissioned and starts service delivery. It will be through combinations of simulations and physical site testing, the onus is on the providers to demonstrate the required compliance. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 30 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Is there any deadband in which inertia providers are not required to deliver inertia? | none | No, providers should be providing an inertial response not a frequency response which would not be effected by a frequency deadband. For further detail on the requirement please see ECC.6.3.19 | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 31 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Reactive Power Capability - par. 2.4 of Technical Specification: in webinar it was mentioned that reactive power capability is not mandatory however it seems to be required in different scope in table attached to required in the Technical Requirements and Specification. Could you clarify on that? | none | This first round of the Mid-Term Stability Market is aiming to procure inertia only. When it comes to the assessment methodology for this first round, the intention is that we will be valuing inertia capability on this basis, rather than reactive power capability or short circuit level capability. However, in line with the Technical Specification, all solutions must provide operational reactive range as this will potentially impact inertia provision for certain solutions. This reactive range should either be the solutions mandatory Grid Code requirement or be from their Bilateral Connection Agreement. We've only published the draft assessment methodology at this stage, please look out for updates to this at ITT stage which will provide more detail on how bidders will be selected. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
|-----------------------|----|------------|-----|----------------------------|-------------------|--|------|--|------|--------|-------------|
| 32 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | If awarded the contract, do we need the provide the contracted Inertia for the whole delivery year, or we just need to provide the contracted Inertia when the asset is asked to do so(for example via EDL/EDT) | none | It should be provided when instructed however any participant must also meet availability requirements (90%) to be able to provide inertia when instructed. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 33 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | to confirm, if a Thermal power plant (CCGT) for instance cannot provide inertia @ 0MW's are they discounted from providing this service? | none | Our eligibility criteria require a provider to have the capability to provide the inertia at 0MW so if this was not possible for a specific thermal CCGT they would not be considered eligible. We encourage you to review the Eligibility Criteria document that we have published in the EOI Pack. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Is there any guidance on the RoCoF expected in the network? | none | For further detail on the RoCoF withstand values please see ECC.6.3.19 which details the RoCoF values that participants are required to withstand | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 35 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Is this service post fault or pre fault? | none | This is a pre-fault service but providers would need to meet the requirements to support post-fault status as described in Technical Specification. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 36 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | One requirement is to be able to deliver at 0MW. Is an existing Grid Code compliant synchronous generator able to stack BM and FPN products as long as they meet the 0MW requirement? | none | To reiterate, GBGF-S providers are required to have the capability to provide inertia at 0MW export (please refer to the Eligibility Criteria for this requirement). In this specific scenario around a GBGF-S provider operating >0MW, for example >0MW FPN, we would not penalise the provider by applying extra penalties or declaring them unavailable, but no stability monies will be paid when generating >0MW for the purpose of the payment formulas. Any units which can't operate at 0MW will still be available in BM as an alternative action. All assets must be expected to deliver a minimum availability of 90%. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 37 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Is is a requirement to respond to the consultation in order to submit a EOI? | none | In short, no. To submit an EOI you just need to register in line with the published details in our instructions to tenderers document. To respond to the consultation you simply need to use the Consultation Proforma and return your feedback by the 5pm 3 November 2023 deadline. Responding to the consultation is completely optional. However, we do encourage providing feedback. To confirm, to be invited to the ITT stage bidders must formally submit an EOI. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 38 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | in order to provide inertia from a grid forming converter at 0MW the plant may need to be constrained keeping a head room because inertia comes from real power. How would be possible to stack other frequency services ? | none | Generally - stacking is permitted under this contract, but please review the details in the tender documents. You can contract in other frequency response services as long as sufficient capability is reserved to deliver contracted stability services at all times. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 39 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Will ESO monitor the Inertia behaviour or should be with Service Provider to install the monitor equipment? I it's with service provider, any recommendation of the monitor equipment/characteristic? | none | As per the technical specification the service provider is required to install Dynamic System Monitoring equipment in line with ECC.6.6.1.2. We do not have a position for the recommendation of monitoring equipment. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 40 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Will be charging and discharging of the BESS or other energy storage facility calculated as an unavallability? If not will the supplier get paid, e.g. during generating electricity? | none | The charging/discharging of a battery should not affect the ability of a BESS to provide Inertia. Unless, the BESS does not have enough energy headroom left to fully enable the inertial response or there is not sufficien inverter headroom to deliver the inertial response. If this will not affect the ability of the solution to provide an inertial response no payment would be foregoed. The provider must ensure that when the service is active the battery state of charge and inverter headroom is managed to enable the service in full. If this question is in relation to the 0MW export criteria, we should clarify this requirement applies only to GBGF S plant only, so GBGF-I providers will be paid in full if generating electricity, providing the contracted stability service is available/delivered at all times. | | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 41 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | What's the longest period could be expected for single Inertia/RoCoF Event? | none | The nature of an Inertia service means that there is not a longest period that the delivery of the service should be expected for. An inertial service would be constantly providing active power (In both directions injection/absorption) as long as the service was being used. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 42 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Delivering the service may require a small import of power presumable this is acceptable and would impact the 0MW delivery requirement | none | We assume this is related to GBGF-S providers which need to have a power supply. In this case, yes the import of active power is permitted as the 0MW criteria apply only to export, not import. For more details on the 0MW GBGF-S requirement please refer to the published Eligibility Criteria. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 43 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | there were some Qs from yesterday's webinar that were not answered. are you planning to publish responses to those Qs | none | Yes, all questions from both webinars and their answers will be published on the ESO website shortly. This will include questions that we are able to answer live and those that we have to take away to confirm the response before providing an answer. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Thinking about energy limited assets such as batteries, is there any maximum delivery period or the service must be active until the control room acts to deactivate it? | none | There would not be a longest period that solutions should expect to be utilised for, the provider is expected to reserve enough energy in the battery to enable the inertia service in full. The Inertia power would be responding by both injecting/absorbing active power subject to system changes. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical webinar | Technical webinar | Is there a requirement for the inertia provider to have a 0.95 lead/lag power factor? | none | The providers solution should meet the Grid Code/BCA requirements for its reactive power range. | none | Closed | 25-Oct-2023 |
| 46 25-Oct-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Contract Award Criteria | N/A | Adopting the framework agreement approach, can we submit Stages 0-3 of the assessment process during the mid-term 25/26 tender with a view to providing a service in a later year? I'm uncertain whether the RFI concept of previous successful tender solutions being pre-qualified needed to have actually provided a service. | none | The draft assessment methodology is written so that any submissions received that satisfy stages 0-3 will be eligibile for the framework agreement. Receiving that framework agreement is not also dependent on satisfying stages 4 - 6 of the assessment process for the same delivery year. Note though - stages 4-6 do need to be satisfied to receive a delivery year contract. So if you bid into mid-term 25/26 and meet the requirements under stages 0 - 3 you would receive a framework agreement. Then in future tender rounds, so long as the details of your submission against these requirements don't change in future years, your asset would be fast tracked, but if there's any change, you would be required to declare this and we would reassess you against those criteria. | | Closed | 27-Oct-2023 |

| 47 25-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Apologies for the basic nature of this query. But what might be the typical duration between instruction to provide inertia and its provision? E.g. can we have 24 hours notice to be providing inertia so that we can optimise on the markets we might be partaking in. Or is it more the instruction is dependant on real time requirements of the network. | none | The instruction is more dependent on real time requirements. Providers will need to acknowledge receipt of an Instruction by the Confirmation Time (2 minutes) and then synchronise by the Synchronising Time (30 minutes) Please refer to clause 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 in the draft contract (SCTs) for details. | ione | Closed | 27-Oct-2023 |
|-----------------------|----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|---|------|---|------|--------|-------------|
| 48 31-Oct-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | I got a response on the webinar (if I am interpreting it correctly) that when a unit is pumping or charging, there is no impact on availability, i.e. unit is considered as available. However, if a unit is generating, i.e. its | none | Generally when a unit is stacking with a permitted service, including when generating above 0MW, this is allowed as providers are obliged to reserve headroom at all times to deliver the service; therefore this would | none | Closed | 20-Nov-23 |
| | | | | | | output is above 0 MW, then the unit is not considered available, i.e. is unavailable and does not receive a payment. Is this interpretation correct? If yes, then I have two follow up questions: -Does this mean that this 'unavailability' goes towards the 90% requirements, even though the unit can provide inertia but with MW output? I understand the no payment rationale, but should it not be considered | | not impact it's availability with regards to the 90% availability requirement. In the case of a GBGF-I asset charging/discharging, as long as a provider has enough headroom to provide the stability service at all times, the asset would still be treated as available. If the asset is unable to provide the service whilst charging/pumping, this would be considered unavailable. | | | |
| | | | | | | as technically available? -If a unit is generating, i.e. is unavailable, do we need to submit Redeclarations as per Clause 5? Is unavailability due to positive MW output considered as 'incapable of providing contracted inertia'. | | In the case of an eligible GBGF-S asset (e.g non-0MW synchronous generator able to provide stability at 0MW export) where the provider is operating above 0MW, (e.g., when stacking with the Balancing Mechanism or Wholesale Market) or indeed below 0MW (e.g., pumping or providing synchronous demand), for the purpose of the availability payment formulas alone it would be treated as 'unavailable' and not paid. | | | |
| | | | | | | | | However, from the perspective of the 90% availability, these periods still count towards the 'availability' because inertia will still continue to be priovided alongside MW output. So while the availability against 90% would be unimpacted, the availability payment would not be made. For more information on stacking rules please refer to Section 9 of the Instructions to Tenderers document that we have published (https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/289611/download) | | | |
| | | | | | | | | With regards to using Clause 5 redeclarations to state the unit is generating/stacking in these scenarios to enable this approach, that is not explicit in the current drafting of the contract but we can consider this as a piece of consultation feedback when finalising the contract terms for ITT stage. | | | |
| 49 3rd-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | The inertia equation in the draft EoI is the swing equation where delta P = Active Inertia Power. Please could you confirm by means of a diagram whether the Power increase is either the AVERAGE power change over the ROCOF period or the magnitude of the largest instantaneous power change over the ROCOF period. | none | We would require the average power change to be calculated over the entire ROCOF period, which would be the average power change rather than the magnitude of the instantaneous power change. This will be explained in the feasibility study guideline at ITT. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 3rd-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Please can you clarify what you mean in the situation where the pre-event MW output is such that the contracted inertial response cannot be delivered. It would be helpful to include an example of a GBGF-I type solution. (We believe what you're referring to is the case where a battery could be operating at a specific pre fault MW output that was too high to allow the full inertial response to be delivered.) | | Yes, your understanding would be correct. For instance if an inverter had no overload capacity and the battery was fully exporting power and an injection of active power was needed to provide the inertial response the inverter would not be able to do so. In this case the contracted inertial response could not be provided. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 3rd-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Will GBGF-I providers need to submit by modelling their maximum inertial response at different power factors (similar to the Stability Phase 3 modelling)? | none | Further detail with regards to feasibility studies will be published at the ITT stage of the tender. The intention is these tests will be very similar to previous pathfinders and users should be expecting to demonstrate their capability through simulations as part of the tender process. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 52 3rd-November-2023 | | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | NGESO have stated in webinars that the studies required to prove capability will follow a similar approach to the Stability Phase 3 (SP3) pathfinder. In SP3, the response to a phase angle jump in the project feasibility tests was confusing plus both a 60 degree and 90 degree phase angle change needed to be modelled. 90 degrees seems unnecessary as no synchronous generator is required to tolerate this; thus it is not clear why it should be a modelling requirement for GBGF solutions again. 60 degrees is specified in the Grid Code as a GBGF-I Withstand limit' but it is not clear whether the provider needs to remain connected. Experience suggests that in some cases a 60 degree change could cause battery cell fuses to operate, thereby disconnecting the battery cells (whilst the inverters would remain connected). It would be better if NGESO could give a practical maximum expected withstand for 'normal' (i.e non-black start) system operation. We want to emphasise that specifying too high a maximum phase angle 'ride-through' change could have a _significant_ cost implication to GBGF tenderers - either in terms of reduced inertia capability offered or extra battery capacity that must be installed to keep the phase angle response with the 1C limit that required by virtually all battery cell manufacturer warranties. It is possible to build extra cell capacity to keep the phase jump response within 1C but if this results in the battery duration going much beyond 2 hours then it it becomes challenging economic as the economics of longer duration batteries are less attractive. A phase angle change of 12 degrees should keep the resulting current surge below 1C and thus supports 12 degrees as being a reasonable limit that does not involve extra cost on GBGF providers | | For the phase angle jump, the technical requirements of the Grid Code need to be met. All GBGF-I solutions (which includes battery owners who wish to install a Grid Forming Solution, noting this is not mandatory) should meet the Grid Code requirement which requires a 60 degree withstand capability as defined in Table PC.A.5.8.2 of the Planning Code and ECP.A.9.1.9.6 of the European Compliance Processes, it would be required for the battery to remain connected up to this condiiton. | one | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 53 3rd-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Regarding EMT model- is a black box model, with limited number of parameters made available acceptable? [redacted to maintain confidentiality whilst making generic information available] | none | Yes, the submission of Black Box models is permittable as per the Grid Code. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Is there any requirement to verify the capability on site? | none | Yes, it is our intention to publish proving tests that would need to be completed through physical testing to prove the tendered inertial value is met by the solution. The required proving tests will be published later in the tender process. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 55 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Is there any limitation of the Inertia Capbility per site? | none | There is no specific limit on the maximum Inertia Capability per site however, we have an overall requirement that no more than 12 GVA.s of inertia can be lost for a credible fault. This would include existing inertia providers on the network, if this relates to a specific sites capacity please contact us to discuss this. Please note in our consultation we asked for feedback on the concept of a minimum size threshold. We are considering this feedback to decide whether to introduce a minimum size threshold at the ITT stage. | ione | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 56 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | What is the required response time to provide the service once instructed by ESO? | none | Solutions must be able to provide the inertia service within 30 minutes of receiving an instruction. Please refer to the definitions for "Confirmation Time" and "Synchronising Time" and clauses 5.6 - 5.8 of the draft contract terms for more details. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | What is the expectation for how long a single Inertia sercive will last? | none | ESO are finalising the response to this question. The query log will be updated once the response has been finalised. | none | Open | ТВС |
| 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Who will monitor the behaviour/performance and how will this monitoring of performance happe? | none | Under the current draft contract providers are required to submit declarations that impact their availability and this availability performance is accounted for in the availability payment formulas. Beyond this the onus to ensure compliance with the service agreement is with the user. The user must ensure that when the service is instructed the contracted inertia value is delivered (accounting for any redeclarations) when needed. Beyond this, in line with the technical requirements users should fit equipment such that ECC.6.6.1.2 is met. As we are at EOI stage and the consultation has recently closed, feedback from this stage may result in updates to the contract which may result in further details about performance monitoring of solutions. | ione | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 59 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | If a site has already passed the Grid Forming requirement of GC but with a different Inertia level of capability do we need to redo all the compliance test or just the Inertia part? [redacted for confidentiality purposes] | none | For specific cases such as this, please contact the ESO to discuss further on a confidential basis where actual details of your asset can be considered. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |

| 60 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Is there any special Positive or Negative Inertia requirement? | none | There are no specific differences in the need to supply positive and negative Inertia Power, the response should be uniform to changes to frequency both above and below the nominal frequency. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
|----------------------|----|------------|-----|------------------------------------|-----|--|--------|--|------|--------|-----------|
| 61 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical Specification | N/A | Ref sec 2.2: "The solution will be considered being utilised when it is connected and instructed to provide the instruction or give to the exercise the exercise to the exerci | none | This requirement is that the reactive power capability of the solution is not affected when it is providing the stability service. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| | | | | Specification | | inertia service to the system, during this time the solution would be expected to also provide the reactive power within the range of capability laid out in section 2.4. The solution should be able to deliver the full range of reactive power whenever the inertia service is instructed." We suggest that the intent of inertia service is to inject or absorb active power during the disturbance, so the facility shall be providing reactive power requirements in compliance to BCA only. | | stability service. | | | |
| 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Assuming the plant is available and starts providing inertial response as per the requirement. During the inertial response event, if there is a tripping event on the grid side (outside project boundary limits) which could lead to the shutdown in the area. How ESO will take this into account while calculating the availability and utilization for the project? | none | Thanks for this question. At this time clause 5.15 details how planned outages will be treated, but during the consultation we have received feedback on this matter in relation to unplanned outages so we will be finalising the contract terms, specifically this clause 5.15, accounting for this feedback. Please can we ask you to review the updated contract terms at ITT for details on this. Please note, only those companies who register their expression of interest officially will be invited to the ITT. | | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 63 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | Technical Specification | N/A | The Facility shall have the capability to provide Reactive Power within the range set out in the following table2." Does ESO require the capability data for the Facility (the whole plant) or the solution (which can be a subsection of the whole plant)? | none | In general we expect the reactive range of the solution to be provided, however that solution is made up. Please contact us with exact details to discuss further if this relates to a specific project. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 6th-November-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | The tender details refers to a need of around 7GW.s. Is this 7GW.s of new requirement above that already procured in pathfinder processes or does this assume that some existing pathfinder 1 assets will be included in this tender. | none | The calculation of the 7 GVA.s is calculated against an economic dispatch that is run for the delivery year 202 2026 and represents a deficit in inertia that the ESO deems economic to procure against on a high availability basis. When calculating this inertia requirement, pathfinder contracts are considered in the background in line with their contracted terms. | | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 65 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | Instructions to Tenderers - EOI | N/A | The timescales in Table 2 show potentially only 12 months between contract award and delivery. This is ver short if a provider wishes to install extra equipment to deliver the service. Can this be increased by decreasing the tender assessment period? With the pre-vetting of applicants early on in the ITT, the interna Sanction process should be quick? | | Correct, the tender timeline has been planned to achieve contract award 12 months ahead of the service start date in line with the principles of the mid-term market to operate on a year ahead (Y-1) basis. At this time for the first round of the mid-term market the tender timeline is as lean as it can be. However as the market becomes established and processes more efficient with the use of the framework contract format and the 'fast tracking' assessment principle, there may be scope in future years to condense the time it takes to run the annual tender process. | | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 66 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | N/A | N/A | Could the terms of the tender be such that a single solution can offer stacked or different offers e.g. 1st 500 MWs at £x / MWs / SP and a further 300 MWs at £Y / MWs / SP? | none | Within our Instructions to Tenderers document (https://www.nationalgrideso.com/document/289611/download) Section 14 we have stated that different offers based on the same underlying asset is allowed. Specifically we have said "Bidders will be able to propose multiple solutions based on variations of the same underlying asset/group of assets, e.g., at different capacity levels, if they wish, up to the solution cap". So if you have a machine connected at a specific connection point, you can bid multiple solutions based on that at different capacity levels and even price levels if you wish. Please do note the rules about mutually exlusive later in Section 14, specifically where it states: "Where bidders propose solutions which are variations of the same asset/group of assets behind one connection point e.g. at different capacity levels or different price points, these will be treated as mutually exclusive of one another." So if you bid multiple solutions based on the same asset, only one would be chosen. | | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | N/A | N/A | We note in Clause 3.7 of the General Terms and Conditions that Stability Contracts are personal to the Provider. What would be the process for Providers applying as Parent Companies and subsequently intending to provide the services with an SPV? Will consent under clause 3.7 be assuredly granted? | none | Similar to the process followed on Pathfinders, parent companies can bid into the process but will be asked in the tender submission to confirm the contracting entity that would enter the contract for each proposed solution. This is where parent companies can confirm the name of the SPV or relevant subsidiary. The contrac will then be executed in the name of the SPV or relevant subsidiary. | | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 68 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | N/A | N/A | What is the procedure in place in the event that a Provider undergoes a name change? | none | If post contract award the Provider goes through a name change, our view is Clause 7 of the Framework Agreement could be relied on to agree to such name change. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | N/A | N/A | Will there be the opportunity to either (i) pay for the cost of power in providing the service or (ii) pass the cost of power through to the NGESO for the given period? [Redacted] | t none | For the mid-term market, the current tender rules are that bidders should account for all their relevant costs, including the cost of power, into their availability fee and utilisation fee. There will be no pass through costs for the cost of power under this contract. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 70 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | N/A | N/A | It is clear that if an asset has a CUSU contract then it will be paid ORPS for its mandatory reponse. But what are the payment terms for any reactive power that can be provided above the mandatory response? [Redacted] | none | By 'CUSU contract' we understand this to mean 'CUSC' and are answering this query on this basis. Under the mid-term stability market contract as currently drafted, Providers will be paid at ORPS rate for their reactive power requirements up to their Grid Code Obligation where entitled to under the CUSC. For any reactive power capability beyond this Providers can explore other services such as Commercial Service Agreements, etc. It is at the bidders discretion which services they elect to use so long as the stacking rules are still adhered to. Please note as we are at EOI and consultation stage the contract terms are draft only and subject to change. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 71 3-Nov-2023 | No | Commercial | EOI | N/A | N/A | Please can you also confirm what happens if the contracted inertial response was not capable of being provided i.e is the availability / usage payment deducted pro-rata with the reduced inertial response or set to zero? How also is this monitored and what are the penalties for non-delivery? | none | Based on how the contract is currently drafted, under clause 5 of the contract Providers would be required to notify ESO through the Redeclaration process if the Provider became aware it was unable to provide the contracted stability service and therefore impacting it's availability (please see Clause 5.4 specifically). In the case the contracted service was completely unavailable, the asset would be treated as unavailable in all affected settlement periods and the availability payment formula and the unavailability rebate in Schedule D would account for this. Clause 5.8 details what would happen if the contracted stability service was deemed available but the Provide failed to synchronise following an instruction. In this case the Provider would be treated as unavailable therefore not receiving the utilisation payment as per the utilisation payment formula, and the unavailability would be accounted for in the same availability payment formula and the unavailability rebate. We encourage you to refer to Clause 5 of the contract for full details as the response is just a summary. Please note as we are at EOI and consultation stage the contract terms are draft only and subject to change. | | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 72 3-Nov-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | Do you know yet the expected proportion of time a 0 MW provider will be dispatched to provide inertia? (i.e % of year you expect to dispatch the provider for inertia). | none | In our EOI documents we have stated that the indicative utilisation information would be provided later in the process at ITT stage. At this same stage we will be publishing an updated version of the draft assessment methodology and our intention is this update will explain how exactly bidders would be assessed with regards to availability and utilisation. | none | Closed | 29-Nov-23 |
| 73 10-Nov-2023 | No | Technical | EOI | N/A | N/A | BESS can produce MWs when supplying inertia - the eligibility criteria says "temporary injection/ absorption of power allowed" from BESS so the 0MW requirement doesn't bite for Batteries. However, how long they would be producing MW or inertia for, if 1 or 5mins requirement etc? I couldn't see this in the technical requirements? | none | ESO are finalising the response to this question. The query log will be updated once the response has been finalised. | none | Open | TBC |