# DS3 System Services Consultation – Scalar Design

This questionnaire has been prepared to facilitate responses to the consultation. Respondents are not restricted to this template and can provide supplementary material if desired.

Please send responses in electronic format to DS3@eirgrid.com or DS3@soni.ltd.uk

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent Name | *<name>* |
| Contact telephone number | *<number>* |
| Respondent Company | *<company>* |

**Note: It is the TSOs’ intention to publish all responses. If your response is confidential, please indicate this by marking the following box with an “x”. Please note that, in any event, all responses will be shared with the Regulatory Authorities.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 **Response confidential**

**The closing date for responses is Friday, 22 April 2016.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Question*** | ***Response*** |
| **Product, Scarcity and Volume Scalars Proposed by TSOs** |
| Question 1: Do you agree with our proposal to implement a product scalar for faster response of the FFR product? If not, please specify why or identify what element of the scalar design you believe requires amendment?Question 2: Do you agree with the implementation of a product scalar for the enhanced delivery of the FFR, POR, SOR and TOR1 products? If not, please specify why or identify what element of the scalar design you believe requires amendment? Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to implement a product scalar for enhanced delivery of the SSRP product with an AVR? If not, please specify why or identify what element of the scalar design you believe requires amendment?Question 4: What are your views on the temporal scarcity scalars presented for implementation of the DRR and FPFAPR products respectively? Do you agree with the principle behind the scalar and, if not, could you explain your rationale?Question 5: Do you agree with the volume scalar proposal set out by the TSOs? If not, what part of the scalar design proposal do you believe requires amendment? |  |
| **Other scalars not currently being proposed for implementation** |
| Question 6: Noting that our minded-to position is to not implement a product scalar for the SSRP product with Watt-less VArs, do you believe there is a material requirement to implement this scalar? If so, please provide justification as to why you believe this scalar is required. Question 7: Noting that our minded-to position is to not implement a product scalar for the enhanced delivery of the DRR product, do you believe there is a material requirement to implement this scalar? If so, please provide justification as to why you believe this scalar to be required. Question 8: Noting that while our minded-to position is to not implement a product scalar for this service at this time, do you agree with our proposal to potentially reassess the impact of introducing this scalar at a later stage, or do you believe there is a material requirement to implement this scalar at an earlier opportunity? If so, please provide justification as to why you believe this scalar to be required.Question 9: Do you agree with the rationale as to why we propose not to implement this scalar? Can you propose an alternative approach as to how this scalar could be introduced?Question 10: Do you agree with the rationale as to why we are proposing not to implement this scarcity scalar at this time? If not, can you provide rationale to support your views?Question 11: Noting the rationale provided as to why we are minded to not implement a locational scalar for SSRP at this time, do you agree with this proposal and the rationale behind it? If not, can you provide rationale to support your views?Question 12: Do you agree with the rationale as to why we are proposing not to implement this scalar? If not, can you provide rationale to support your views?Question 13: Do you agree with the rationale as to why we are minded not to implement this scalar? If not, can you provide rationale to support your views? |  |
| **Performance Scalar**  |
| Question 14: Do you agree with our proposals for the performance scalar design? If not, what part of the scalar design proposal do you believe requires amendment? |  |