

Supply Substitution vs Load Absorption

Gas TCMF

26th April 2006

Introduction

- ◆ To calculate a Unit Cost Allowance (UCA) for a new System Entry Point requires a methodology to:
 - ◆ Maintain a Supply and Demand match including the new Entry Point
 - ◆ Allocate any identified costs between Entry and Exit

UCA Methodology

- ◆ Prevailing - Route Costs:
 - ◆ Calculated from the additional investment required to support an increase in flow along each route
 - ◆ Disaggregated into Entry/Exit costs on average on a 50/50 basis
- ◆ For large New Entry points, modeling a corresponding increase in demand at a single Exit point might more than double local flows, and hence not be modeled accurately by Transcost
- ◆ Proposed - “System Costs”:
 - ◆ Calculated from the additional investment required to support a sustained increase in flow at an Entry point with balancing adjustments to other Entry and/or Exit points.
 - ◆ A cost is determined for the entry point by only considering those costs trigger by the entry point flow increase

Maintain Supply and Demand match

- ◆ For any steady-state hydraulic model to operate, it is necessary to achieve a system balance between Entry (supply) and Exit (demand) flows
- ◆ Prevailing methodology maintains a supply & demand balance by
 - ◆ Starting from a balanced central case
 - ◆ Considering route costs i.e. matched increase in Entry/Exit pairs
- ◆ Options identified by Ofgem for “System Costs” are:
 - ◆ Load (demand) Absorption
 - ◆ Supply Substitution, or
 - ◆ A Hybrid of both the above

Allocation of Costs to Entry & Offtake

- ◆ Once a system balance achieved, costs associated with additional assets required to maintain transmission capacity can be identified
- ◆ Costs need to be split between Entry & Offtake. Options identified by Ofgem are:
 - ◆ 50/50 Entry v Offtake split
 - ◆ 100% cost allocation to Entry
 - ◆ Cost allocation based on engineering judgement

Load Absorption

- ◆ Increase demand to match the higher supply level
- ◆ How?
 - ◆ Known load growth?
 - ◆ Scaling Firm demand?
 - ◆ All firm offtakes equally?
 - ◆ Consider Interruptible Offtake flows?
 - ◆ A proportion of all Interruptible offtakes modelled equally, or
 - ◆ Selected Interruptible offtakes modelled?

Load Absorption: Entry Exit Cost Split

- ◆ Offtake related reinforcement costs might be identified
- ◆ These could be removed by
 - ◆ Engineering judgement:
 - ◆ Feasible but a non-transparent process
 - ◆ 50:50 split:
 - ◆ Understates share of investment costs driven by incremental entry capacity for entry points at the extremities of the system due to the distributed offtake increase

Supply Substitution

- ◆ Decrease existing supply to allow for the higher supply level
- ◆ How?
 - ◆ Scaling supplies?
 - ◆ All supplies equally?
 - ◆ Selected supplies e.g. exclude those <50 miles from new SEP
 - ◆ Furthest ASEPs from the new Entry Point
 - ◆ Merit order – reduce flows starting from the Entry Points furthest from the new Entry Point?
 - ◆ Storage
 - ◆ Interconnectors/LNG Importation
 - ◆ Beach

Supply Substitution : Entry Exit Cost Split

- ◆ Offtake related reinforcement costs would not be identified
 - ◆ 50:50 split:
 - ◆ Understates share of investment costs driven by incremental entry capacity for any entry point
 - ◆ 100% Entry
 - ◆ Consistent with a process where only Entry flows are changed

Hybrid Approach

- ◆ A complex process could be defined based on
 - ◆ Known load growth
 - ◆ Interruptible loads
 - ◆ Reduced use of storage & Interconnectors (high merit order supplies)

Hybrid: Entry Exit Cost Split

- ◆ 100% Entry
 - ◆ Process could be designed to only generate entry costs
 - ◆ Transparency?
- ◆ Offtake related reinforcement costs might be identified
- ◆ These could be removed by
 - ◆ Engineering judgement:
 - ◆ Feasible but a non-transparent process
 - ◆ 50:50 split:
 - ◆ Understates share of investment costs driven by incremental entry capacity for entry points at the extremities of the system due to the distributed offtake increase

Summary

- ◆ National Grid NTS View:
 - ◆ Supply Substitution should be used for UCA calculation
 - ◆ Use merit order and start with those furthest from the new Entry Point
 - ◆ 100% Entry Cost Allocation as only Entry flow increases are modelled
 - ◆ The 50/50 split used within the LRMC methodology remains appropriate
 - ◆ consistent with modelling of route costs where equal Entry and exit flow increases are considered