NESO Mid-Term (Y-1) Stability Market 27-28 Consultation stage query log

Date 1-Apr-26

	Do you class this Query as Confidential (Yes/No)	Technical/ Commercial Query	Document Reference (if applicable)	Provider Query	Attachments	NESO Response	Associated Attachments (if applicable)	Date Response Issued
1	No	Commercial	N/A	"No more than 12 GVAs behind a credible fault" - presumably this is all inertia solutions, not 12 of the 15GVAs being sought in this tender.	None	Yes, this would consider the overall contribution from plant connected to the system. Not just from tenderers in the Mid-Term Stability Market.	None	02 April 2026
2	No	Commercial	N/A	Noting you state no indexation is applied for the year, but it is not clear if you are also intending this to apply in the event of a 2 year contract. NESO's stance on no remuneration for import power (or protection against excessive import power prices) is already problematic - extending this to a 3.5 year risk is even more so. Results in risk premiums and/or the risk of equipment being removed from service; neither of which is beneficial to the consumer.	None	From NESO's perspective, our current view is that a two-year contract period is still relatively short for applying an indexation mechanism, particularly given the structure of the Mid-Term stability market. Our working assumption is that bidders are best placed to price in their forecast energy and inflation risk within their availability and utilisation bids over that timeframe, rather than introducing formal indexation.	None	02 April 2026
3	No	Commercial	N/A	"Payment based on being available and accepting the instruction". Surely you mean also delivering on the instruction?	None	NESO confirm that all a Provider can do is accept the instruction, but payment of the utilisation rate (delivering on the instruction) ultimately depends on whether they then deliver the service. If they do not deliver against the accepted instruction, the contract covers this through the Instruction Failure Rebate.	None	02 April 2026
4	No	Commercial	N/A	Please confirm stacking rules with e.g. the mid-term reactive market (recent consultation). Noting that ORPS itself is in a state of flux - what stage will this be at in time for this tender process (the uncertainty regarding future ORPS revenues will impact risk premiums)	None	NESO has reviewed the stacking rules alongside the recently published consulation documents for the mid-term reactive market. We will work to update the stacking rules as appropriate to ensure alignment where appropriate. With regards to ORPS, NESO has concluded its consultancy phase, and the final report is undergoing internal review. The related code modification remains at an early stage of progression and has not yet moved into formal workgroup activity. For the purpose of this Y-1 tender NESO acknowledge that this project interacts with the ORPS payment available under a Y-1 Stability contract, but we don't forsee this impacting the stacking rules.	None	02 April 2026
5	No	Commercial	N/A	Penalties for not being "on" when utilisation is called for: It is notable that NESO are tying these penalties to the costs of their alternatives in the Balancing Mechanism. It would be instructive to understand how NESO are planning to collate these charges against the backdrop of large thermal plant not being readily dispatchable in these non-delivery timeframes (CCGTs off for long durations take a long time to start back up - they are unlikley to be around in typical BM decision timeframes that NESO are currently used to to dispatch short notice inertia)	None	NESO is under the assumption that this is referring to the Instruction Failure Rebate. If this is the case, it is no longer linked to altermative Inertia costs and instead based on provider's Contract Rate and Utilisation Rate.	None	02 April 2026
6	No	Commercial	N/A	Despite changes since Round 1, we still believe that the scale of Security required is disproportionately high compared to the contract value and out of alignment with other NESO contracts.	None	NESO have taken your feedback onboard, and having reviewed we believe that the changes made since Round 1 more accurately reflect the value of the contract. For example, should a proivder be awarded a 12-month contract, the security requested is capped at 90 days (~25% of the total contract value)	None	02 April 2026
7	No	Commercial	N/A	Section 12 mentions the use of Ariba, however it was communicated recently that NESO's use of Ariba was to be discontinued, please clarify.	None	For the duration of Round 3, the intention is still to use Ariba as the procurement platform for this tender event. NESO are working to introduce a new procurement platform which will replace Ariba, but this new procurement platform will not be available in time for the launch of the ITT for Round 3. Therefore, Ariba will continue to be used for now. Future tender rounds of the Mid-term Stability Market will use the new procurement platform.	None	02 April 2026

8	No	Commercial	N/A	Section 24 is misleading. It states that the successful Provider must "sign the contract", however the Provider must sign the framework agreement upon tender submission in respect of each solution, and the tender is binding, so what is left to sign upon tender acceptance?	None	Thank you for this feedback. NESO acknowledges that Section 24 may be misleading when read alongside the tender submission requirements, particularly the requirement for providers to sign the Framework Agreement at the point of tender submission. We will update this wording accordingly for the ITT. For clarity, the intended process is as follows: Providers submit signed Framework Agreements for each solution or solution variant they bid into the tender. Where a provider already holds a valid Framework Agreement for said solution or solution variant from a previous tender round, a new agreement will not be required unless NESO determines that an update is necessary, in which case a revised Framework Agreement must be signed. With respect to the Tender Acceptance Letter, no signature is required. Following contract award, the only remaining obligation in this scenario is the provision of acceptable security.	None	02 April 2026
9	No	Commercial	N/A	NESO cap solutions from the same underlying asset to 3 bids. Can NESO please confirm if this is 3 bids for 27/28 and 3 bids for 27/28-29, or 3 bids across both contract periods for one underlying asset	None	NESO confirm that the solution cap is 3 bids across both contract periods as providers will be required to provide pricing for both periods.	None	02 April 2026
10	No	Commercial	N/A	We welcome the greater clarity of Proving Test information in this round of Stability Mid-term 27/28. Can NESO please confirm that all proving test requirements will be shared at Launch of the ITT to allow bidders to understand the requirements with OEM's in good timescales ahead of submission. i.e. no new requirements will be provided by NESO post ITT Launch.	None	The current proving test requirements are published publicly and we are working on minor updates following feedback received as part of the consultation, so an updated versionwill be published shortly. so bidders, OEMs and delivery partners have full visibility in good time ahead of submission. However, while that remains our aim, there may be instances where new information comes to light during the ITT window. For example through clarification queries, technical validation, or emerging system requirements. That means we may need to update or refine the Proving Test expectations. Where this occurs, we will ensure any updates are communicated transparently and with as much notice as possible.	None	02 April 2026
11	No	Commercial	N/A	The ITT pack is to be made available 25/02/26, the submission deadline is forecasted to be May 26. This would provide at the least just over 2 months to prepare the feasibility reports and documents required. The timeframes are very tight for bidders to contract for the reporting, agree the commercial approach with lenders and shareholders, provide commitments to securities and align any necessary works to facilitate the service. We kindly ask that NESO revise the submission date to June/July. Should NESO also provide points 5, 6 and 7, we forecast that stages 2 and 4 of the technical assessment would be eased by a higher quality of response to afford NESO more time post submission to evaluate and award contracts.	None	NESO notes the concerns around submission deadline. The official ITT submission date will be confirmed and issued within the Instructions to Tenderers document as part of the ITT pack.	None	02 April 2026
12	No	Commercial	N/A	Responses above were requested to use the 'wrap text' tool, please note the tool was unavailable as the document has been protected as such. Please ensure that all text provided is properly considered.	None	Thank you for this feedback, we noted this issue on the template and will rectify going forwards.	None	02 April 2026
13	No	Commercial	N/A	We believe that any service provider with units which have already pre-qualified under a previous tender round should be excluded from needing to provide security guarantees. As they have already met conditions precident from previous tenders, LDs and therefore security requirements should no longer apply.	None	NESO thanks you for sharing this feedback. We understand the point raised regarding units that have previously pre-qualified under previous contracts for similar services. NESO will consider this for future tender rounds. However, for Round 3, NESO is not planning to remove or amend the current security requirements, which will continue to apply consistently to all bidders.	None	02 April 2026
14	No	Commercial	N/A	Utilisation price including "Fuel Cost" - presume you mean power ? Utilisation Price in £/GVA.s/h : can you confirm the intent is we still tender on the basis of £/hr for Utilisation (and £/SP for availability), and you will derive the £/GVA.s/h from this (given our GVA.s value separately provided)	None	On the utilisation price including "fuel cost", your understanding is correct, this to refers to power-related costs. Utilisation costs should be inclusive of all costs required to utilise the asset when instructed. The intent is that Providers continue to tender on the basis of a utilisation price in £/hour (and an availability price in £/SP), with NESO deriving the £/GVA.s/h metric from the tendered £/hour utilisation price using the GVA.s value separately provided.	None	02 April 2026
15	No	Commercial	N/A	NESO should add that stacking with other services can also be proven via studies where necessary. Sometimes it is impossible to complete physical testing to prove capability and it can only be proven via studies.	None	NESO notes the comment regarding demonstrating stacking capability. As part of the updated documents issued at ITT stage, NESO has already updated the stacking rules to provide greater clarity on how stacking with other services may be assessed, including the requirement for providers to demonstrate capability where relevant. If further clarity is needed, then please specify which services you wish to stack in this instance through the query management process set out within the ITT documentation. This will allow NESO to consider whether any further clarification is required within the existing stacking provisions set out in the ITT documentation.	None	02 April 2026

16	No	Commercial	N/A	NESO specify tenderers can fast track some assessment stages (0-3) if they have a framework agreement and have previously been approved. We believe that Stage 4 Eligibility Criteria covers the same assessment as Stage 2 Technical Assessment, so Stage 4 should be included in the fast track process to be automatically passed unless capabilities have been changed.	None	Thank you for your feedback. For this tender round, NESO considers that fast-tracking through Stages 1–3 provides an appropriate level of proportionality where tenderers hold an executed framework agreement and have previously been approved. However, for Round 3, NESO still requires all bidders to submit responses to Stages 4 and 5, regardless of any existing framework agreement. This ensures that eligibility and delivery requirements are assessed consistently for this round.	None	02 April 2026
17	No	Commercial	N/A	We request that NESO provide clarity between requirements for GFM plant as set out in the Grid Code and the technical assessment carried out for tenders such as this. We believe there to a be risk that a GFM plant may pass all Grid Code requirements (and hence be issued a FON) but could fail technical requirements for this service. This makes little sense given that the plant would continue to operate as the behaviours that may have deemed unacceptable in the tender assessment would still occur. We also ask that NESO give consideration of applying a reduced assessment to plant that has already passed the required GFM Grid Code compliance assessment. Given the regularity of stability related tender processes that NESo appears likely to run over the coming years, it seems like an inefficient use of time and effort for all parties to be continually asked to "prove" the basic functionality of plant over and over again.	None	Thank you for your comments. NESO recognises the importance of clarity between Grid Code requirements for Grid-Forming (GFM) plant and the technical assessment applied within service-specific tender processes. NESO is actively reviewing how Grid Code requirements can be better aligned with service-specific requirements where appropriate. However, it is important to note that the Grid Code sets minimum compliance requirements for connection and operation. Network Service tenders, by contrast, are designed to procure specific performance beyond these minimum requirements, for which Providers are remunerated. As such, it is reasonable that additional technical assessment is required to demonstrate suitability for the service being procured. A plant meeting Grid Code GFM requirements and holding a Final Operational Notification (FON) does not automatically imply that it meets all service-specific technical requirements, which may be more onerous or targeted to particular system needs. NESO recognises the efficiency benefits of re-using existing evidence where possible. Providers may resubmit previously completed simulations or studies, provided they demonstrate compliance with the relevant tender technical requirements. Where such submissions are technically sufficient, further re-assessment would not be required.	None	02 April 2026
18	No	Commercial	N/A	We request that NESO removes the requirement to evidence approval from the TO for the ability to connect Grid Forming, this is not something TOs provide as standard.	None	Providers are no longer required to evidence such approval at the tender stage. The associated risk now sits with the provider; if successful, they will be required to update their connection agreement as necessary and manage any risks associated with securing the appropriate consents or amendments. Please see the updated tender document, this requirement has been changed in the latest ITT documents.	None	02 April 2026
19	No	Commercial	N/A	NESO should procure on a technology-neutral basis. Its proposal to pay both an availability and utilisation payment to synchronous plant but only an availability payment to inverter-based plant distorts technology-neutrality. We agree that NESO should pay a utilisation fee to synchronous plant. There is typically a non-zero marginal cost of running such plant which NESO should be exposed to in order to identify the most efficient solution for the system at any point in time (which may be to switch a synchronous machine off). Inverter-based plant may have zero marginal cost of stability provision, but also may not. The marginal cost may be an opportunity cost, for example if the plant is unable to stack frequency response-type services with a mid-term stability contract, the marginal cost of stability provision would be the lost frequency response revenues. Where plant has genuinely zero marginal cost of stability provision, competitive tension in the auction should drive them to bid zero utilisation fee.	None	NESO agrees that procurement should be technology-neutral, but this does not require identical payment structures where technologies operate differently. A utilisation payment is appropriate for synchronous plant because NESO can directly instruct these plant to provide the stability service, and doing so exposes a genuine marginal cost. A utilisation price therefore supports efficient operational decisions. In contrast, inverter-based plant providing stability are contracted to deliver a fixed, always-on capability. NESO cannot instruct the capability used to deliver the service, and there is therefore no operational action through which the service can be instructed to be “utilised” in real time. As a result, a utilisation payment for inverter-based plant would not reflect an actionable system decision and would not improve efficiency. Any opportunity costs faced by providers are expected to be reflected in availability bids, while competitive tension should drive utilisation prices to zero where marginal costs are genuinely zero. On this basis, NESO considers an availability-only payment for inverter-based stability provision to be appropriate and consistent with technology-neutral procurement.	None	02 April 2026
20	No	Technical	Technical Specification	Page 3 of tech spec has a footnote referencing utilisation (but it is not a sentence linked to utilisation so makes no sense).	None	There is a typo in the next footnote. This has been amended. Thank you for pointing it out.	None	02 April 2026
21	No	Technical	Proving Tests	Proving tests: Power Oscillation Damping now seems to need demonstrating in simulations across the frequency range 0.3 to 2.0Hz for both voltage oscillations and frequency oscillations (26 cases) – an entirely new concept throughout and one I hope would be demonstrated by AVR only as any suggestion of a Power System Stabiliser makes no sense on a 0MW synch comp. Please advise - we believe requirements for Grid Forming Inverters to prove their cability is significantly over complicating the process for synchronous compensators.	None	For synchronous compensators only Power Oscillation Damping - Voltage Oscillations test must be performed to demonstrate its oscillation damping capability. Active power oscillation tests are only expected for GBGF-I solutions.	None	02 April 2026

22	No	Technical	Proving Tests	Proving tests: Section 5.3 in the proving document now addresses a series of permutations and combinations of voltage and frequency disturbances in a table/grid! 24 cases, 2 load points for a 0MW unit (6 if active power provider with power both in and out, so BESS) each needing 16 signals plotting. Simple sum is 24 x 2 x 16 = 768 plots in the report for section 5.3 alone. Who is able to look and digest all these plots? We can understand NESO being very concerned and wanting extra proving & simulation data from synthetic inertia providers, but is all of this really necessary for synchronous compensators?	None	We acknowledge that applying the full 24-case matrix leads to a large volume of plots. We will review how some plots may be combined to reduced the total number of plots required in an updated version of the proving tests document, which will be published shortly.	None	02 April 2026
23	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.4 Reactive Power Capability	Please could NESO provide some additional information on how bidders should treat co-located projects particularly in terms of the reactive requirements (max and min Q in the feasibility studies). We understand that the feasibility studies must consider all assets and equipment behind the grid entry point which includes both or more technologies in the co-located project but not how the Grid Code reactive obligations should be considered when there are two different technologies with separate MSAs. The prevalence of co-located projects is going to expand massively in the coming years so providing explicit guidance to bidders would be appreciated.	None	It is correct that feasibility studies must consider all assets and equipment behind the GEP. The provider must clearly demonstrate the aggregate reactive capability achievable at the boundary under the test conditions.	None	02 April 2026
24	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.5 Other Technical Requirements, point 13.	We appreciate NESO providing clarity on this operational expectation. We agree it seems sensible.	None	The expectation of the requirement of Section 2.5 is that the Facility must demonstrate the ability to detect and damp oscillations in the 0.3–2 Hz range.	None	02 April 2026
25	No	Technical	Technical Specification - Section 2.5 Other Technical Requirements - GBGF-S Damping Control	In relation to damping control requirements, we note reference to yet-to-be-published future guidance, but without this it is impossible to properly respond to this consultation topic. We would ask that such future guidance is subject to a separate consultation process once published.	None	Thank you for the feedback, the publication of the SSO guidance note for the Synchronous Machines is a separate process.	None	02 April 2026
26	No	Technical	Technical Specification - Section 2.6 Control and Indication Facilities - Physical tests	There is no fast fault current injection in GBGF-S; hence, no requirement for fast fault current measurement. With regards to the 1kHz requirement for other Grid Forming Plant tests, according to the GB Grid Code and Guidance Note on GBGF-S as well as other NESO Pathfinder Specifications, only 100Hz (10ms) is required for the voltage control test and 1Hz (1s) for the reactive range test required for GBGF-S facility. Therefore, we would propose NESO to state explicitly that this requirement applies solely to GBGF-I technology and does not apply to GBGF-S.	None	At present, the Proving Test document stipulates that measurements shall be sampled at a minimum rate of 1 kHz (Tech Spec 2.7.4). These tests are only for testing Grid-Forming functions rather than all testing, such as voltage control and reactive power capability	None	02 April 2026
27	No	Technical		It would be helpful to know what, if anything, has changed in the suite of documentation since Round 2. It would really help the review process if there were tracked changes.	None	Thank you for the feedback, we will consider this in future.	None	02 April 2026
28	No	Technical	Technical Specification	Section 2.2. page 4, Utilisation Profile - GBGF-I are expected to be available for > 90% of the contracted period without a utilisation profile shared. An indication of utilisation for GFGB-S is provided as 15-25%. Can NESO please provide further guidance on the expectated utilisation of GBGF I, will it be the same as GBGF-S or will NESO prefer to more heavily utilise the GBGF-I technologies? At current, GBGF-I would have to submit pricing based on the most onerous scenario to be conservative, thus inflating the anticipated bid price. Should NESO provide futher clarity on the GBGF-I utilisation profile this would allow GBGF-I to place a more competitive bid, on a more level playing field against GBGF-S.	None	For GBGF-I technologies, payment will be made through a single availability fee payment with no separate utilisation payment. Requiring the service at least 90% availability during the contract period. NESO also note that plant is required to operate with a fixed inertia constant and to deliver this inertia capability across the operational range of the plant (Active and Reactive Power Capability)	None	02 April 2026
29	No	Technical	Technical Specification - Section 2.2. page 4, Utilisation Profile	We kindly suggest to NESO, that should NESO commit to provide a more flexible approach, so as to permit participation in permitted stacked services by providing notifications of intended usage of the inertia service at week ahead or day ahead timescales. There would be opportunity to significantly reduce the cost of a BESS solution. At current, a BESS would be required to dedicate MW capacity to the inertia service for all availability over settlement periods, even if the inertia service is not required. This results in the inertia service competing against the opportunity cost of the BESS markets throughout the year. Greater sight of actual availability and utilisation requirements, would allow a BESS the opportunity to combine the income streams to discount the cost of the inertia service (having prioritised the inertia service at all times, once notified by NESO to do so).	None	GBGF-I solutions receives a single availability-only payment, and that's why no utilisation schedule or short-term instructions are issued. NESO also note that plant is required to operate with a fixed inertia constant and to deliver this inertia capability across the operational range of the plant (Active and Reactive Power Capability)	None	02 April 2026

30	No	Technical	Technical Specification - Section 2.4 Reactive Power Capability, 2.4.8	Section 2.4 Reactive Power Capability, 2.4.8 allows solutions with operational restrictions on the connection offer to forego Reactive Power requirements of the service delivery. We appreciate this consideration. Can NESO please confirm that for the purpose of the Feasibility Report/Simulation studies and technical questionairre, that a solution with such operational restriction, neednt demonstrate the reactive power components?	None	If a solution has restrictions on it's MVAr range, it is still required to complete the Feasibility Study with the required MVAr range as obligated under the Grid Code.	None	02 April 2026
31	No	Technical	Technical Specification - Section 2.9 page 1	Section 2.9 page 12, Compliance Requirements references the requirement to provide a full set of test requirements no less than 1 year before the Scheduled Commercial Operations Date. Can NESO verify that the ITT launch, NESO will settout precisely the compliance requirements and no further compliance requirements will be made, in order to comply with this statement?	None	The Proving Tests have now been published on the NESO website, with an updated version to be published shortly, please note that NESO reserve the right to update and change these requirements.	None	02 April 2026
32	No	Technical	Technical Specification	We request NESO to add clarity on expectations of what they expect the technical performance to be for tenderes to pass the requirements. The Feasibility Study document has not been shared as part of this tender, we request that it has additional clarity in compared to the previous tender, again requesting that NESO are explicit in what behaviour they would expect to observe in all the required studies for there to be a pass. It would be beneficial, particularly where newer technologies are concerned, if NESO were to provide example "ideal" response characteristics against which bidders could assess their own modelled performance	None	The Feasibility Study document will be provided at the ITT stage. In addition, NESO has published the guidance document "GBGF-I Phase Angle Jump Behaviour", which sets out the expected technical behaviour for GBGF-I solutions in the relevant feasibility tests. This guidance is available at: https://www.neso.energy/document/376661/download	None	02 April 2026
33	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.6 Other Technical Requirements	We do not agree with NESO's requirement that parties should not be able to go into Grid Following mode if they have declared themselves unavailable to the provide the GFM service. If issues were to arise with the GFM service, this may require detailed "offline" investigation and modelling work to determine the root cause of the problem. Refusing to allow a plant to change to GFL mode during this period of service unavailability creates a disproportionate risk of lost revenue and would likely render the provision of this service "unbankable" – i.e. to obtain the relatively small additional revenue offered by this contract, a bidder would be required to place at risk all revenue from their site should an issue with the GFM arise as the "fall-back" of temporary GFL operation would be blocked. Additionally, we would have thought that NESO would like to add the caveat that if NESO ENCC instructs the plant to go into Grid Following that this would be allowed.	None	Thank you for the feedback, we have reviewed this internally and do not forsee this requirement changing.	None	02 April 2026
34	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.6 Other Technical Requirements	We do not believe this requirement takes into account the affect of the AC assets (e.g. transformers and cables) that normally make up the connection between the inverters (0.69kV) and the Point of Connection (e.g. 400kV). In particular, the reactive power contribution of the transformers (typically 33kV/400kV) is dependent on loading. During RoCoF period, the transformer loading will change. If the Inverter Voltage Source maintain the IVS (i.e. with no MVAr correction command from Power Plant Controller to adjust MVArs at the PoC), then the reactive power observed at the PoC will vary compared to the pre-event state due to the change in reactive loss / gain across the balance of plant (BoP) assets. If NESO wish to assess pure IVS behaviour to determine the GFM function, then we believe NESO should assess only the behaviour as observed at the inverter terminals without any additional actions being taken by the PPC. If NESO wish to assess P/Q delivery at PoC, and retain the requirement that the impact shall be "limited", then we believe NESO should specify that they expect to see a User's solution include some form of compensation (either control system or asset based) to mitigate what is otherwise an entirely natural and expected characteristic of a typical connection design. Please clarify the requirement "any change in reactive power must be in support of maintaining the voltage setpoint". Our interpretation is that this would mean that Voltage Control mode would be the only acceptable mode of operation for this round of tender. Please confirm that reactive power control mode would be unacceptable under this criterion. It's unclear on how NESO will assess the requirement to have "inherent capability to independently	None	NESO will take the feedback away and provide clarity in the Technical Specification and Feasibility Study.	None	02 April 2026
35	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.6 Other Technical Requirements	It is not clear how NESO will identify "subsidiary control functions". We assume that a POD function may well be categorised as such, but would NESO also consider any of the following to be "subsidiary control functions": LFSM / FSM / Deload / V-Q droop control / Inertia + Damping / Phase Angle Jump Power? Ideally would provide specific examples of what does and doesn't constitute a "subsidiary control function".	None	A subsidiary control function is the function acting to control the oscillation, for instance the PPC or the PSS in the case of a synchronous machine.	None	02 April 2026
36	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.6 Other Technical Requirements	There is no specific requirement in a connection agreement to identify a plant as being GFM or not. We are therefore usure how a connection agreement would be updated as suggested by NESO. Please clarify what area of the BCA or ConsAg NESO expect this information to be captured.	None	This requirement has been updated now, there should be further clarity provided.	None	02 April 2026

37	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.7 Control & indications	We believe the references are incorrect, which section is 3.1. and 3.2 refering to?	None	Thank you, this is a typo. The references should read 2.1 and 2.2, not 3.1 and 3.2	None	02 April 2026
38	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.7 Control & indications	Reactive power is expected to be lower accuracy(+/-3%) compared with active power measurement, Elexon's CoP meter has the same understanding. Will NESO separate the accuracy requirement for Active power and Reactive power?	None	This is the accuracy of the DSM meter, not the settelement metering. NESO do not see the need to change this.	None	02 April 2026
39	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.7 Control & indications	Can NESO please make it clear on the definition and test cases for 'Physical Testing'? If this is for FAT with HIL/PHIL? ECC.66.3.2 said 100Hz for other Grid Forming Plant tests. Please clarify why NESO is now specifying 1kHz and to which specific signals this requirement applies? We note that NESO's requirements appear to differ from those in the Grid Code and between one commercial tender and the next. While we understand that requirements evolve and that this area (particularly for GFM assets) is relatively new, we request that NESO give consideration to how these changes affect assets that may have been designed to meet the requirement of previous tenders. We believe there is a risk NESO will inadvertently exclude plant from tenders that could in fact deliver the service perfectly adequately. If a requirement is changed between one tender to the next, then where possible (i.e. when the updated requirement is not critical to delivery of the service) NESO should state that solutions that meet the "old" requirement will also be accepted.	None	It is the responsibility of the user to propose a testing regime and for NESO to agree to it. NESO have clarified this requirement and do not see a need to change this requirement.	None	02 April 2026
40	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.3 Inertia Capability	NESO shall make it clear on the Active Inertia Power calculation method: If this is based on average power for a 1Hz/s with 1s duration; or is this is based on absolute change of power for a 1Hz/s with 1s duration.	None	NESO do not see the need to clarify this in the technical specification, the operation of the plant is not affected by the method that is used to value the inertia in the tender process	None	02 April 2026
41	No	Technical	Technical Specification 2.5 Power Oscillation Damping	NESO shall make it clear the definition of 'antiphase'. Shall be wide range of antiphase rather than just 180degrees.	None	NESO do not see the need to clarify this following updates to the technical specification.	None	02 April 2026
42	No	Technical	Proving Tests	We request NESO to add a pass criteria for all the tests specified, what behavior will NESO consider is a pass in their assessment.	None	NESO will take this away and consider how to clarify the assesment in the Proving Tests.	None	02 April 2026
43	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 2: Overview - Table 1	Section 2: Overview - Table 1 saying Section 3. Grid Code Compliance is a requirement. But Section 3 is 'Non-Contractual Testing'. Thought NESO want to say Section 4.?	None	Section 2: Thank you, we will fix this typo.	None	02 April 2026
44	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 4.1	Section 4.1 - Can NESO please release the additional compliance requirement for the plant that can provide constant MVAr mode.	None	Section 4: The provision of Constant MVAr mode is only when requrested by NESO, NESO will provide this guidance on a case by case basis.	None	02 April 2026
45	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 4.2	Section 4.2 - The title is already saying voltage control, what's the intection to put the constant MVAr mode in this section?	None	Section 4: Constant MVAr is a method through which system voltage may be controlled by NESO.	None	02 April 2026
46	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 5.1	Section 5.1 - What is the phase jump angle withstand value?	None	Section 5: Please see the Grid Code for the definiton of Phase Jump Withstand Value	None	02 April 2026
47	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 5.2	Section 5.2 - NESO shall make it clear that the contracted Inertia assessment shall only be done for 1Hz/s with a period of 1s. The result from different event is only for reference.	None	Section 5.2 - The contracted Inertia is not restricted for RoCoF events of 1 Hz/s.	None	02 April 2026
48	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 5.3	Section 5.3 - "The Inertia must macth or be greater than Inertia values stated in feasibility study". Has NESO considered that scenarios for feasibility study is different with this section? There is no combined events during feasibility, the IVS is not affected by post fault combined events. Especially when under Constant Q control mode, the cheng of post voltage will dramatically affect the solution terminal voltage. This requirement doesn't show any technical respect. We would recomment only the summary of Inertia value shall be provided.	None	Section 5.3 - The Inertia value is required to be delivered across a range of scenarios. NESO will review the wording used in this section.	None	02 April 2026
49	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 5.5	Section 5.5 - GBGF-I, the GFM has the damping capability by default, the wide antiphase shall be the only passing criteria on the damping capability.	None	Section 5.5 - Thank you for the comment, it is NESO's directive what the passing criteria is for each question.	None	02 April 2026
50	No	Technical	Proving Tests Section 6.4	Section 6.4 - GBGF-I has the damping capability by default, there is no need for additional/subsidary POD function. For this situation, there is no POD gain need to be tunned. So the question to NESO is if this is a mandatory requirement for additional/subsidary POD function whilst the GBGF-I has already had the damping capability?	None	Section 6.4 - The guidance provided is indicative only, if the users plant does not rely upon this equipment an alternative method of demonstrating the damping capability may be used, noting this still needs to demonstrate the damping capability in full.	None	02 April 2026