Consultation

Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Publication date:	26 June 2026
Response deadline:	7 August 2026
Team:	Long Duration Electricity Storage (LDES)
Email:	LDES@ofgem.gov.uk

Contents

Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage 1

Foreword 5

Executive summary 6

1. Introduction 7

Questions 8
Timeframes 9
How to respond 9
Tracking progress 9
Confidentiality 9

2. Minded-to decisions 11

Minded-to decisions 13

3. Project Assessment process 14

Objective of the Project Assessment 14
Inputs to the Project Assessment 14
Components of the Project Assessment 14
Project Assessment – minded-to decisions 15

4. Cost Assessment 17

Approach to the cost assessment and evidence use 17
Treatment of uncertainty 18
Outputs from the cost assessment 18

5. Economic Assessment 20

Economic Assessment process 20
Economic Assessment inputs 20
Monetised impacts 22
Non-monetised impacts 24
Economic Assessment ranking 29
Amendments from the MCA Framework 31
Limitations 32
Economic Assessment outputs 33
How the Economic Assessment informed minded-to decisions 33

6. Financial Assessment 37

Financial Assessment process 37
Regime Requests 37

Financial Assessment score 40
Revenue estimation process 41
Cap and floor levels 42
Outputs from the Financial Assessment 43
Amendments from the MCA Framework 43
Limitations of the Financial Assessment 44
How the Financial Assessment informed minded-to decisions 45

7. Strategic Assessment 51

Strategic Assessment process 51
Scenario analysis 51
Deliverability Assessment 52
Portfolio-level considerations 53
Amendments from the MCA Framework 54
How the Strategic Assessment informed minded-to decisions 55

8. Capacity and Attrition 61

Capacity and attrition approach 61
Limitations 62
How Capacity and Attrition informed minded-to decisions 62

9. Next steps 67

Consultation – Minded-to decisions 67
Publication – Final awards 67
Future windows – consultation 68

Send us your feedback 69

Appendix 1. Key project inputs 70

Appendix 2. Project Assessment Results overview 74

Appendix 3. Economic Assessment final outputs 78

Appendix 4. Economic Assessment normalised outputs 82

Appendix 5. Strategic Assessment outputs 86

Appendix 6. Project Assessment Summaries 90

Appendix 7. Abbreviations 110

Appendix 8. Privacy policy 112

Personal data 112

Foreword

Long Duration Electricity Storage (LDES) is an increasingly important part of our energy system. NESO advice shows we need to increase the amount of storage on the system over the next few years. These assets let us capture energy from excess renewables when the wind is blowing and sun is shining and store this for when customers need it.

Ofgem has designed and is running its first ever window for cap and floor support to encourage the development of LDES projects, applying the successes of the similar schemes we have run for many years to encourage the development of interconnectors to other countries.

We were pleased with the very strong set of applicants we received for Window 1 with over 70 projects of nearly 30 GW participating in the Project Assessment. We have completed a thorough project assessment to select the best projects to meet system need. We are pleased to set out the results of that assessment today, with a varied portfolio of projects which we are minded-to support to ensure we are developing the clean power system for the future.

Beatrice Filkin

Director of Major Projects

Ofgem

Executive summary

This document sets out our minded-to decisions for the first ever application window for the Long Duration Electricity Storage cap and floor regime.

Our minded-to decisions result in a portfolio of 16 projects, representing 7,645 MW of capacity. The selected portfolio provides, in our view, an appropriate mix of duration, technology and locational distribution. It includes a strong representation of higher-duration assets, consistent with policy objectives and Capacity Advice. Decisions have been taken in line with our published methodologies, with judgement applied transparently where required.

Overall, the evidence suggests the proposed portfolio is likely to deliver system and consumer benefits, including improved security of supply, reduced emissions and lower system costs. Cap and floor payments are expected to be broadly neutral over time in direct bill terms, with wider system benefits improving outcomes for consumers.

The minded-to capacity is set at the upper end of range of NESO's advice to account for potential project attrition while meeting system need. This approach balances the risks of under-procurement and over-procurement, recognising inherent uncertainties in delivery. We intend to manage delivery risks through conditions and deliverability requirements. The resulting portfolio is therefore expected to deliver sufficient capacity even if some projects do not proceed, while maintaining value for consumers.

We recognise the importance of maintaining a pipeline of projects and we are keen to see the continuing development of new and emerging technologies. Further application windows are expected, subject to consultation in 2026 and a decision on a second window by 2027. Future windows will be informed by the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan and will consider potential improvements to regime and assessment processes.

We invite feedback on our minded-to decisions. Consultation will close on 07 August 2026. We will review responses, including any evidence of methodological issues, errors or inconsistencies, before finalising our decisions. Final cap and floor awards are expected to be published in Autumn 2026, alongside any associated delivery requirements and conditions to be reflected in our regulatory framework.

1. Introduction

1.1 This consultation seeks views on Ofgem's minded-to decisions on the outcome of the Project Assessment for Window 1 of the Long Duration Electricity Storage (LDES) cap and floor regime. Window 1 represents the first application window of the regime and has involved assessment of a large and diverse group of projects.

1.2 77 projects were deemed eligible for the LDES cap and floor regime, as set out in our Eligibility Assessment Outcome published in September 2025. Four projects withdrew from the process before the Project Assessment commenced. This consultation therefore relates to the assessment of the remaining 73 projects.

1.3 This document sets out how the Project Assessment has been undertaken across these projects and the basis on which the decisions set out in this consultation have been reached. The assessment has been conducted in line with previous Ofgem publications, except where amendments have been set out within this document.

1.4 Where judgement has been exercised, including in combining assessment outputs and making portfolio-level decisions, this has been undertaken within the scope of the discretion set out in the Multi-Criteria Assessment (MCA) Framework. This consultation seeks views on both the application of that framework and the reasonableness of the judgements set out in this document.

1.5 We draw on two subsidiary documents produced by the National Energy System Operator (NESO) as part of our Project Assessment, which accompany this consultation:

- The *LDES: Final Methodology* sets out the modelling approaches used for system benefits (the "System Benefit Modelling") and security of supply (the "Security of Supply Modelling").
- The *LDES: Response to DESNZ Request for Advice. Q3 (Part 2)* (the "Capacity Advice") sets out advice on the level of capacity required by the electricity system.

1.6 These documents serve distinct purposes and are based on different assumptions. They should therefore be read separately, although we consider them together where relevant in this consultation.

1.7 This document is accompanied by a subsidiary document setting out our assessment of impacts, and by a set of appendices providing further detail on: project inputs to the assessment; detailed breakdowns of project results; summaries of individual projects' assessment outcomes; the impacts of our

proposed portfolio; and abbreviations used in this consultation. Stakeholders are encouraged to consider these when responding to this consultation.

1.8 In undertaking the Project Assessment, we have drawn on modelling and analytical outputs from NESO, alongside input from external advisers. These inputs have supported the development and application of the assessment methodologies and the interpretation of evidence. Ofgem retains responsibility for all judgements and decisions set out in this document.

1.9 This document should be read alongside the following publications:

- LDES Window 1 – Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework (September 2025)
- Decision on the project assessment framework for Window 1 LDES cap and floor regime (September 2025)
- NESO Assessment Methodology for System and Welfare Impacts (September 2025)
- LDES Cost Assessment Guidance (September 2025)
- LDES Financial Framework Decision (September 2025)
- LDES Eligibility Assessment Outcome (September 2025)
- LDES Technical Decision Document (March 2025)
- Long duration electricity storage: proposals to enable investment (October 2024)

1.10 We have included additional links where relevant throughout this document.

Questions

1.11 We welcome views on our minded-to decisions and the reasoning set out in this document. This consultation seeks your views on whether the approach, methodology and evidence have been applied appropriately, including the proportionate, fair and consistent use of submitted evidence and standardised assumptions in reaching these decisions.

1.12 In particular, we welcome views on the following questions:

Question 1: Do you agree with the minded-to decisions set out in this consultation?

Question 2: Do you agree with our minded-to capacity decision for Window 1?

Question 3: Do you agree with our minded-to decisions on Regime Requests?

Question 4: Do you agree with opening further application windows?

1.13 Our minded-to decisions are made with reference to the information available at the time of publication. To ensure fairness, consistency and comparability across projects, we do not intend to take account of new or materially revised project-

specific information submitted after that point, nor do we generally intend to re-run the Project Assessment on the basis of updated project data.

1.14 However, we will consider consultation responses carefully before reaching a final decision. In particular, we will consider whether any representation identifies a material methodological issue, evidential error, inconsistency in the application of the assessment framework, or other relevant matter that may justify further analysis, correction or adjustment before final decisions are made.

Timeframes

1. Stage 1 Consultation open: 26 June 2026
2. Stage 2 Consultation closes. Deadline for responses: 07 August 2026
3. Stage 3 Responses reviewed and Final decision published: Autumn 2026

How to respond

1.15 Complete our online consultation by 07 August 2026. If you have any questions, email ldes@ofgem.gov.uk.

1.16 We will publish non-confidential responses, but we will not publish responses from individuals. If any of your responses contain confidential information, please use the text box in the consultation to clearly explain which parts of your response you wish to be kept confidential. We will publish your name as part of the response unless you tell us not to.

Tracking progress

1. Click on this link
2. Then enter required information, including email address and click 'Confirm your subscription'
3. You will receive an email to notify you when it has changed status.

Confidentiality

You may request that your response, or parts of it, are treated as confidential. We will respect such requests, subject to any legal or regulatory obligations to disclose information. These may include obligations under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, statutory directions, court orders, or other applicable regulations. Where relevant, we may also disclose information with your explicit consent. If you wish to keep your response confidential, you should clearly state this and provide reasons.

If only part of your response is confidential, you should clearly identify the sections concerned and provide the confidential material in a separate appendix. Where necessary, we may contact you to clarify how your information should be treated, including requesting further justification for confidentiality.

Where responses contain personal data as defined under the UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR), the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority will act as the data controller. Information provided will be used in accordance with Ofgem's statutory functions and section 105 of the Utilities Act 2000. Further information is set out in the Privacy policy on consultations (Appendix 8).

Where a response is submitted confidentially, we will not publish the respondent's name or the content of the response. We may publish the number of confidential responses received. Where responses are summarised, they will not be attributed to individual respondents, and each response will be considered on its own merits.

2. Minded-to decisions

This section sets out our minded-to decisions. These are informed by the evidence gathered through the assessment process and reflect our current view on a pathway to delivering capacity aligned with system need. It explains how the assessments have informed these positions and that final cap and floor awards will be conditional on projects meeting post-award requirements.

Consultation questions in this section

Q1. Do you agree with the minded-to decisions set out in this consultation?

2.1 The minded-to decisions set out a pathway to delivering long-duration electricity storage capacity aligned with system need. It comprises 16 projects delivering 7,645 MW, the upper end of the range set out in the Capacity Advice. In our judgement, this level provides appropriate headroom for reasonable attrition risk while maintaining a credible prospect of delivery within the relevant timeframes.

2.2 The resulting portfolio of projects has a strong representation of higher-duration assets, consistent with overall policy objectives and the Capacity Advice which also indicates a preference for deployment of long-duration and higher-capacity technologies. It also includes a mix of technologies and geographic spread, which in our view supports flexibility and resilience across the system.

2.3 Our minded-to decisions are informed by the Economic, Financial and Strategic Assessments, drawing on outputs from the Cost Assessment and modelling analysis. No single assessment or metric has determined the outcome. Rather, we have considered the relative performance of individual projects alongside the composition of the portfolio as a whole, including overall value for money, deliverability, consumer risk, and the balance of technology and location.

2.4 The Economic Assessment forms the starting baseline for our decision-making. It provides a ranking of the highest performing projects, in terms of their relative socio-economic welfare benefits against the relevant counterfactual and reflecting a combined view of both monetised (including a cost benefit assessment) and non-monetised impacts, such as security of supply and system operability.

2.5 We have overlaid the Financial and Strategic Assessments to determine whether the Economic Assessment ranking should be adjusted. Projects with materially elevated risk profiles or sensitivities have been adjusted as part of this process, while some more marginal cases have been retained where the risks are judged to be proportionate in light of the expected benefits.

2.6 As part of this overlay, we have considered deliverability risks. However, we do not consider that the evidence we have reviewed justifies excluding projects solely based on their deliverability, where a credible pathway remains open. In reaching this view, we have considered that delivery risk may be managed through conditions that may be attached to any award and that to exclude such projects now would risk deprioritising projects that otherwise perform strongly overall.

2.7 These decisions have been reached in accordance with our published decisions and methodology, including the MCA Framework. A limited number of amendments to the methodology have been made and are explained within this document, in line with our discretion to make amendments to methodology and process where necessary to address material deficiencies in assessment inputs and outputs.

2.8 In making these minded-to decisions, we have complied with our relevant statutory duties, had regard to the relevant considerations identified in previous publications and considered the relevant and available evidence. Where judgement has been required, due to the forward-looking and evaluative nature of the Project Assessment, it has been exercised proportionately, consistently and for the reasons set out in this document.

2.9 Final awards will be made following consideration of comments received through consultation. These awards will be conditional on meeting delivery requirements. Projects will be required to continue to make sufficient progress, demonstrate ongoing viability, and may be subject to time-bound milestones designed to ensure timely and credible progression to delivery.

2.10 Such conditions may include, but are not limited to, requirements relating to deliverability and project progress, evidence of financeability and commitment, regulatory compliance, the securing of necessary consents, and compliance with applicable design requirements. Ofgem will monitor compliance with any such conditions and may withdraw cap and floor support where they are not met.

2.11 Table 1 below sets out the portfolio of projects that following our Project Assessment we are minded-to decide should receive cap and floor support.

Minded-to decisions

Table 1: Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Name	Technology	Region	MW	Duration
Loch Kemp Storage	PSH	N_Scotland	660	22.3
Coire Glas	PSH	N_Scotland	1440	32
TeesCAES	CAES	NE_England	50	30
Earba PSH	PSH	N_Scotland	1800	15
Field Netherton	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	16.3
Field New Deer	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	18.03
Field Rigifa	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	18.03
Field Fyrish	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	16.5
Field Long Stratton	Li-ion BESS	E_England	400	16.05
East Claydon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	12
Ocker Hill BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	145	8
Sundon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	8
Drakelow (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	385	8.7
Frontier Legacy	VFB/Zn	N_Wales	65	8
Springwell	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	400	11.1
Thornton BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	100	11.11

3. Project Assessment process

This section explains the overall structure of the Project Assessment. It summarises the objective of the assessment, the key inputs used, the main assessment components, and the overall approach to decision-making. Further detail on the methodology, outputs and any minded-to decisions are set out in the relevant sections of this document.

Objective of the Project Assessment

3.1 The objective of the Project Assessment is to identify which projects should receive cap and floor support, in a way that protects the interests of existing and future consumers. While the assessment draws on structured analytical outputs, it also requires judgement about how to weigh the benefits, risks and uncertainties associated with different projects, and how those projects work together as a portfolio.

Inputs to the Project Assessment

3.2 Information used in the assessment was drawn from project submissions, through the Data Submission Form (DSF), and from external sources. The DSFs and requirements for supplementary information were published on 23 September 2025. Completed DSFs and supporting information were required to be submitted by 18 November 2025.

3.3 A Supplementary Questions (SQ) process was undertaken to clarify information provided. It did not provide an opportunity for projects to submit new information after the deadline. Updated DSFs reflecting this clarification process were shared with projects on 10 December 2025 to confirm accuracy.

3.4 Any adjustments to submitted data are explained in the relevant sections of this document.

Components of the Project Assessment

3.5 The Project Assessment has been undertaken across three main components: Economic Assessment, Financial Assessment and Strategic Assessment. These components draw on project-submitted data, the Cost Assessment outputs and System Benefit Modelling.

3.6 The Cost Assessment reviews project-submitted costs to determine the inputs used across the assessment. This includes assessing whether costs should be used as provided, standardised, adjusted or excluded to ensure consistency and

comparability. The resulting outputs are used across the Economic, Financial and Strategic Assessments. Further detail is set out in Section 4.

3.7 The Economic Assessment considers both monetised and non-monetised impacts. Monetised impacts are derived from system modelling outputs and compared against project costs, while non-monetised impacts capture wider system outcomes. These outputs are combined using a structured approach to support comparison across projects. Further detail is set out in Section 5.

3.8 The Financial Assessment compares expected project revenues against cap and floor levels to assess the extent of potential consumer support and relative exposure to floor payments over the regime term. Further detail is set out in Section 6.

3.9 The Strategic Assessment considers factors not fully captured elsewhere, including scenario sensitivity, deliverability and portfolio composition. This supports assessment of project credibility and performance across different system conditions. Further detail is set out in Section 7.

Project Assessment – minded-to decisions

3.10 Across all components, we have sought to ensure that inputs are treated on a consistent and comparable basis. This includes project-submitted cost, technical and modelling inputs, as well as standardisation of key assumptions. These approaches have been applied across projects or groups of projects and are reflected in the outputs of each assessment.

3.11 The Project Assessment has been undertaken in line with the published MCA Framework. As set out in that document, we retained discretion to make targeted amendments to the process or methodology where necessary in light of the evidence available, including to address material issues of data quality, modelling or comparability. Any material amendments are identified and explained in the relevant sections of this document.

3.12 The outputs of each component of the Project Assessment have been considered together as part of our decision-making. No single metric, score or threshold has been applied in isolation. Instead, indicators and benchmarks are used to inform comparison, with outcomes assessed alongside the overall composition of the portfolio. The MCA Framework does not apply a mechanistic rule for combining the components of the Project Assessment but supports the use of structured judgement in bringing them together.

3.13 In applying this approach, we have:

- treated the Economic Assessment ranking as a starting point for informing our decision-making;
- considered Financial Assessment results where evidence indicates materially elevated consumer exposure risk;
- assessed Strategic Assessment results (including scenarios, deliverability, and diversity) where risks or benefits are not captured elsewhere;
- exercised judgement where there is divergence between these components, giving greater weight to factors that are material to consumer protection; and
- considered the appropriate level of capacity for Window 1 in line with the Capacity Advice and taking into account possible attrition.

3.14 The detailed sections that follow should therefore be read as evidence supporting the decisions set out in this consultation, rather than as standalone outcomes. These decisions reflect the outcome of this integrated assessment process, based on the evidence available at the time of assessment. Taken together, this approach ensures a consistent, evidence-based and proportionate assessment of projects against the objectives and policy intent of the regime.

3.15 Each assessment section concludes with a table showing how the project order develops through the Project Assessment. The Economic Assessment ranking is used as the starting point. Where a project's position in that order changes as a result of Financial Assessment or Strategic Assessment outputs, this is referred to as an "adjustment".

- Table 2 (Section 5) presents the Economic Assessment ranking.
- Table 3 (Section 6) presents the ranking after any adjustments informed by the Financial Assessment.
- Table 4 (Section 7) presents the ranking after any further adjustments informed by the Strategic Assessment.
- Table 5 (Section 8) presents our proposed minded-to decisions for individual projects, reflecting all adjustments and the minded-to decision on capacity for Window 1.

3.16 In the tables referenced above, and in the appendices to this document, results are generally shown to two decimal places for relative comparison only. This does not imply additional precision or certainty in results.

4. Cost Assessment

This section explains how we undertook our Cost Assessment. It ensures that project costs were treated on a fair, consistent and comparable basis across the Project Assessment. Using benchmarking, cohort comparison and expert review, we derived the cost inputs used across the Project Assessment.

Objective of the cost assessment

4.1 The Cost Assessment was undertaken to determine project costs in a fair, consistent and credible basis. The assessment considered critical cost line items, treatment of optimism and cost saving opportunities, contingency assumptions, cost estimate class and associated uncertainty, and wider assumptions such as foreign exchange rates. We also checked submissions for errors and removed unsupported savings where appropriate.

4.2 Section 4.2 of the Cost Assessment Guidance describes the Project Assessment Update process. We previously intended to undertake further cost assessment following our minded-to decisions – we now expect to undertake this process in line with the delivery requirements following our final cap and floor regime award in Autumn 2026. This will allow us to use more mature project data to set the relevant values in the Facility-Specific Parameter Register for the project.

Approach to the cost assessment and evidence use

4.3 Projects were grouped into five technically distinct categories and assessed through three broader Technology Groups: conventional lithium-ion batteries, novel batteries, and turbine technologies. Projects were reviewed on a like-for-like basis within these groups, with moderation applied within and across groups to support consistency.

4.4 The Cost Assessment required the interpretation of project-submitted data, supported by evidence such as supplier quotes, third-party reports and quantitative cost and schedule risk assessments where provided. This approach supports fair and comparable treatment of costs across all projects and addresses differences in submitted costs and assumptions.

4.5 This comparative Cost Assessment gave us sufficient confidence to rank projects to make minded-to decisions. However, it does not constitute and endorsement of any individual projects' costs, scope of works, or maturity or a guarantee that any of these costs will be determined to represent good value for money at the

Post Construction Review and/or any earlier stage of the Cost Assessment process such as that described in paragraph 4.2.

4.6 The Cost Assessment used benchmarking, cohort comparison and expert review. External benchmarks were used where available, and cohort comparison was used where sufficient comparable project data existed, with input from subject matter experts where necessary. Where information was incomplete or unclear, the SQ process was used to clarify information already submitted.

Treatment of uncertainty

4.7 The assessment considered projects' submitted P50 cost estimates and reviewed the treatment of uncertainty in P10 and P90 scenarios. Where contingency provisions were assessed as excessive or insufficient, adjustments were made as appropriate. We did not adjust P90 costs upwards, consistent with the Cost Assessment Guidance that these values would form the Project Cost Ceiling (PCC), and if a project's costs were to exceed the PCC, we would expect to set cap and floor values based on the PCC. In some cases P90 costs were reduced where they covered risks beyond the intended scope of our pessimistic cost scenario, as we would not expect Consumers to be exposed to these costs in those circumstances.

4.8 Many projects used different assumptions when converting costs to GBP. This meant that projects using more optimistic exchange rate assumptions could appear more competitive for reasons unrelated to their underlying costs. To ensure comparability, we standardised costs with foreign exchange exposure by applying exchange rates as of 18 November 2025, the Project Assessment submission deadline. We also reviewed supplier quotes and bid validity, adjusting costs where necessary to ensure consistent treatment across all projects.

Outputs from the cost assessment

4.9 The Cost Assessment produced eight Cost Assessment Outputs, as defined in the Cost Assessment Guidance: Development Expenditure (Devex), Capital Expenditure (Capex), Operating Expenditure (Opex), Replacement / Renewal Expenditure) Repex, Decommissioning Expenditure (Decommex), Pass Through Costs, and Project Maturity (Maturity).

4.10 We identified different approaches to Decommex cost estimation across projects in the Conventional Battery and Novel Battery Technology Groups. Although projects provided supporting explanations for their submitted values, the assumptions underpinning those values were not consistently comparable across projects and were subject to significant uncertainty.

4.11 To avoid differences in assumptions or presentation affecting the assessment, we applied a standard benchmarked Decommex value to projects in the Conventional Battery and Novel Battery Technology Groups. These benchmarks were developed using the evidence available from project submissions, supported by expert review. We considered the range of submitted values, the explanation and evidence provided by projects, and whether the resulting value was reasonable when applied across comparable projects. We then applied the benchmark consistently within the relevant Technology Groups, rather than accepting divergent project-specific assumptions that could not be tested on a consistent basis.

4.12 The benchmarks were expressed as a function of installed capacity because, for these Technology Groups, we considered this to provide a proportionate and comparable basis for Project Assessment. This approach was used for the purposes of the Cost Assessment Outputs and the Project Assessment. It does not represent a final determination of each project's efficient decommissioning costs.

5. Economic Assessment

This section explains the Economic Assessment. It compares costs and benefits across projects, using monetised impacts to inform an initial ranking and non-monetised impacts to refine that ranking. The Economic Assessment ranking serves as the starting point for our decision-making.

Economic Assessment process

5.1 The Economic Assessment process comprises three main elements:

- Monetised impacts demonstrate system value, with benefits quantified using system modelling outputs and assessed relative to project costs on a present-value basis.
- Non-monetised impacts capture critical system outcomes not reflected in monetary terms, including security of supply[1] and system operability. These are assessed through structured scoring frameworks and combined with monetised impacts to incorporate wider system and policy benefits into the Economic Assessment.
- A weighting approach combines monetised and non-monetised results (see Economic Assessment ranking) to produce an overall Economic Assessment score and ranking. This ensures the assessment reflects both economic efficiency and wider system value, while supporting robust comparison across projects.

Economic Assessment inputs

Inputs from modelling

5.2 NESO was commissioned to quantify the system impacts of LDES projects through System Benefit and Security of Supply Modelling. NESO published its proposed methodology in September 2025 and subsequently finalised the methodology applied in this assessment. While the core assessment approach and principles remain consistent with the September 2025 publication, the final methodology incorporates additional detail and implementation refinements. The final methodology is published alongside this consultation.

[1] In the MCA Framework, security of supply was originally included as a monetised impact. It is now being considered as a non-monetised impact with detail set out in the "Amendment from the MCA Framework" part of this section.

5.3 System Benefit Modelling estimates the incremental impact of each project on the electricity system relative to a counterfactual without that project. These outputs are used to support comparison and ranking of monetised impacts and to inform the overall Economic Assessment score and ranking.

5.4 Security of Supply Modelling uses NESO's resource adequacy methodology to assess whether the electricity system is able to meet demand under a wide range of future conditions. These outputs were used as an input to the non-monetised security of supply component and to the overall Economic Assessment score and ranking.

Inputs from projects

5.5 Projects submitted a range of evidence used within the Economic Assessment through Data Submission Forms.[2] In some instances, particularly for inputs used for modelling, project submitted data was refined or derived to support comparability across projects. This included standardising key inputs where submitted values were not directly comparable or were assessed as not credible. These approaches were applied across projects or groups of projects.

5.6 The following examples illustrate how key inputs were refined or standardised using project-submitted data:

- **Energy capacity (MWh)** inputs used within the System Benefit Modelling were calculated using each project's continuous discharge capacity, discharge duration and efficiency assumptions (subject to any caps imposed, as described below), to reflect the storage capability committed by each project. These parameters determine the extent to which a project can discharge at rated power over the required duration. For the purposes of the assessment, energy capacity was treated as a fixed project characteristic over the asset life. Minimum and maximum state of charge assumptions were also standardised, so that submitted energy capacity values were assessed on a comparable basis.

- **Round-trip efficiency (RTE)** inputs were also reviewed and refined. As part of this, our technical specialists and advisors identified some project-submitted values which were not credible for the relevant technology, significantly exceeding those of any known project currently in operation. Where this was the case, values were capped based on specialist engineering advice and a review of known best-in-class assets. This included, for Li-ion BESS projects, capping RTE values at 91% where higher values had been submitted.

[2] Key project inputs can be found in Appendix 1 (Table 6).

Inputs from our Cost Assessment

5.7 Costs used in the Economic Assessment to normalise project scores were taken from project submissions through the Data Submission Form (DSF) and then adjusted through the Cost Assessment process. This process determines whether submitted costs are used as provided, standardised, adjusted or excluded.

Monetised impacts

5.8 Monetised impacts demonstrate system value, with benefits quantified using system modelling outputs and assessed relative to project costs on a present-value basis. These are brought together through the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR), calculated as follows.

$$BCR = PV(Benefits) \div PV(Costs)$$

Benefits

5.9 The Economic Assessment monetises project impacts where it is practical to do so. The modelling estimates the net socio-economic welfare delivered by each project by comparing system costs with and without the project on a present-value basis. For each impact, the monetised value reflects the change in system costs after the projects is included, and the results are aggregated to estimate each project's overall contribution to socio-economic welfare (SEW).

5.10 The following metrics from the System Benefit Modelling were used to produce the monetised outputs.[3] A full description of each metric is given in the updated NESO methodology published alongside this consultation:

NESO system benefit modelling metric
Wholesale Market Costs
CfD Costs ***Note**. The same CfD cost metric is used in two components of the monetised benefits, but with opposite signs. For consumers it is treated as a cost, while for producers it is treated as revenue.*
Wholesale Market Net Revenue - Producers

[3] All components are derived from the System Benefit Modelling GB-focused Day Ahead model, with the exception of CfD Costs for consumers and associated revenues for CfD-supported generation, which originate from the Balancing Mechanism model. These are included in the total welfare calculation for completeness but do not influence relative project rankings, as CfD payments represent a transfer between Consumers and producers and therefore net out in the calculation of total benefits.

Wholesale Market Net Revenue - Storage
Interconnector Congestion Rent
Wholesale market temporal arbitrage (initial commitment)
Unpriced Carbon Externality Cost

5.11 For each component, annual values are aggregated and then converted to present value using a discount rate consistent with Green Book guidance.

5.12 The monetised impact outputs are then combined as follows:

Consumer SEW = Reduction in Wholesale Market Costs and CfD Costs

Producer SEW = Wholesale Market Net Revenue (Producers) + Wholesale Market Net Revenue (Storage) + Interconnector Congestion Rent + CfD Revenues

LDES Owner SEW = Wholesale market temporal arbitrage (initial commitment)

Carbon Externality Reduction = Reduction in Unpriced Carbon Externality Cost

5.13 These components form the total benefits that is used as the numerator of the BCR:

Total benefits = Consumer SEW + Producer SEW + LDES Owner SEW + Carbon Externality Reduction

Project costs

5.14 The present value of project costs forms the denominator of the BCR and is the combination of costs derived from our Cost Assessment process and a terminal value.

5.15 The costs included are Devex, Capex, Opex and Repex. These costs are profiled over the 25-year appraisal period, in line with project submissions. Decommissioning costs were excluded as they are expected to be incurred beyond the end of the 25-year appraisal period. TNUoS and business rates were excluded as they represent transfers rather than true economic costs.

5.16 In line with the MCA Framework, a terminal value is included to reflect the continuation of project benefits beyond this period. This recognises that, for some technologies, capital investment made during the 25-years is expected to support operation beyond that time horizon.

5.17 We have applied standardised and technology-specific economic life assumptions based on project submissions and specialist advice. These assumptions reflect the point at which a project would be expected to require significant further capital investment to continue operating.

5.18 The assumed economic life for each technology type is as follows:

Technology	**Assumed economic life**
Lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (Li-ion BESS)	25 years
Pumped Storage Hydro (PSH)	40 years
Vanadium Flow Battery (VFB)	30 years
Vanadium Flow/Zinc Battery (VFB/Zn)	30 years
Liquid Air Energy Storage / Battery Energy Storage System Hybrid (LAES/BESS)	25 years
Compressed Air Energy Storage (CAES)	25 years

5.19 The terminal value is calculated as a proportion of each project's Capex (including Repex), equivalent to the remaining useful economic life after the 25-year horizon and is added in the final year.

Non-monetised impacts

5.20 Non-monetised impacts capture critical system outcomes not easily monetised and not already reflected in the monetised impacts. These non-monetised impacts were assessed alongside monetised impacts to provide a fuller view of project performance. These impacts were combined with monetised impacts, using the approach described in paragraph 5.55, to reflect wider system and policy benefits. Where possible, they were quantified using modelling or data-driven approaches; otherwise, they were assessed using structured scoring frameworks or qualitative evidence.

5.21 The non-monetised outputs are:

- **Security of Supply**: Contribution to system reliability
- **Avoided Renewable Curtailment**: Reduction in curtailed renewable generation
- **System Operability**: Ability to support secure and stable system operation
- **Wider Economic and Social Impacts**: Benefits beyond the electricity system
- **Real-time Flexibility**: Ability to respond to system imbalances and price signals

- **Option Value**: Potential for future benefits.

5.22 The **Security of Supply** assessment considers the contribution of each project to system adequacy, focussing on the extent to which a project reduces the expected shortfall between electricity supply and demand under system stress conditions. Projects were assessed taking account of key technical characteristics, including discharge capacity, duration and efficiency.

5.23 The assessment was based on Security of Supply Modelling using a resource adequacy methodology. The primary metric used is Expected Energy Unserved (EEU), which measures the expected volume of unmet demand across a range of simulated conditions. EEU is a probabilistic, forward-looking measure derived across multiple weather years and outage scenarios.

5.24 Projects were grouped for modelling based on characteristics such as storage duration, technology type and efficiency. Where relevant, assumptions were standardised across projects, and certain technologies were modelled separately where required.

5.25 Security of supply was assessed using a marginal additional approach, comparing system outcomes with and without additional capacity. Modelling was undertaken for a defined set of years, with results interpolated or applied where direct modelling outputs are not available.

5.26 Modelling outputs were converted to present value and normalised by discharge capacity of the project to enable comparison across projects. Results vary across projects, primarily reflecting differences in storage duration and discharge capability. Projects with longer duration generally deliver stronger security of supply outcomes.

5.27 The **Avoided Renewable Curtailment (ARC)** assessment considers the change in curtailed renewable generation associated with each project. It measures the difference in the volume of renewable generation constrained off when the project is included, relative to a project-specific counterfactual.

5.28 ARC was used as a proxy for potential wider consumer benefits that are not assessed elsewhere. For example, avoided curtailment could reduce the strike prices that renewables projects need to bid in CfD auctions to achieve their target hurdle rate, or the amount of renewable capacity needed to meet decarbonisation targets.

5.29 ARC was derived from the System Benefit Modelling using the GB-focused Day Ahead model and was calculated as the change in curtailment over the appraisal

period, expressed in present value terms. To support comparison across projects of different sizes, ARC is normalised by discharge capacity.

5.30 Results show variation across projects, reflecting differences in how projects interact with system constraints and absorb excess renewable generation, which depend on both project characteristics and system conditions.

5.31 The **System Operability** assessment considers the contribution of each project to the secure and efficient operation of the electricity system, beyond the elements that are already assessed as part of the monetised and Security of Supply assessments. It focuses on the extent to which projects can provide services that support system stability alongside their core storage function.

5.32 The assessment was based on a structured scoring methodology developed in collaboration with technical specialists and advisors, including NESO. Projects were assessed across a defined set of operability services: frequency response and reserve, stability, voltage control and restoration. For each service, projects were assessed across four dimensions:

- Capability: whether the project can provide the service
- Availability: how often the project is available to provide the service
- Quantity: how much of the service the project can provide, and
- Location: whether the project is located in an area of particular need for this service.

5.33 Inputs were standardised where necessary. Where submitted data was not directly comparable across projects, for example because projects had used different assumptions or interpreted questions differently, we used proxy metrics or estimates derived by technical specialists and advisors in place of the submitted figures.

5.34 For the locational assessment, scoring was informed by Annex 3 of NESO's Clean Power 2030 Operability and Operations Analysis, which sets out expected regional needs for services such as short circuit level and voltage support.

5.35 For each service, a raw project score was first calculated by multiplying the project's capability, availability, quantity and, where relevant, location scores. That raw score was then normalised by cost, to support comparison across projects of different sizes.

5.36 For each service, these cost-normalised scores were combined using the weights assigned to each service to produce an overall system operability score for each project. The weights reflect the relative importance of each service to system

operability, the extent to which assets are expected to be competitive in providing it, and uncertainty in the assessment.

5.37 The results indicate that Li-ion BESS and PSH projects are more frequently represented among higher-scoring projects, reflecting their stronger overall contribution across the assessed operability services.

5.38 The **Wider Economic and Social Impacts** (WESI) assessment considers impacts not captured in monetised or other non-monetised metrics, including effects on local communities, the UK economy and the energy sector. It focuses on identifying whether there is robust, project-specific evidence of materially different impacts across projects.

5.39 The assessment was based on a structured qualitative framework using evidence submitted through Data Submission Forms and supporting material. The assessment considered five categories of potential benefit: environmental enhancements; community benefits delivered through project activity; skills development and training; contributions to domestic supply chains and labour markets; and research, development and export potential.

5.40 Projects were scored against each criterion on a three-point scale (0 / + / ++), based on the strength of evidence provided. This reflects both:

- the credibility of the evidence (for example, whether benefits are supported by clear plans, analysis or delivery mechanisms), and
- the extent to which impacts are material and project-specific, rather than generic or assumed.

5.41 Scores were combined using a weighted approach to produce an overall WESI score. Weighting reflects:

- the relevance of each category to wider policy objectives;
- the robustness of the available evidence; and
- the degree to which impacts differ meaningfully across projects.

5.42 Impacts that represented transfers or are captured elsewhere in the assessment were excluded.

5.43 Results show variation across projects, primarily reflecting differences in the strength of evidence provided. Some technologies, particularly those that are less established, more frequently demonstrate stronger WESI performance. This

reflects evidence of potential innovation benefits, knowledge spillovers and contributions to domestic supply chains.

5.44 The **Real-time Flexibility** assessment considers whether projects provide additional flexibility benefits to the system not captured in modelling or elsewhere in the assessment, including their ability to respond to short-term system conditions through intra-day and balancing mechanism activity. It assesses whether there is robust evidence of material differences between projects to support relative comparison in the Economic Assessment.

5.45 A qualitative assessment of the evidence submitted by developers was undertaken to identify whether project characteristics could lead to material differences in real-time flexibility. Factors considered included duration, efficiency, co-location and short-term power capability.

5.46 Duration, efficiency and co-location were not used to differentiate projects, as the evidence did not demonstrate material or consistent differences. Short-term power capability above continuous capacity was identified as the only differentiating factor between projects that could bring additional flexibility benefits to the system, beyond those captured elsewhere in the assessment. Projects were assessed on whether this capability could be sustained over a defined short-term duration, with greater weight applied to discharge capability.

5.47 Only a small subset of projects demonstrated sustained short-term power capability above continuous capacity and therefore received a positive score. All remaining projects were assigned a neutral outcome.

5.48 The **Option Value** assessment considers the extent to which Projects may provide additional future benefits, for example by enabling expansion or adaptation over time.

5.49 Given the inherent uncertainty in future developments, Option Value was assessed qualitatively on a comparative basis, focusing on whether there was credible evidence that some projects are better placed than others to provide future optionality.

5.50 Projects were assessed using a structured, positive-only scoring framework based on evidence submitted through Data Submission Forms and supporting materials. Outcomes were assigned as follows:

- 0: no evidence of expansion potential, or none identified
- +: expansion potential identified, but with limited supporting evidence
- ++: expansion potential identified and supported by more developed evidence (for example, on costs, land availability or delivery considerations)

5.51 These scores reflect the strength and completeness of the evidence provided, rather than the value of expansion potential itself. No additional adjustments were made based on technology-specific assumptions in the absence of supporting project-level evidence.

5.52 Results show a range of outcomes across projects. Many projects identify some expansion potential but provided limited supporting evidence, while a smaller subset provided more developed and credible evidence of how expansion could be delivered.

5.53 Differences in outcomes also reflect underlying technology characteristics. In particular, modular technologies (such as Li-ion BESS) more frequently demonstrate expansion potential.

Outputs from the Non-Monetised Impacts assessments

5.54 Results for non-monetised impacts are intended to support comparison across projects and should be considered alongside the monetised assessment and other non-monetised impacts as part of the overall Economic Assessment. No single non-monetised impact is determinative in isolation.

Economic Assessment ranking

5.55 The Economic Assessment combines the monetised assessment with the six non-monetised components to produce a final ranking. This was undertaken using a swing weighting approach. Swing weighting allows the relative importance of each component to be determined by considering three factors:

- a priori importance of the metric in achieving the objectives of the regime;
- certainty of the assessment, based on available evidence; and
- materiality of differences between projects.

5.56 To combine scores across all monetised and non-monetised impacts, the approach involved rescaling the scores for each impact, so that the scores for all metrics were measured on a common scale. We did this by assigning a score of 0 to the lowest scoring project and a score of 100 to the highest scoring project for each metric individually. The scores for all other projects were determined based on their position relative to the lowest and highest scores. These rescaled scores are presented in Table 9.

5.57 The components were then comparatively assessed, and relative weights were assigned based on their importance against the factors above. These weightings were based on structured judgement, informed by the evidence across the

assessment, rather than through a mechanistic calculation.[4] They were then applied to derive an overall Economic Assessment ranking.

Type	**Metric**	**Weighting**
Monetised	Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)	40%
Non-monetised	Security of Supply (SoS)	19%
Non-monetised	Avoided Renewable Curtailment (ARC)	15%
Non-monetised	System Operability (SO)	12%
Non-monetised	Wider Social and Economic Impacts (WESI)	8%
Non-monetised	Real-time Flexibility (RTF)	4%
Non-monetised	Option Value (OV)	1%

5.58 The BCR was treated as the most important component within the Economic Assessment. The BCR provides a measure of net economic value by comparing system-wide benefits to project costs. It was given greater weight as it directly reflects overall value for money to consumers and captures material differences in performance across projects.

5.59 Weights for non-monetised components were set relative to the BCR. Components that are central to the assessment framework and demonstrate clear differentiation across projects were assigned higher relative weights. For example, security of supply was assigned a relatively high weighting reflecting its importance to system resilience, strong alignment with the rationale for intervention, and the fact that it is not fully captured elsewhere in the assessment. It also demonstrates clear differentiation between projects and was supported by relatively robust modelling outputs.

5.60 By contrast, components where evidence is more limited, or where differences between projects are less pronounced, were assigned lower weights. For example, real-time flexibility was assigned a lower weighting reflecting the narrow scope of the assessment and the fact that only a subset of projects demonstrated

[4] The percentages sum to 100% but do not in the table due to rounding to zero decimal places.

material differences, while option value from expansion was given a low weighting given its more speculative nature and lower certainty in the evidence base.

Amendments from the MCA Framework

5.61 A limited number of amendments from the MCA Framework have been made within the Economic Assessment. These are set out below, together with the reasons for them.

5.62 **Use of GB-focussed Day Ahead model outputs and exclusion of Balancing Mechanism model outputs:** NESO's GB-focussed Day Ahead model outputs have been used for the purpose of the Economic Assessment, as they provide a stable and project-sensitive basis for assessing GB system and welfare impacts.

5.63 NESO's published methodology (September 2025) set out a sequential modelling approach incorporating both Day Ahead and Balancing Mechanism models. Under this framework, outputs from both models were intended to inform the Economic Assessment.

5.64 During the course of Project Assessment, NESO identified that the Balancing Mechanism model exhibited residual optimisation degeneracy. This means that, in some cases, the model could select between multiple technically valid optimisation outcomes with very similar overall system costs. This could result in variation in certain Balancing Mechanism model-derived outputs that was not necessarily driven by underlying differences in project characteristics and therefore reducing their suitability for ranking projects.

5.65 As a result, we decided to exclude Balancing Mechanism model-derived outputs for the purpose of project ranking within the Economic Assessment and instead rely on outputs from the GB-focussed Day Ahead model, which NESO considered a sufficiently robust, stable and project-sensitive basis for the Economic Assessment undertaken in this window.

5.66 To note, Balancing Mechanism model outputs remained suitable for use within the Financial Assessment, as NESO's review did not identify any material degeneracy impact associated with their use for this purpose.

5.67 **Treatment of Security of Supply**: Security of Supply has been treated as a non-monetised impact. The MCA Framework proposed monetising this impact by multiplying Expected Energy Unserved (EEU) by an assumed Value of Lost Load (VoLL). However, further consideration of how security of supply impacts are modelled has led to a change in approach.

5.68 Unlike other monetised welfare impacts, which are derived from the System Benefit Modelling using FES pathways, security of supply is estimated using a

separate resource adequacy model with a different reference scenario. This scenario is not directly comparable to the counterfactuals used elsewhere in the Economic Assessment and, therefore, the modelling outputs from System Benefit Modelling and Security of Supply Modelling are not directly comparable and cannot be simply added together.

5.69 Security of supply is now assessed using the EEU metric, normalised by discharge capacity, and considered alongside other metrics within the Economic Assessment.

5.70 **Normalisation of non-monetised impacts**: Certain non-monetised impacts have been normalised by discharge capacity rather than cost. The MCA Framework indicated cost-based normalisation; however, we have modified that to a discharge capacity-based approach which has been applied to Security of Supply and Avoided Renewable Curtailment. This supports comparison across projects while reflecting differences in scale and duration within the assessment framework.

Limitations

5.71 This section focuses on limitations that arose during the application of the Economic Assessment, particularly where constraints on modelling, data or methodology affected how the assessment was undertaken in practice. For further detail on modelling-specific considerations, please refer to NESO's final methodology published alongside this consultation.

5.72 **Location within the Economic Assessment:** One limitation relates to the modelling outputs used to inform the assessment. As described above, outputs from the Balancing Mechanism model were excluded due to identified issues with degeneracy. As a result, locational differences are less fully reflected within the monetised assessment than originally envisaged.

5.73 Some locational effects remain captured within the assessment, including through the design of counterfactuals and within non-monetised components such as System Operability. However, the reduced reliance on Balancing Mechanism outputs means that certain locational dynamics may not be fully reflected in the Economic Assessment ranking.

5.74 However, we do note that locational diversity is considered in the Strategic Assessment.

5.75 **Treatment of project-submitted data**: Project-submitted inputs have generally been used as provided, with some standardisation applied where necessary to help with comparability (including, for example, capacity inputs used for modelling). While these adjustments were applied consistently, these

assumptions may result in some outputs over- or under-representing individual project characteristics.

Economic Assessment outputs

5.76 The outputs of the Economic Assessment are set out in appendices 3 and 4. These appendices present the underlying results for each project in alphabetical order.

5.77 Specifically:

- Appendix 3 (Table 8) presents the final outputs of the Economic Assessment, including both monetised and non-monetised components and how they are combined to produce the overall Economic Assessment score.
- Appendix 4 (Table 9) presents the unweighted, normalised results (between 0 and 100) for each project across the monetised and non-monetised components of the Economic Assessment.

How the Economic Assessment informed minded-to decisions

5.78 The Economic Assessment ranking forms the starting point for our decision-making process.

5.79 Table 2 below presents the Economic Assessment ranking and key Economic Assessment outputs for each project. It includes the final Economic Assessment score, together with its monetised and non-monetised component scores.

Table 2: Economic Assessment ranking (baseline)

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	Final Score	Monetised Score	Non-Monetised Score
1	Loch Kemp Storage	PSH	N_Scotland	660	22.3	2030	180.12	100.00	80.12
2	Coire Glas	PSH	N_Scotland	1440	32	2033	170.39	77.49	92.90
3	TeesCAES	CAES	NE_England	50	30	2029	118.20	25.97	92.23
4	Earba PSH	PSH	N_Scotland	1800	15	2033	112.09	53.15	58.93
5	Field Netherton	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	16.3	2030	102.16	39.26	62.89
6	Field New Deer	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	18.03	2030	101.44	38.26	63.17
7	Field Rigifa	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	18.03	2030	95.27	27.90	67.37
8	Field Fyrish	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	16.5	2030	94.04	32.37	61.67
9	Field Long Stratton	Li-ion BESS	E_England	400	16.05	2033	93.06	31.62	61.44
10	Hunterston	LAES/BESS	S_Scotland	300	8	2030	84.77	0.00	84.77
11	Killingholme 1	LAES/BESS	E_Midlands	300	8	2030	77.80	0.88	76.92
12	East Claydon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	12	2030	75.91	27.55	48.36
13	Kincardine	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	145	8	2029	73.35	54.46	18.89
14	Ocker Hill BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	145	8	2029	73.27	44.94	28.33
15	Sundon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	8	2030	72.14	25.19	46.95
16	Drakelow (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	385	8.7	2030	70.96	20.70	50.26
17	Frontier Legacy	VFB/Zn	N_Wales	65	8	2029	69.32	30.57	38.75
18	Springwell	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	400	11.1	2030	69.12	27.44	41.68
19	Thornton BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	100	11.11	2029	67.58	42.76	24.82
20	Neilston BESS 3	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	300	11.22	2030	66.96	34.01	32.95
21	Branxton BESS	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	480	8	2029	66.00	36.82	29.18
22	Thorpe Marsh 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	336	8.7	2033	65.38	12.52	52.85
23	Glenmuckloch	PSH	S_Scotland	182	9.1	2030	64.06	25.51	38.54

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	Final Score	Monetised Score	Non-Monetised Score
24	Loch na Cathrach	PSH	N_Scotland	500	8	2030	63.73	25.79	37.94
25	Neilston BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	100	11.11	2029	63.72	41.91	21.81
26	Frontier Botley	VFB/Zn	S_Wales	200	8	2030	63.35	17.40	45.95
27	Frontier Pelham	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.73	17.28	45.44
28	Frontier Bramford 2	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.60	17.24	45.37
29	Frontier Navenby	VFB/Zn	E_Midlands	200	8	2030	62.60	17.61	44.99
30	Frontier Wymondley	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.36	17.15	45.21
31	Frontier Bramford 1	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.20	16.97	45.22
32	Frontier Market	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.10	16.69	45.41
33	Frontier Astwood	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.08	16.86	45.21
34	Frontier Hockcliffe	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	62.00	16.92	45.09
35	Mossmorran	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	200	8	2029	61.78	40.80	20.98
36	Frontier Grange Lane	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	99	8	2030	61.73	22.84	38.90
37	Exeter Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	250	8	2028	60.78	33.60	27.18
38	Thorpe Marsh 1	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	354	8.7	2030	60.22	15.09	45.12
39	Frontier Weaver	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	120	8	2030	59.12	19.59	39.53
40	Enderby (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_England	310	8.64	2030	57.18	16.20	40.97
41	Frontier Ayr	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	200	8	2030	56.43	13.54	42.89
42	Gretna	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	400	8	2029	55.66	35.49	20.17
43	Rayleigh BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	290	8	2029	55.45	31.23	24.22
44	Chickerell Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	400	8	2029	55.38	29.52	25.86
45	Frontier Busby	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	150	8	2030	54.35	10.91	43.44
46	Frontier Norwich	VFB/Zn	E_England	85	8	2031	52.83	10.53	42.29
47	Westport Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	150	10.2	2030	51.71	23.20	28.52
48	Frontier Willington	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	90	8	2030	50.17	6.06	44.11

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	Final Score	Monetised Score	Non-Monetised Score
49	Chessington BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029	49.95	23.00	26.95
50	Connahs	Li-ion BESS	N_Wales	500	8	2029	48.99	16.33	32.66
51	LDES Barry	VFB	S_Wales	50	8	2030	48.76	15.35	33.41
52	Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	341	10	2030	48.50	17.31	31.19
53	Nexus 1	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	1800	8.7	2030	48.37	14.42	33.96
54	Plumpton Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	1000	8	2030	48.01	11.28	36.73
55	Hagshaw	VFB	S_Scotland	500	8	2030	47.84	9.70	38.14
56	Solomons Farm BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029	47.21	22.89	24.31
57	Canner's Lane	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	46.24	12.94	33.31
58	Navenby Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	45.91	11.06	34.85
59	Dalby Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	45.56	10.86	34.70
60	Mowbray Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2029	45.51	16.33	29.18
61	Hawthorn Pit	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030	45.34	13.82	31.52
62	Al Boum Photo	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	100	11.11	2032	44.79	12.96	31.83
63	LDES Roosecote	VFB	W_Midlands	50	8	2030	44.04	9.99	34.05
64	Swinford Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_England	1000	8	2030	43.41	9.57	33.84
65	Bellmoor Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030	43.26	10.74	32.51
66	Didcot Parkway	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	138	8	2029	43.17	24.27	18.91
67	Lapwing	Li-ion BESS	E_England	249.6	11.68	2030	42.73	17.61	25.12
68	Middleton BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	100	8	2029	42.65	20.72	21.93
69	Old Rides	Li-ion BESS	London	1000	8	2030	42.55	11.32	31.24
70	Spirebush	VFB	S_Scotland	100	8	2030	42.48	10.79	31.70
71	Caithness BESS	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	456	8	2030	40.15	12.56	27.59
72	Aberthaw Energy	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	249	8	2030	30.51	13.41	17.09
73	Deeside Power	VFB	N_Wales	50	8	2028	26.05	5.23	20.82

6. Financial Assessment

This section explains the Financial Assessment. The Financial Assessment compares expected revenues with project costs and cap and floor levels to assess the extent of potential consumer support and relative exposure to floor payments. The Financial Assessment is combined with the Economic Assessment to inform our decision-making.

Consultation questions in this section

Q2. Do you agree with our minded-to decisions on Regime Requests?

Financial Assessment process

6.1 The Financial Assessment process comprises of two main stages:

- Stage 1: We first determine the inputs to the Financial Assessment by assessing Regime Requests, where projects have proposed changes to the default cap and floor parameters. This includes requests relating to regime variation, regime duration and residual value.
- Stage 2: A Financial Assessment score is then produced for each project using the applicable regime parameters. This draws on four core elements:
    - project costs, derived from the Cost Assessment process;
    - revenue estimates, derived using a Revenue Assessment methodology;
    - cap and floor levels, based on project-specific parameters determined through the Cap and Floor Financial Model (CFFM), including the outcome of any Regime Requests; and
    - comparison of projected revenues against each project's floor level to compute the Financial Assessment score.

Regime Requests

6.2 The Financial Framework establishes a regime with standardised parameters set by Ofgem and limited flexibility for projects to propose changes to regime duration, residual value or, in exceptional cases, regime variation. The default parameters include a 25-year regime duration, zero residual value, and indicative default rates of return of 4.47% at the floor and 7.48% at the cap, both expressed in CPIH-real terms.

6.3 Projects could make Regime Requests to seek limited changes to certain parameters of the cap and floor regime where justified. These requests are designed to address any specific project characteristics or risks not fully captured

in the standard regime design while continuing to support consumer benefit and value for money. They are assessed alongside the default regime assumptions as part of the Financial Assessment.

6.4 We assessed 50 Regime Requests in total:

- two Regime Variation requests,
- one Regime Duration request,
- 45 Residual Value requests, and
- two combined Regime Duration and Residual Value requests.

Regime Variations

6.5 We are minded-to reject both Regime Variation requests. The submissions did not provide sufficient evidence to meet the criteria set out in the Financial Framework. In particular, the projects did not demonstrate that the default administrative regime (including regime duration, residual value and the ACOD floor) had been fully considered, nor that it is insufficient to secure financing.

6.6 One project proposed a capital structure aligned to interconnector precedent, including an alternate debt service coverage ratio (DSCR), and did not demonstrate that the flexibility within the default regime would be insufficient to support project-specific debt terms. Evidence was limited to indicative engagement with a single potential lender and does not demonstrate that finance would not be available under the default regime, including the ACOD floor.

6.7 Neither submission provided sufficiently robust quantitative analysis to justify a higher, inflation-linked floor. In particular, the projects did not demonstrate that the administrative floor is insufficient, or that the requested uplift is necessary to meet lender requirements. Detailed financial evidence, including returns analysis and sensitivities were not provided, and we are therefore unable to assess the need for, or scale of, any uplift or its impact on consumers.

6.8 The projects did not demonstrate that the requested variations would deliver consumer benefit or represent value for money. While wider socio-economic benefits were identified, these are assessed separately under the Economic Assessment and do not substitute for evidence on consumer impacts within the Financial Assessment. Available evidence also indicates limited reliance on floor support, suggesting the projects are expected to operate within the default cap and floor corridor.

Regime Duration

6.9 We are minded-to reject the requested variation to regime duration as it did not meet the evidential bar for departure from the default regime. The submission did not provide sufficient quantitative evidence to support a longer regime duration. In particular, it did not demonstrate that the default 25-year regime is inappropriate, that it would not support delivery, or that an extension is necessary to achieve value for money.

6.10 Insufficient evidence was provided on consumer impacts. While a reduction in the first-year floor was identified, the project did not assess how costs would evolve over time or the cumulative impact on consumers, including intergenerational fairness. The submission also referenced an asset life exceeding the default regime duration, evidence based solely on asset life or depreciation is not sufficient where it does not account for the effects of an inflation linked regime structure over time.

Residual Value

6.11 Of the 45 projects that requested a non-zero residual value, we are minded-to accept 41 and minded-to reject four. Most projects provided sufficient evidence that a non-zero residual value was appropriate, either because it reflected credible post-regime asset value or reduced the level of the floor. The four rejected requests linked residual value to negative decommissioning costs, which was not consistent with the requirement that residual value reflects the expected economic value of the project beyond the regime, based on reasonable and supportable assumptions.

Combined requests

6.12 We are minded-to reject the two combined requests for an extended Regime Duration and a non-zero Residual Value. The submissions did not provide sufficient quantitative evidence to support an extended regime duration, including that the default 25-year regime is insufficient or that an extension would deliver consumer benefit, including value for money. While reductions in the first-year floor were identified, the projects did not assess how costs would evolve over time or the cumulative impact on consumers.

6.13 The projects did not provide sufficient evidence on the relationship between asset life and regime duration. As set out in the Financial Framework, asset life or depreciation alone is not sufficient where it does not account for the effects of an inflation-linked regime structure over time or demonstrate value for money. As the case for a longer duration was not demonstrated, the associated residual value proposals are not supported.

How Regime Request decisions informed the Financial Assessment

6.14 Following this assessment, projects proceed to the Financial Assessment on the basis of the applied regime parameters. For projects proposing an alternative floor, regime duration or a non-zero residual value, those parameters are assessed through the Financial Assessment and reflected in the cap and floor levels generated through the CFFM. Where a request is rejected, the default parameters are used instead.

Financial Assessment score

6.15 The Financial Assessment provides a basis for comparing the expected financial impacts of projects on consumers, including the likelihood and potential scale of cap and floor payments. It draws on project-specific cap and floor levels, expected revenue estimates, and assessed cost information.

Inputs to the Financial Assessment score

6.16 The inputs to the Financial Assessment are revenue estimates across the main components of the revenue stack, project-specific and standardised assumptions used to support comparability, and project-specific cap and floor levels. These inputs are derived from a combination of system modelling outputs, external analysis and project-submitted data.

Inputs to the Revenue Assessment

6.17 We estimated project revenues across the main components of the revenue stack. These components are Ancillary Services, Balancing Mechanism (previously referred to as Non-Energy BM Actions in the MCA Framework), Capacity Market, Wholesale Temporal Arbitrage (Initial Commitment) and Re-optimisation. System Benefit Modelling provides estimates for Wholesale Temporal Arbitrage (Initial Commitment) and Balancing Mechanism revenues, while the remaining revenue streams are informed by analysis from external advisers. Project-submitted data is used to inform calibration of selected components and to provide context for the assessment.

6.18 Consistent with the MCA Framework, the Financial Assessment is not intended to predict future revenues with certainty or to assess the standalone financial viability of individual projects. It provides a structured basis for comparing expected revenue profiles and cap and floor levels.

6.19 Standardised assumptions or adjustments were applied to revenue information to support consistency and comparability across projects. These were applied where submitted forecasts differ materially from other available evidence or

where benchmarking indicates significant variation across otherwise similar projects. Further detail can be found in paragraphs 6.34 to 6.36.

Standardisation within the Revenue Assessment

6.20 For each project, we applied a consistent approach to the two revenue components estimated by the System Benefit Modelling (Wholesale Temporal Arbitrage (Initial Commitment) and Balancing Mechanism), taking account of differences between project-submitted information and modelling outputs. These components are subject to greater uncertainty and variation than other parts of the revenue stack. The approach was designed to limit the influence of uncertain or model-dependent estimates, while retaining the overall shape of the modelling outputs and anchoring outcomes in project-specific evidence.

Inputs from our Cost Assessment

6.21 The Financial Assessment also draws on assessed cost information from the Cost Assessment. This reflects project-submitted estimates that have been subject to a proportionate assessment and, where appropriate, adjustment using Ofgem's cost assessment methodologies. These inputs are used to determine project-specific cap and floor levels and to compare expected revenues with the floor level.

Revenue estimation process

6.22 We have estimated revenues across the main components of the revenue stack to allow for comparison between projects. These estimates are not intended to predict future revenues precisely. We have managed revenue uncertainty through a consistent and proportionate approach, using common assumptions across projects to support comparability. This allows us to assess expected revenues and relative revenue risk on a like-for-like basis.

6.23 Where appropriate, we have drawn on modelling outputs and supporting analysis alongside project-submitted information to inform our estimates. Given the forward-looking nature of the assessment, revenue forecasts are inherently uncertain and require judgement. For this reason, the assessment focuses on comparing relative revenue risk across projects rather than predicting absolute outcomes.

6.24 Components of the revenue stack:

- **Ancillary Services revenues**: Revenues are informed by the System Operability assessment (paragraph 5.31) using outputs as a proxy for relative capability and to allocate a share of total revenues. Service-level revenue pools are derived from the System Benefit Modelling estimates of

system-wide balancing costs, alongside assumptions on the share expected to be captured by projects. Revenues are then allocated to projects in proportion to their relative scores.

- **Balancing Mechanism revenues**: Balancing Mechanism revenues are informed by the System Benefit Modelling of system conditions, reflecting the value of redispatch and constraint management. Given uncertainty in real-time system behaviour, these revenues are applied on a consistent and comparative basis rather than as precise forecasts of project-level earnings. Please note as per paragraph 5.66, although these revenues were outputs from NESO's Balancing Mechanism model, it was considered appropriate to use them, as NESO did not identify any material degeneracy that would affect their suitability for this purpose.
- **Capacity Market revenues**: Revenues are primarily driven by auction clearing prices and technology-specific derating factors, both of which are uncertain. Estimates draw on available evidence, including recent auction outcomes, project submissions and supporting analysis, and are intended to illustrate relative revenue potential and exposure to risk rather than predict specific outcomes.
- **Wholesale Temporal Arbitrage (Initial Commitment)**: Revenues are informed by the System Benefit Modelling. These reflect the value storage assets can capture by charging when prices are low and discharging when prices are high and form the core component of the revenue stack.
- **Re-optimisation**: Revenues reflect additional value from adjusting operations in response to real-time market conditions after initial commitment. These revenues are inherently uncertain and sensitive to modelling assumptions. Project submissions showed wide variation, so a common approach has been applied across projects to ensure consistency, rather than relying on project-specific forecasts.

Cap and floor levels

6.25 The Financial Assessment scores are calculated using project-specific floor levels.

6.26 Provisional cap and floor levels are set based on assessed project costs and the relevant regime parameters. Where applicable, project-specific requests relating to regime duration, residual value or regime variation are considered as part of this process. Further detail on the methodology is set out in the Cap and Floor Financial Model (CFFM) and the accompanying CFFM Handbook.

6.27 Project costs are drawn from the Cost Assessment, with further adjustments to reflect how costs are expected to be treated within the cap and floor regime. In particular, pass-through costs and financing costs (including Interest During Construction) are included, and costs are adjusted to reflect the time value of money. Residual value assumptions are also applied, where relevant.

6.28 In simple terms, cap and floor levels are calculated using a building blocks approach. Assessed project costs are combined with financing assumptions and rates of return to derive the revenue thresholds that support investability at the floor and limit excess returns at the cap. These thresholds are then used to assess the extent of potential consumer exposure through floor payments.

6.29 This stage establishes the revenue thresholds against which project revenues are assessed. In particular, the floor represents the level below which projects may receive support and therefore plays a central role in determining the potential for consumer exposure.

Outputs from the Financial Assessment

6.30 Financial Assessment scores are calculated by comparing estimated project revenues against each project's floor level over the regime duration. The resulting score provides a normalised indicator of expected revenues relative to the floor, allowing comparison of potential reliance on floor payments across projects of different scales.

6.31 Financial Assessment scores are intended to support relative comparison between projects rather than to provide precise forecasts. Scores below or above 1.00 indicate whether expected revenues are below or above the floor level on average over the regime. This is intended as a broad, directional indicator of potential reliance on floor payments and associated consumer exposure, rather than a decision threshold.

6.32 Where relevant, the effect of accepted Regime Requests is reflected in the Financial Assessment score. Where requests are not accepted, projects are assessed on the basis of the default regime parameters. The Revenue Assessment also produces adjusted revenue ranges across the main revenue streams. These are used as inputs to the Financial Assessment model and help inform our view of potential consumer support under the cap and floor regime.

Amendments from the MCA Framework

6.33 A limited number of amendments have been made within the Financial Assessment. These are set out below, together with the reasons for them.

6.34 **Revenue adjustment**: System Benefit Modelling for Balancing Mechanism and Wholesale Temporal Arbitrage (Initial Commitment) have been adjusted using the minimum observed difference from project-submitted data for those revenue components. Re-optimisation has also been impacted as this is a factor of the Wholesale Temporal Arbitrage (Initial Commitment) data. This reflects our judgement that modelling outputs provide a consistent basis for comparing relative performance across projects but are not directly comparable to project forecasts in absolute terms.

6.35 We have used both PLEXOS modelling outputs and project-submitted information to inform adjusted revenue estimates for use in the Financial Assessment, while submitted forecasts are retained for reference. This supports a consistent and comparable assessment across projects and avoids undue reliance on any single source of evidence.

6.36 Consistent with the MCA Framework, the Financial Assessment is a high-level, forward-looking assessment based on modelled revenues and assumptions. It is intended to support a consistent comparison of projects, rather than to provide precise forecasts of future revenues.

6.37 **Financial Assessment scenario analysis**: Scenario analysis of the Financial Assessment score has been removed for the purposes of the Financial Assessment. While some variation in financial scores is observed under different scenarios, analysis indicates that this does not materially affect relative comparison or selection outcomes. Additional scenario analysis is therefore not considered informative for this assessment.

Limitations of the Financial Assessment

6.38 The Financial Assessment is subject to limitations, reflecting uncertainty in long-term revenue projections. Estimates depend on modelling assumptions, market developments and system conditions that cannot be predicted with certainty. The assessment therefore places greater weight on relative comparisons of downside risk across projects than on precise absolute forecasts.

6.39 Adjustments to project-submitted data and common assumptions on revenues and regime parameters have been made. Revenue estimates derived from System Benefit Modelling reflect modelled system behaviour under defined assumptions and are not intended to represent realisable market revenues. They should be interpreted as comparative indicators of relative performance, rather than forecasts.

6.40 Long-term revenue forecasting remains inherently uncertain. Actual revenues may differ from forecast revenues because they will depend on future market

conditions, operational performance and other factors that cannot be predicted with certainty at this stage. The Financial Assessment outputs should therefore be interpreted as a range of potential outcomes under a consistent framework of assumptions and considered alongside the Economic and Strategic Assessments within the MCA Framework.

How the Financial Assessment informed minded-to decisions

6.41 The Financial Assessment informed our decision-making. The Financial Assessment assesses project costs and expected revenues to evaluate financial viability and the extent of potential consumer support required under the cap and floor regime.

6.42 Financial Assessment outputs have been considered alongside the Economic and Strategic Assessments, consistent with the approach set out in the MCA Framework. This reflects the forward-looking nature of the Financial Assessment and the need to interpret its results in the context of uncertainty and other assessment factors.

6.43 We have elected to make adjustments to our Economic Assessment ranking for projects with Financial Assessment scores that demonstrate materially elevated risk profiles. Projects below a score of 0.60 have been identified, through analysis of the distribution of scores, as having comparatively higher downside risk. This was not a pre-determined threshold, but a judgement applied in the round, reflecting a clear separation in the data.

6.44 Although not fixed in advance, this threshold has been applied consistently across projects as a proportionate proxy for materially elevated risk of floor reliance, rather than as a standalone decision rule. This approach to setting the threshold also has regard to the wider strategic benefits offered by some projects, acknowledging that a trade-off may be justifiable where particular benefits offset a lower Financial Assessment score.

6.45 In applying this threshold alongside the Economic Assessment baseline ranking, we are exercising the judgment contemplated by the MCA Framework to interpret Financial Assessment outputs and to make proportionate decisions where risk is most pronounced. We welcome views on the appropriateness of this threshold and how it has been applied.

6.46 Table 3 below presents the Economic Assessment ranking alongside the Financial Assessment results. The Financial Assessment (FA) score is shown alongside the Submitted FA score for comparison and is presented as either above or below the threshold.

6.47 For clarity:

- Projects whose position has been adjusted following consideration of the Financial Assessment outputs are indicated in **bold** and labelled "(adj)" alongside their ranking to denote that their position has changed.
- In all cases, projects retain their relative order from the Economic Assessment baseline, even where their position within the table has changed to reflect adjustments.

Table 3: Economic Assessment ranking with Financial Assessment results

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score
1	Loch Kemp Storage	PSH	N_Scotland	660	22.3	2030	Above	Above
2	Coire Glas	PSH	N_Scotland	1440	32	2033	Above	Above
3	TeesCAES	CAES	NE_England	50	30	2029	Above	Above
4	Earba PSH	PSH	N_Scotland	1800	15	2033	Above	Above
5	Field Netherton	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	16.3	2030	Above	Above
6	Field New Deer	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	18.03	2030	Above	Above
7	Field Rigifa	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	18.03	2030	Above	Above
8	Field Fyrish	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	16.5	2030	Above	Above
9	Field Long Stratton	Li-ion BESS	E_England	400	16.05	2033	Above	Above
12	East Claydon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	12	2030	Above	Above
13	Kincardine	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	145	8	2029	Above	Above
14	Ocker Hill BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	145	8	2029	Above	Above
15	Sundon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	8	2030	Above	Above
16	Drakelow (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	385	8.7	2030	Above	Above
18	Springwell	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	400	11.1	2030	Above	Above
19	Thornton BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	100	11.11	2029	Above	Above
20	Neilston BESS 3	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	300	11.22	2030	Above	Above
21	Branxton BESS	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	480	8	2029	Above	Above
22	Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	336	8.7	2033	Above	Above
25	Neilston BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	100	11.11	2029	Above	Above
26	Frontier Botley	VFB/Zn	S_Wales	200	8	2030	Above	Above
27	Frontier Pelham	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above
28	Frontier Bramford 2	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score
29	Frontier Navenby	VFB/Zn	E_Midlands	200	8	2030	Above	Above
30	Frontier Wymondley	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above
31	Frontier Bramford 1	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above
32	Frontier Market	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above
33	Frontier Astwood	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above
34	Frontier Hockcliffe	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	Above	Above
35	Mossmorran	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	200	8	2029	Above	Above
37	Exeter Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	250	8	2028	Above	Above
38	Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	354	8.7	2030	Above	Above
40	Enderby (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_England	310	8.64	2030	Above	Above
42	Gretna	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	400	8	2029	Above	Above
43	Rayleigh BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	290	8	2029	Above	Above
44	Chickerell Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	400	8	2029	Above	Above
47	Westport Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	150	10.2	2030	Above	Above
49	Chessington BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029	Above	Above
50	Connahs	Li-ion BESS	N_Wales	500	8	2029	Above	Above
52	Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	341	10	2030	Above	Above
53	Nexus 1	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	1800	8.7	2030	Above	Above
54	Plumpton Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
56	Solomons Farm BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029	Above	Above
57	Canner's Lane	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
58	Navenby Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
59	Dalby Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
60	Mowbray Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2029	Above	Above
61	Hawthorn Pit	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030	Above	Above

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score
62	Al Boum Photo	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	100	11.11	2032	Above	Above
64	Swinford Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_England	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
65	Bellmoor Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
66	Didcot Parkway	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	138	8	2029	Above	Above
67	Lapwing	Li-ion BESS	E_England	249.6	11.68	2030	Above	Above
68	Middleton BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	100	8	2029	Above	Above
69	Old Rides	Li-ion BESS	London	1000	8	2030	Above	Above
71	Caithness BESS	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	456	8	2030	Above	Above
72	Aberthaw Energy	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	249	8	2030	Above	Above
10 (adj)	**Hunterston**	**LAES/BESS**	**S_Scotland**	**300**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
11 (adj)	**Killingholme 1**	**LAES/BESS**	**E_Midlands**	**300**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
17 (adj)	**Frontier Legacy**	**VFB/Zn**	**N_Wales**	**65**	**8**	**2029**	**Above**	**Below**
23 (adj)	**Glenmuckloch**	**PSH**	**S_Scotland**	**182**	**9.1**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
24 (adj)	**Loch na Cathrach**	**PSH**	**N_Scotland**	**500**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
36 (adj)	**Frontier Grange Lane**	**VFB/Zn**	**W_Midlands**	**99**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
39 (adj)	**Frontier Weaver**	**VFB/Zn**	**W_Midlands**	**120**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
41 (adj)	**Frontier Ayr**	**VFB/Zn**	**S_Scotland**	**200**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
45 (adj)	**Frontier Busby**	**VFB/Zn**	**S_Scotland**	**150**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
46 (adj)	**Frontier Norwich**	**VFB/Zn**	**E_England**	**85**	**8**	**2031**	**Above**	**Below**
48 (adj)	**Frontier Willington**	**VFB/Zn**	**W_Midlands**	**90**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
51 (adj)	**LDES Barry**	**VFB**	**S_Wales**	**50**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
55 (adj)	**Hagshaw**	**VFB**	**S_Scotland**	**500**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
63 (adj)	**LDES Roosecote**	**VFB**	**W_Midlands**	**50**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
70 (adj)	**Spirebush**	**VFB**	**S_Scotland**	**100**	**8**	**2030**	**Above**	**Below**
73 (adj)	**Deeside**	**VFB**	**N_Wales**	**50**	**8**	**2028**	**No Data***	**No Data***

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage
*Deeside Power Energy Hub did not submit a CFFM and so have no Financial Assessment data.

7. Strategic Assessment

This section explains the Strategic Assessment. It considers factors not fully captured in previous assessments, including scenario sensitivity, deliverability and overall portfolio-level considerations. The Strategic Assessment is combined with the Economic Assessment and Financial Assessment to inform our decision-making.

Strategic Assessment process

7.1 The Strategic Assessment comprises of the following elements:

- Scenario analysis allows us to test the robustness of outcomes under a range of plausible future system conditions. It evaluates how relative project performance and ranking of the Economic Assessment varies under alternative assumptions, ensuring results are not dependent on a single case.
- Deliverability Assessment assesses whether projects are credible to deliver in practice, considering key risks in aggregate.
- Diversity assessment considers the overall mix of technologies, locations and interdependencies. This ensures that outcomes are aligned with system needs, avoids unintended concentration risks where possible, and provides a balanced technology portfolio capable of delivering a range of system services.

Scenario analysis

7.2 The purpose of the scenario analysis is to test how robust the Project Assessment outcomes are under a range of future conditions. It supports consideration of risks of regret and uncertainty when comparing projects and helps assess whether relative project outcomes remain broadly stable when key assumptions about costs, revenues and system conditions are varied.

7.3 As set out in the MCA Framework, scenario analysis is structured around two complementary elements: flexibility across scenarios and the risk of cost overruns. The first examines how sensitive a project's relative position is to alternative system conditions, including different Future Energy Scenarios (FES) pathways and weather years. The second considers how stable outcomes remain when project costs differ from the Base Case.

7.4 All scenarios are assessed relative to a defined Base Case. For the Economic Assessment, the Base Case comprises the FES Holistic Transition pathway, a standard 2013 weather year, and a base cost scenario using adjusted project-

submitted P50 values, excluding pass-through costs such as business rates and TNUoS charges.

7.5 Each scenario introduces a single change relative to the Base Case. This allows us to test sensitivity to specific assumptions in a clear and transparent way and to better understand which factors drive changes in outcomes. The Economic Assessment scenarios considered in the aggregate deviation "Scenario Analysis Score" presented in Table 4 are two alternative FES pathways (Electric Engagement and Falling Behind) and two alternative weather years (1990 and 1997). The pessimistic cost sensitivity was produced and considered independently but we decided not to include it in this aggregate score.

7.6 The scenario analysis identified a small number of projects that were materially more sensitive than others to changes in the underlying assumptions. These are treated as higher-risk cases in the Strategic Assessment. More generally, however, most projects exhibited some sensitivity while remaining broadly stable in comparative terms. This supports the view that the proposed portfolio is largely robust under a range of plausible future conditions.

Deliverability Assessment

7.7 The purpose of the Deliverability Assessment is to identify whether there are material risks to projects delivering their proposed capacity within their stated delivery timelines. It highlights areas where delivery risk may be higher and should be taken into account – it is not intended to provide a binary view on whether a project will or will not be delivered, nor does it determine licence award or replace the need for further assurance at later stages of the cap and floor regime.

7.8 The assessment focused on delivery risk factors that we consider material at this stage of project development and that are commonly associated with large-scale infrastructure delivery. These were: schedule contingency and overall delivery timeline assumptions; grid connection arrangements and readiness; planning and consenting status; proposed IT and Operational Technology (OT) security measures; and supply chain availability, informed by both project submissions and external technical advice.

7.9 The assessment produced assessment outputs for each project. We applied judgment to combine these outputs into an overall assessment of the likelihood of these deliverability risks not being mitigated following a cap and floor award using a red, amber and green rating.[5] We do not consider that the current evidence justifies excluding projects solely on these risks – where a pathway to

[5] Green (low likelihood of risks not being mitigated), Amber (medium likelihood of risks not being mitigated), Red (High likelihood of risks not being mitigated)

timely delivery remains open and where the projects otherwise perform strongly overall.

7.10 On connections specifically, we consider a project's current position in the connection queue is largely outside their control. Accordingly, where a credible pathway to timely delivery remains open, and where a project otherwise performs strongly overall, we are minded to manage the resulting risk through conditions attached to any award of cap and floor support, including time-bound milestones, consistent with the approach taken in previous cap and floor regimes.

Portfolio-level considerations

7.11 The Strategic Assessment also considers portfolio-level effects to assess whether the proposed portfolio appropriately balances benefits and risk across the portfolio as a whole. In particular, we considered technological diversity, locational diversity and interdependencies between projects, recognising that these factors may affect whether the overall portfolio is robust and resilient for consumers.

Diversity

7.12 The MCA Framework noted that it could be in the long-term interests of consumers to avoid over-reliance on a narrow set of technologies, and that there may be wider benefits from learning associated with deployment of novel technologies. Consistent with this, we considered the portfolio emerging from the Economic, Financial and project-level Strategic Assessments and, where justified, considered an appropriate level of technology diversity, taking into account the wider evidence base and the overall impact on consumer outcomes.

7.13 The MCA Framework also recognised that system benefits may not scale linearly when projects are considered as a portfolio, and that the distribution of projects across locations may therefore be relevant. As set out in paragraph 5.72, we have not relied on locational signals from System Benefit Modelling on a project-by-project basis. However, location remains reflected within the Economic Assessment through the design of counterfactuals and other components, including system operability.

7.14 In addition to the modelling set out in NESO's September 2025 methodology, NESO has undertaken additional zonal sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of different locations on redispatch costs. We considered this analysis as part of the wider evidence base on locational impacts. However, given its project-agnostic nature and the fact that it was designed to provide a broad zonal comparison, we did not consider it a sufficient basis for adjusting the proposed portfolio.

Interdependencies

7.15 We also considered whether material interdependencies exist between projects that could affect deliverability or the effectiveness of the portfolio. Based on project submissions and supporting evidence, most projects did not identify material interdependencies.

7.16 A small number of potential interdependencies were identified, most notably where projects may interact through shared natural resources, such as water availability for pumped storage hydro projects. In those cases, resolution is subject to external processes, including planning and environmental permitting decisions by the relevant authorities.

7.17 This analysis has informed our consideration of interdependencies within the Strategic Assessment and has been taken into account alongside other portfolio-level factors as part of our overall approach. While interdependencies may give rise to delivery risks in a limited number of cases, we have considered these risks at a portfolio level, including through our consideration of potential project attrition in setting the capacity limit. Projects will need to manage any relevant interdependencies as part of delivery, including securing the necessary consents and approvals.

Amendments from the MCA Framework

7.18 A limited number of amendments have been made within the Strategic Assessment. These are set out below.

7.19 **Removal of Financial Assessment alternative revenue scenarios**: As described in paragraph 6.34 and in light of the changes made to revenue estimation for the Financial Assessment, we have not included alternative revenue-based scenarios within the Strategic Assessment. This means that scenario testing does not include alternative FES pathways, weather years, or high and low revenue sensitivities for Financial Assessment scores, as was originally contemplated under the MCA Framework.

7.20 **Removal of the optimistic cost scenario**: Following review of project-submitted P10 cost data, we decided not to include an optimistic cost scenario within scenario analysis. This reflects concerns about the reliability and consistency of the project-submitted data that would inform such a scenario, as well as our judgement that downside cost risk is the more material consideration at this stage given the potential transfer of cost risk to consumers.

How the Strategic Assessment informed minded-to decisions

7.21 The Strategic Assessment informed our decision-making. The Strategic Assessment considers factors not fully captured in the Economic and Financial Assessments, including scenario sensitivity, deliverability, and overall portfolio-level considerations – thereby reducing the risk of regret under uncertainty and supporting a portfolio that is robust rather than merely optimal on a single central case.

7.22 Most projects remain largely stable under a range of future scenarios. Projects below a scenario score threshold of -100 have been identified as exhibiting greater sensitivity across the scenarios considered. This threshold was not pre-determined in advice but has been identified through analysis of the distribution of scores, which shows clear separation between projects with a relatively higher and lower risk exposure.

7.23 We considered it appropriate to use a threshold to provide a structured and transparent basis for identifying projects that were materially more sensitive to changes in underlying assumptions, rather than relying solely on unstructured judgment. In our judgment, the threshold reduces the risk of over-weighting uncertainty, while still allowing the outcomes of the assessment to be informed by uncertainty where sensitivity is most pronounced.

7.24 Projects are assessed as largely having a credible pathway to delivery, noting external uncertainties mentioned above. Delivery risks were assessed across components such as contingency, gate connections, supply chain, planning and information technology. The likelihood of these deliverability risks not being mitigated has been assessed using a red, amber and green rating.[6]

7.25 Overall, the assessment has been made on a project-by-project basis, but we acknowledge that some degree of interdependency may arise between these projects. For example, potential supply chain constraints where assets are located in similar areas, or constraints affecting assets that rely on the same water resources, including those arising from water abstraction rights or other local authority requirements.

7.26 We do not consider that the current evidence justifies excluding projects solely on these risks – where a pathway to timely delivery remains open and where the projects otherwise perform strongly overall. These delivery risks can be managed through conditions and ongoing project milestones, and that to exclude such

[6] Green (low likelihood of risks not being mitigated), Amber (medium likelihood of risks not being mitigated), Red (High likelihood of risks not being mitigated)

projects now would risk deprioritising those that our assessment shows could deliver significant system benefits.

7.27 We have applied discretion in line with the MCA Framework to broaden the technology diversity by including one Vanadium Flow/Zinc Battery project. This does not displace earlier assessments but reflects a portfolio-level judgment. No project is included on diversity grounds alone – reflecting the judgment that the residual risks of this project are proportionate when weighed against the benefits of greater technological diversity.

7.28 This modest expansion increases representation of technologies with different operating characteristics without materially changing the overall portfolio. Given its limited scale, inclusion would not materially increase risk to consumers, while offering potential upside through increased diversity and learning benefits. It does not result in the exclusion of any projects that would otherwise have been included.

7.29 The proposed portfolio has an appropriate locational spread of projects. The largest concentration of projects is in Scotland with the remaining projects spread across England and Wales. Our judgment is that the deployment of capacity in the proposed locations is appropriate and is likely to have positive system benefits. There is also no indication the system would be adversely impacted.

7.30 Table 4 below presents the Economic Assessment ranking, incorporating adjustments informed by the Financial Assessment outputs (see Table 3) and further adjustments arising from the Strategic Assessment.

7.31 For clarity:

- Projects previously adjusted following the Financial Assessment outputs (see Table 3) are labelled "(adj)" alongside their ranking.
- Projects whose position changes as a result of the Strategic Assessment are highlighted in **bold** and labelled "(adj)" to denote that an adjustment has occurred following consideration of Strategic Assessment outputs.
- In all cases, projects retain their relative order from the Economic Assessment baseline, even where their position within the table has changed to reflect adjustments.

Table 4: Economic Assessment ranking with adjustments based on Financial and Strategic Assessment outputs

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First operation	Scenario Analysis Score	Deliverability Rating	Diversity
1	Loch Kemp Storage	PSH	N_Scotland	660	22.3	2030	-2	Green	
2	Coire Glas	PSH	N_Scotland	1440	32	2033	2	Green	
3	TeesCAES	CAES	NE_England	50	30	2029	-17	Amber	
4	Earba PSH	PSH	N_Scotland	1800	15	2033	1	Green	
5	Field Netherton	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	16.3	2030	-3	Amber	
6	Field New Deer	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	18.03	2030	-8	Amber	
7	Field Rigifa	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	18.03	2030	4	Amber	
8	Field Fyrish	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	16.5	2030	9	Amber	
9	Field Long Stratton	Li-ion BESS	E_England	400	16.05	2033	-19	Amber	
12	East Claydon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	12	2030	1	Amber	
14	Ocker Hill BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	145	8	2029	-55	Amber	
15	Sundon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	8	2030	7	Amber	
16	Drakelow (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	385	8.7	2030	-12	Amber	
17 (adj)	**Frontier Legacy**	**VFB/Zn**	**N_Wales**	**65**	**8**	**2029**	**-149**	**Amber**	**Yes**
18	Springwell	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	400	11.1	2030	-6	Amber	
19	Thornton BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	100	11.11	2029	-77	Green	
20	Neilston BESS 3	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	300	11.22	2030	-31	Amber	
21	Branxton BESS	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	480	8	2029	-17	Amber	
22	Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	336	8.7	2033	38	Green	
26	Frontier Botley	VFB/Zn	S_Wales	200	8	2030	-11	Amber	
27	Frontier Pelham	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	-14	Amber	
28	Frontier Bramford 2	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	-15	Amber	
29	Frontier Navenby	VFB/Zn	E_Midlands	200	8	2030	-13	Amber	

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First operation	Scenario Analysis Score	Deliverability Rating	Diversity
30	Frontier Wymondley	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	-16	Amber	
31	Frontier Bramford 1	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	-17	Amber	
32	Frontier Market	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	3	Amber	
33	Frontier Astwood	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	-13	Amber	
34	Frontier Hockcliffe	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030	-13	Amber	
35	Mossmorran	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	200	8	2029	-29	Amber	
37	Exeter Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	250	8	2028	46	Green	
38	Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	354	8.7	2030	61	Green	
40	Enderby (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_England	310	8.64	2030	51	Amber	
42	Gretna	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	400	8	2029	17	Amber	
43	Rayleigh BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	290	8	2029	51	Green	
44	Chickerell Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	400	8	2029	13	Green	
47	Westport Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	150	10.2	2030	-33	Amber	
49	Chessington BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029	19	Amber	
50	Connahs	Li-ion BESS	N_Wales	500	8	2029	-3	Amber	
52	Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	341	10	2030	-5	Green	
53	Nexus 1	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	1800	8.7	2030	22	Green	
54	Plumpton Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	1000	8	2030	63	Amber	
56	Solomons Farm BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029	27	Amber	
57	Canner's Lane	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	50	Amber	
58	Navenby Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	57	Amber	
59	Dalby Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030	72	Amber	
60	Mowbray Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2029	47	Amber	
61	Hawthorn Pit	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030	65	Amber	

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First operation	Scenario Analysis Score	Deliverability Rating	Diversity
62	Al Boum Photo	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	100	11.11	2032	49	Green	
64	Swinford Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_England	1000	8	2030	58	Amber	
65	Bellmoor Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030	78	Amber	
66	Didcot Parkway	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	138	8	2029	-1	Amber	
67	Lapwing	Li-ion BESS	E_England	249.6	11.68	2030	38	Green	
68	Middleton BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	100	8	2029	43	Amber	
69	Old Rides	Li-ion BESS	London	1000	8	2030	74	Amber	
71	Caithness BESS	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	456	8	2030	42	Amber	
72	Aberthaw Energy	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	249	8	2030	20	Amber	
10 (adj)	Hunterston	LAES/BESS	S_Scotland	300	8	2030	-39	Green	
11 (adj)	Killingholme 1	LAES/BESS	E_Midlands	300	8	2030	-61	Amber	
13 (adj)	**Kincardine**	**Li-ion BESS**	**S_Scotland**	**145**	**8**	**2029**	**-156**	**Amber**	
23 (adj)	Glenmuckloch	PSH	S_Scotland	182	9.1	2030	-23	Green	
24 (adj)	Loch na Cathrach	PSH	N_Scotland	500	8	2030	-23	Green	
25 (adj)	**Neilston BESS 2**	**Li-ion BESS**	**S_Scotland**	**100**	**11.11**	**2029**	**-123**	**Green**	
36 (adj)	Frontier Grange Lane	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	99	8	2030	-60	Amber	
39 (adj)	Frontier Weaver	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	120	8	2030	-24	Green	
41 (adj)	Frontier Ayr	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	200	8	2030	-20	Green	
45 (adj)	Frontier Busby	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	150	8	2030	-15	Green	
46 (adj)	Frontier Norwich	VFB/Zn	E_England	85	8	2031	7	Green	
48 (adj)	Frontier Willington	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	90	8	2030	0	Amber	
51 (adj)	LDES Barry	VFB	S_Wales	50	8	2030	-4	Amber	
55 (adj)	Hagshaw	VFB	S_Scotland	500	8	2030	-25	Amber	
63 (adj)	LDES Roosecote	VFB	W_Midlands	50	8	2030	20	Amber	

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First operation	Scenario Analysis Score	Deliverability Rating	Diversity
70 (adj)	Spirebush	VFB	S_Scotland	100	8	2030	-3	Green	
73 (adj)	Deeside	VFB	N_Wales	50	8	2028	0	Amber	

8. Capacity and Attrition

This section explains Capacity and Attrition. It draws on the Capacity Advice and wider evidence on likely delivery risk to assess how much capacity should be awarded in Window 1 while protecting consumers. It also explains why we consider a total award capacity at the upper end of the recommended capacity range.

Consultation questions in this section

Q3. Do you agree with our minded-to capacity decision for Window 1?

Capacity and attrition approach

8.1 Given the volume of eligible projects and the combined capacity seeking support, we consider it prudent to only award up to a certain total capacity. This ensures that cap and floor regimes are awarded in line with expected system requirements and limits the risk of exposing consumers to excessive floor payments or reduced system benefits from over-procurement. At the same time, it recognises that a project not receiving an award in Window 1 has not necessarily failed the assessment but may instead fall outside the capacity required at this stage.

8.2 Our assessment of the appropriate capacity range draws primarily on the Capacity Advice which recommended that between 2.7GW and 7.7GW of additional capacity would be needed by 2035 – indicating that deployment in the middle to upper end of this range is likely to be cost-optimal and supports delivery of Clean Power 2030 and Net Zero 2050[7]. We have also taken into account that capacity expansion modelling shows a preference for longer-duration assets in the first instance, reflecting their ability to provide sustained system value during extended periods of low renewable output.

8.3 A further key consideration is attrition risk: the possibility that some projects offered an award may not proceed to operation. Attrition may occur for a range of reasons, including developers choosing not to accept an award, financing challenges, or other unforeseen delivery issues. Attrition risk is particularly relevant for larger and more complex projects, including some pumped storage hydro schemes, and where projects have sought but not obtained changes to the standard regime.

[7] The majority of the outputs from modelled pathways and sensitivities indicate that the middle to upper bound of additional capacity deployment in the recommended range is more likely to be cost optimal.

Limitations

8.4 Our approach to determining capacity and attrition is subject to limitations. The primary constraint is the reliance on an overall optimal capacity range derived from pre-existing analysis, rather than a disaggregated assessment of specific capacity requirements in particular locations and with defined technical capabilities. While interim Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP) outputs provide support for the existing range, the underlying evidence base on future system needs remains evolving and does not yet provide sufficiently granular system-level requirements.

8.5 In addition, attrition risk remains inherently uncertain. There is limited empirical evidence on project attrition under this regime, and individual projects may exhibit materially different risk profiles. Taken together, these limitations mean that the optimal level and composition of capacity cannot be determined with precision. We have therefore adopted a proportionate approach based on the best available aggregate evidence, while recognising that future system planning would inform any subsequent application windows.

How Capacity and Attrition informed minded-to decisions

8.6 Our minded-to decision on capacity is to include a total of 7,645MW, just below the upper limit of the advised range (7,700MW). This provides headroom for a reasonable degree of attrition while also ensuring that, if all projects proceed, the total capacity awarded remains within the recommended capacity range.

8.7 We consider this approach reflects a sensible balance between the risk of under-procurement, in the event of attrition, and over-procurement, if excessive capacity is supported at consumer expense. We have not adopted the more aggressive approach of setting capacity above the recommended range in anticipation of attrition. Instead, we consider that remaining within that range, but towards its upper end, provides the most proportionate balance on the evidence available.

8.8 The resulting portfolio is also consistent with the broader evidence base. It has a strong representation of higher-duration and larger-capacity assets, in line with the Capacity Advice, and provides a reasonably evidenced pathway to delivering substantial capacity by 2030 and beyond. While delivery cannot be guaranteed and attrition risk remains, the selected projects are, on the evidence currently available, capable of supporting both Clean Power 2030 ambitions and longer-term system needs.

8.9 Table 5 presents our proposed minded-to decisions for all projects. It identifies those projects proposed for inclusion within our Window 1 portfolio, reflecting our

minded-to position on portfolio composition and capacity. The table also shows where a project's position has changed during our assessment following consideration of the Economic, Financial and Strategic Assessments.

Table 5: Minded-to decisions

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	EA Adjustment	FA Adjustments	SA Adjustments
1	Loch Kemp Storage	PSH	N_Scotland	660	22.3	2030			
2	Coire Glas	PSH	N_Scotland	1440	32	2033			
3	TeesCAES	CAES	NE_England	50	30	2029			
4	Earba PSH	PSH	N_Scotland	1800	15	2033			
5	Field Netherton	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	16.3	2030			
6	Field New Deer	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	18.03	2030			
7	Field Rigifa	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	18.03	2030			
8	Field Fyrish	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	16.5	2030			
9	Field Long Stratton	Li-ion BESS	E_England	400	16.05	2033			
12	East Claydon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	12	2030			
14	Ocker Hill BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	145	8	2029			
15	Sundon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	8	2030			
16	Drakelow (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	385	8.7	2030			
17	Frontier Legacy	VFB/Zn	N_Wales	65	8	2029		Yes	Yes
18	Springwell	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	400	11.1	2030			
19	Thornton BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	100	11.11	2029			
20	Neilston BESS 3	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	300	11.22	2030			
21	Branxton BESS	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	480	8	2029			
22	Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	336	8.7	2033			
26	Frontier Botley	VFB/Zn	S_Wales	200	8	2030			
27	Frontier Pelham	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
28	Frontier Bramford 2	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
29	Frontier Navenby	VFB/Zn	E_Midlands	200	8	2030			

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	EA Adjustment	FA Adjustments	SA Adjustments
30	Frontier Wymondley	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
31	Frontier Bramford 1	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
32	Frontier Market	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
33	Frontier Astwood	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
34	Frontier Hockcliffe	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	2030			
35	Mossmorran	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	200	8	2029			
37	Exeter Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	250	8	2028			
38	Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	354	8.7	2030			
40	Enderby (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_England	310	8.64	2030			
42	Gretna	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	400	8	2029			
43	Rayleigh BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	290	8	2029			
44	Chickerell Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	400	8	2029			
47	Westport Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	150	10.2	2030			
49	Chessington BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029			
50	Connahs	Li-ion BESS	N_Wales	500	8	2029			
52	Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	341	10	2030			
53	Nexus 1	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	1800	8.7	2030			
54	Plumpton Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	1000	8	2030			
56	Solomons Farm BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	2029			
57	Canner's Lane	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030			
58	Navenby Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030			
59	Dalby Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	2030			
60	Mowbray Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2029			
61	Hawthorn Pit	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030			
62	Al Boum Photo	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	100	11.11	2032			

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Ranking	Project	Technology	Region	Capacity	Duration	First Operation	EA Adjustment	FA Adjustments	SA Adjustments
64	Swinford Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_England	1000	8	2030			
65	Bellmoor Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	2030			
66	Didcot Parkway	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	138	8	2029			
67	Lapwing	Li-ion BESS	E_England	249.6	11.68	2030			
68	Middleton BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	100	8	2029			
69	Old Rides	Li-ion BESS	London	1000	8	2030			
71	Caithness BESS	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	456	8	2030			
72	Aberthaw Energy	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	249	8	2030			
10	Hunterston	LAES/BESS	S_Scotland	300	8	2030		Yes	
11	Killingholme 1	LAES/BESS	E_Midlands	300	8	2030		Yes	
13	Kincardine	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	145	8	2029			Yes
23	Glenmuckloch	PSH	S_Scotland	182	9.1	2030		Yes	
24	Loch na Cathrach	PSH	N_Scotland	500	8	2030		Yes	
25	Neilston BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	100	11.11	2029			Yes
36	Frontier Grange Lane	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	99	8	2030		Yes	
39	Frontier Weaver	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	120	8	2030		Yes	
41	Frontier Ayr	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	200	8	2030		Yes	
45	Frontier Busby	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	150	8	2030		Yes	
46	Frontier Norwich	VFB/Zn	E_England	85	8	2031		Yes	
48	Frontier Willington	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	90	8	2030		Yes	
51	LDES Barry	VFB	S_Wales	50	8	2030		Yes	
55	Hagshaw	VFB	S_Scotland	500	8	2030		Yes	
63	LDES Roosecote	VFB	W_Midlands	50	8	2030		Yes	
70	Spirebush	VFB	S_Scotland	100	8	2030		Yes	
73	Deeside Power	VFB	N_Wales	50	8	2028		No data	

9. Next steps

This section sets out the next steps. Following consultation, we intend to publish our Window 1: Final Awards in Autumn 2026 alongside the associated regulatory framework and development requirements. We also expect to undertake consultation on design of future windows in 2026 and confirm our position by 2027.

Consultation questions in this section

Q4. Do you agree with opening further applications windows?

Consultation – Minded-to decisions

9.1 Consultation on our Window 1: Minded-to Decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage cap and floor regime closes on 07 August 2026. This consultation seeks your views on whether the approach, methodology and evidence have been applied appropriately, including the proportionate, fair and consistent use of submitted evidence and standardised assumptions to reach our minded-to decision.

9.2 We will consider consultation responses carefully before reaching a final decision. In particular, we will consider whether any representation identifies a material methodological issue, evidential error, inconsistency in the application of the assessment framework, or other relevant matter that may justify further analysis, correction or adjustment before final decisions are made.

Publication – Final awards

9.3 We intend to publish our Window 1: Final Awards – Long Duration Electricity Storage cap and floor regime in Autumn 2026. As mentioned above, we also expect to put in place clear delivery requirements, including conditions and ongoing project milestones to ensure projects develop in line with their delivery plans, which will allow us to revoke cap and floor agreements from projects that are not making sufficient progress.

9.4 These will include but are not limited to, progress in securing connections and financing, reaching final investment decision, demonstrating construction progress, meeting testing and commissioning requirements, and achieving commercial operation. Projects must also provide regular reporting on progress, risks, and any material delivery constraints, including how these are being managed.

9.5 We will also continue to develop and finalise the regulatory framework, including licence conditions informed by stakeholder feedback, and the Regulatory Instructions and Guidance (RIGs). These documents will also reflect requirements for project delivery, reporting and operation under the regime.

Future windows – consultation

9.6 We acknowledge that this is the first application window for the LDES cap and floor scheme. Developing a clear future pipeline will benefit both developers and consumers by ensuring that we can retain the strong levels of interest we have seen in this window. We expect to open further windows to address any possible attrition, or where delivery risks arise from Window 1, and to ensure capacity requirements align with future system needs.

9.7 We intend to consult this year on the design of possible future windows following the outcome of Window 1, with the aim of confirming our intent to open a second window by 2027. Opening will be subject to consultation, development of clear evidence from the forthcoming SSEP on specific system requirements, further Ofgem policy work to develop the regime and selection process, including learning lessons from Window 1.

9.8 We expect to consider multiple factors as part of this consultation, including but not limited to:

- the specific system needs and requirements informed by the SSEP
- alignment with overall energy system reforms
- whether current regime parameters remain appropriate
- overall improvements to selection process
- the possible role of emerging technologies.

9.9 We also recognise the importance of maintaining investor confidence and avoiding unnecessary costs for developers. In designing any future window, we will consider options to streamline participation for projects previously assessed in Window 1, where appropriate. There will be no automatic route into a future window, but projects unsuccessful in Window 1 will not be excluded.

Send us your feedback

We believe that consultation is at the heart of good policy development. We are keen to receive your comments about this consultation. We would also like to get your answers to these questions:

- Do you have any comments about the quality of this document?
- Do you have any comments about its tone and content?
- Was it easy to read and understand? Or could it have been better written?
- Are its conclusions balanced?
- Did it make reasoned recommendations?
- Do you have any further comments?

Please send your feedback to stakeholders@ofgem.gov.uk.

Appendix 1. Key project inputs

Table 6: Key project inputs

Project	Technology	Region	Capacity (MW)	Duration (hours)	RTE (%)	Regime duration (years)	First Operation	Track
Aberthaw Energy	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	249	8	91	25	2030	Track 1
Al Boum Photo	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	100	11.11	90	25	2032	Track 2
Bellmoor Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Branxton BESS	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	480	8	91	25	2029	Track 1
Caithness BESS	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	456	8	88	25	2030	Track 1
Canner's Lane	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Chessington BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	90	25	2029	Track 1
Chickerell Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	400	8	89	25	2029	Track 1
Coire Glas	PSH	N_Scotland	1440	32	82	25	2033	Track 2
Connahs	Li-ion BESS	N_Wales	500	8	85	25	2029	Track 1
Dalby	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Deeside	VFB	N_Wales	50	8	69	25	2028	Track 1
Didcot Parkway	Li-ion BESS	S_Wales	138	8	90	25	2029	Track 1
Drakelow (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	385	8.7	91*	25	2030	Track 1
Earba PSH	PSH	N_Scotland	1800	15	79	25	2033	Track 2
East Claydon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	12	90	25	2030	Track 1
Enderby (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_England	310	8.64	91*	25	2030	Track 1
Exeter Storage	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	250	8	90	25	2028	Track 1
Field Fyrish	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	16.5	87	25	2030	Track 1
Field Long Stratton	Li-ion BESS	E_England	400	16.05	90	25	2033	Track 2

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Technology	Region	Capacity (MW)	Duration (hours)	RTE (%)	Regime duration (years)	First Operation	Track
Field Netherton	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	16.3	87	25	2030	Track 1
Field New Deer	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	400	18.03	85	25	2030	Track 1
Field Rigifa	Li-ion BESS	N_Scotland	200	18.03	85	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Astwood	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Ayr	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Botley	VFB/Zn	S_Wales	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Bramford 1	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Bramford 2	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Busby	VFB/Zn	S_Scotland	150	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Grange Lane	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	99	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Hockcliffe	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Legacy	VFB/Zn	N_Wales	65	8	62	25	2029	Track 1
Frontier Market	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Navenby	VFB/Zn	E_Midlands	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Norwich	VFB/Zn	E_England	85	8	62	25	2031	Track 2
Frontier Pelham	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Weaver	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	120	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Willington	VFB/Zn	W_Midlands	90	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Frontier Wymondley	VFB/Zn	E_England	200	8	62	25	2030	Track 1
Glenmuckloch	PSH	S_Scotland	182	9.1	61	25	2030	Track 1
Gretna	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	400	8	91	25	2029	Track 1
Hagshaw	VFB	S_Scotland	500	8	69	25	2030	Track 1
Hawthorn Pit	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Hunterston	LAES/BESS	S_Scotland	300	8	See note**	25	2030	Track 1

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Technology	Region	Capacity (MW)	Duration (hours)	RTE (%)	Regime duration (years)	First Operation	Track
Killingholme 1	LAES/BESS	E_Midlands	300	8	See note**	25	2030	Track 1
Kincardine	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	145	8	91	25	2029	Track 1
Lapwing	Li-ion BESS	E_England	249.6	11.68	90	25	2030	Track 1
LDES Barry	VFB	S_Wales	50	8	69	25	2030	Track 1
LDES Roosecote	VFB	W_Midlands	50	8	69	25	2030	Track 1
Loch Kemp Storage	PSH	N_Scotland	660	22.3	80	25	2030	Track 1
Loch na Cathrach	PSH	N_Scotland	500	8	78	25	2030	Track 1
Middleton BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	100	8	84	25	2029	Track 1
Mossmorran	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	200	8	91	25	2029	Track 1
Mowbray Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	NE_England	1000	8	85	25	2029	Track 1
Navenby Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Neilston BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	100	11.11	90	25	2029	Track 1
Neilston BESS 3	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	300	11.22	90	25	2030	Track 1
Nexus 1	Li-ion BESS	SW_England	1800	8.7	87	25	2030	Track 1
Ocker Hill BESS	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	145	8	91	25	2029	Track 1
Old Rides	Li-ion BESS	London	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Plumpton Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	W_Midlands	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
Rayleigh BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	290	8	91	25	2029	Track 1
Solomons Farm BESS	Li-ion BESS	London	240	11.17	90	25	2029	Track 1
Spirebush	VFB	S_Scotland	100	8	69	25	2030	Track 1
Springwell	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	400	11.1	91	25	2030	Track 1
Sundon Storage	Li-ion BESS	E_England	500	8	89	25	2030	Track 1
Swinford Energy Park	Li-ion BESS	E_England	1000	8	85	25	2030	Track 1
TeesCAES	CAES	NE_England	50	30	62	25	2029	Track 1

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Technology	Region	Capacity (MW)	Duration (hours)	RTE (%)	Regime duration (years)	First Operation	Track
Thornton BESS 2	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	100	11.11	90	25	2029	Track 1
Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	341	10	91	25	2030	Track 1
Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	354	8.7	91*	25	2030	Track 1
Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	Li-ion BESS	E_Midlands	336	8.7	91*	25	2033	Track 2
Westport Energy Storage	Li-ion BESS	S_Scotland	150	10.2	83	25	2030	Track 1

*These projects had their RTE capped in accordance with paragraph 5.6.

**Due to the hybrid design of these projects, round-trip efficiency varies across the underlying technologies. This was reflected in the modelling, and no single RTE value is reported in this table.

Appendix 2. Project Assessment Results overview

A2.1 The table below presents the key outputs from the Economic Assessment, Financial Assessment, and Strategic Assessment for each project. The Economic Assessment outputs comprise the final score, monetised component score, and non-monetised component score. The Financial Assessment outputs comprise the submitted Financial Assessment (FA) score, based on project-submitted revenue assumptions, and the FA score with adjusted revenues following our assessment. The Strategic Assessment outputs comprise the Deliverability score and the Scenario Analysis score, which reflects the aggregate deviation in Economic Assessment ranking across the alternative FES and weather year scenarios assessed.

Table 7: Project Assessment results

Project	Final EA Score	Monetised Score	Non-monetised Score	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score	Deliverability Score	Scenario Analysis Score
Aberthaw Energy	30.51	13.41	17.09	Above	Above	Amber	20
Al Boum Photo	44.79	12.96	31.83	Above	Above	Green	49
Bellmoor Energy Park	43.26	10.74	32.51	Above	Above	Amber	78
Branxton BESS	66.00	36.82	29.18	Above	Above	Amber	-17
Caithness BESS	40.15	12.56	27.59	Above	Above	Amber	42
Canner's Lane	46.24	12.94	33.31	Above	Above	Amber	50
Chessington BESS	49.95	23.00	26.95	Above	Above	Amber	19
Chickerell Storage	55.38	29.52	25.86	Above	Above	Green	13
Coire Glas	170.39	77.49	92.90	Above	Above	Green	2
Connahs	48.99	16.33	32.66	Above	Above	Amber	-3
Dalby Energy Storage	45.56	10.86	34.70	Above	Above	Amber	72
Deeside Power	26.05	5.23	20.82	No data	No data	Amber	0
Didcot Parkway	43.17	24.27	18.91	Above	Above	Amber	-1
Drakelow (Innova)	70.96	20.70	50.26	Above	Above	Amber	-12
Earba PSH	112.09	53.15	58.93	Above	Above	Green	1

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Final EA Score	Monetised Score	Non-monetised Score	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score	Deliverability Score	Scenario Analysis Score
East Claydon Storage	75.91	27.55	48.36	Above	Above	Amber	1
Enderby (Innova)	57.18	16.20	40.97	Above	Above	Amber	51
Exeter Storage	60.78	33.60	27.18	Above	Above	Green	46
Field Fyrish	94.04	32.37	61.67	Above	Above	Amber	9
Field Long Stratton	93.06	31.62	61.44	Above	Above	Amber	-19
Field Netherton	102.16	39.26	62.89	Above	Above	Amber	-3
Field New Deer	101.44	38.26	63.17	Above	Above	Amber	-8
Field Rigifa	95.27	27.90	67.37	Above	Above	Amber	4
Frontier Astwood	62.08	16.86	45.21	Above	Above	Amber	-13
Frontier Ayr	56.43	13.54	42.89	Above	Below	Green	-20
Frontier Botley	63.35	17.40	45.95	Above	Above	Amber	-11
Frontier Bramford 1	62.20	16.97	45.22	Above	Above	Amber	-17
Frontier Bramford 2	62.60	17.24	45.37	Above	Above	Amber	-15
Frontier Busby	54.35	10.91	43.44	Above	Below	Green	-15
Frontier Grange Lane	61.73	22.84	38.90	Above	Below	Amber	-60
Frontier Hockcliffe	62.00	16.92	45.09	Above	Above	Amber	-13
Frontier Legacy	69.32	30.57	38.75	Above	Below	Amber	-149
Frontier Market	62.10	16.69	45.41	Above	Above	Amber	3
Frontier Navenby	62.60	17.61	44.99	Above	Above	Amber	-13
Frontier Norwich	52.83	10.53	42.29	Above	Below	Green	7
Frontier Pelham	62.73	17.28	45.44	Above	Above	Amber	-14
Frontier Weaver	59.12	19.59	39.53	Above	Below	Green	-24
Frontier Willington	50.17	6.06	44.11	Above	Below	Amber	0
Frontier Wymondley	62.36	17.15	45.21	Above	Above	Amber	-16
Glenmuckloch	64.06	25.51	38.54	Above	Below	Green	-23

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Final EA Score	Monetised Score	Non-monetised Score	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score	Deliverability Score	Scenario Analysis Score
Gretna	55.66	35.49	20.17	Above	Above	Amber	17
Hagshaw	47.84	9.70	38.14	Above	Below	Amber	-25
Hawthorn Pit	45.34	13.82	31.52	Above	Above	Amber	65
Hunterston	84.77	0.00	84.77	Above	Below	Green	-39
Killingholme 1	77.80	0.88	76.92	Above	Below	Amber	-61
Kincardine	73.35	54.46	18.89	Above	Above	Amber	-156
Lapwing	42.73	17.61	25.12	Above	Above	Green	38
LDES Barry	48.76	15.35	33.41	Above	Below	Amber	-4
LDES Roosecote	44.04	9.99	34.05	Above	Below	Amber	20
Loch Kemp Storage	180.12	100.00	80.12	Above	Above	Green	-2
Loch na Cathrach	63.73	25.79	37.94	Above	Below	Green	-23
Middleton BESS	42.65	20.72	21.93	Above	Above	Amber	43
Mossmorran	61.78	40.80	20.98	Above	Above	Amber	-29
Mowbray Energy Park	45.51	16.33	29.18	Above	Above	Amber	47
Navenby Energy Park	45.91	11.06	34.85	Above	Above	Amber	57
Neilston BESS 2	63.72	41.91	21.81	Above	Above	Green	-123
Neilston BESS 3	66.96	34.01	32.95	Above	Above	Amber	-31
Nexus 1	48.37	14.42	33.96	Above	Above	Green	22
Ocker Hill BESS	73.27	44.94	28.33	Above	Above	Amber	-55
Old Rides	42.55	11.32	31.24	Above	Above	Amber	74
Plumpton Energy Park	48.01	11.28	36.73	Above	Above	Amber	63
Rayleigh BESS	55.45	31.23	24.22	Above	Above	Green	51
Solomons Farm BESS	47.21	22.89	24.31	Above	Above	Amber	27
Spirebush	42.48	10.79	31.70	Above	Below	Green	-3
Springwell	69.12	27.44	41.68	Above	Above	Amber	-6

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Final EA Score	Monetised Score	Non-monetised Score	Submitted FA Score	Assessed FA Score	Deliverability Score	Scenario Analysis Score
Sundon Storage	72.14	25.19	46.95	Above	Above	Amber	7
Swinford Energy Park	43.41	9.57	33.84	Above	Above	Amber	58
TeesCAES	118.20	25.97	92.23	Above	Above	Amber	-17
Thornton BESS 2	67.58	42.76	24.82	Above	Above	Green	-77
Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	48.50	17.31	31.19	Above	Above	Green	-5
Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	60.22	15.09	45.12	Above	Above	Green	61
Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	65.38	12.52	52.85	Above	Above	Green	38
Westport Energy Storage	51.71	23.20	28.52	Above	Above	Amber	-33

Appendix 3. Economic Assessment final outputs

A3.1 The table below presents the Economic Assessment ranking and final scores for each project. The final score comprises a weighted monetised component score and a weighted non-monetised component score. The weighted non-monetised component score is derived from six components: Security of Supply (SoS), Avoided Renewable Curtailment (ARC), System Operability (SO), Wider Economic and Social Impacts (WESI), Real-time Flexibility (RTF), and Option Value (OV).

Table 8: Economic Assessment results

Project	Ranking	Final Score	Monetised Score	Non-Monetised Score	SoS	ARC	SO	WESI	RTF	OV
Aberthaw Energy	72	30.51	13.41	17.09	5.39	1.92	9.79	0.00	0.00	0.00
Al Boum Photo	62	44.79	12.96	31.83	15.64	1.88	11.63	1.85	0.00	0.83
Bellmoor	65	43.26	10.74	32.51	6.40	5.08	14.92	4.44	0.00	1.67
Branxton BESS	21	66.00	36.82	29.18	2.26	2.67	22.58	0.00	0.00	1.67
Caithness BESS	71	40.15	12.56	27.59	7.06	4.21	15.49	0.00	0.00	0.83
Canner's Lane	57	46.24	12.94	33.31	4.99	5.40	17.63	4.44	0.00	0.83
Chessington BESS	49	49.95	23.00	26.95	9.59	4.70	9.23	2.59	0.00	0.83
Chickerell Storage	44	55.38	29.52	25.86	3.33	3.04	11.99	6.67	0.00	0.83
Coire Glas	2	170.39	77.49	92.90	47.50	18.72	15.20	11.48	0.00	0.00
Connahs	50	48.99	16.33	32.66	4.46	5.52	14.81	7.04	0.00	0.83
Dalby	59	45.56	10.86	34.70	7.16	4.89	18.40	2.59	0.00	1.67
Deeside Power	73	26.05	5.23	20.82	0.00	9.99	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.83
Didcot Parkway	66	43.17	24.27	18.91	2.34	2.69	10.37	1.85	0.00	1.67
Drakelow (Innova)	16	70.96	20.70	50.26	7.66	2.37	23.85	5.56	9.99	0.83
Earba PSH	4	112.09	53.15	58.93	23.42	9.28	14.37	11.85	0.00	0.00
East Claydon	12	75.91	27.55	48.36	13.43	4.92	21.67	6.67	0.00	1.67

Enderby (Innova)	40	57.18	16.20	40.97	7.66	2.25	14.67	5.56	10.00	0.83
Exeter Storage	37	60.78	33.60	27.18	1.48	3.19	14.17	6.67	0.00	1.67
Field Fyrish	8	94.04	32.37	61.67	19.16	10.45	16.34	8.15	7.57	0.00
Field Long Stratton	9	93.06	31.62	61.44	25.17	5.65	14.90	8.15	7.57	0.00
Field Netherton	5	102.16	39.26	62.89	20.23	9.63	17.31	8.15	7.57	0.00
Field New Deer	6	101.44	38.26	63.17	22.74	12.24	14.32	6.30	7.57	0.00
Field Rigifa	7	95.27	27.90	67.37	20.98	12.70	17.97	8.15	7.57	0.00
Frontier Astwood	33	62.08	16.86	45.21	3.55	10.14	11.53	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Ayr	41	56.43	13.54	42.89	3.60	10.15	9.13	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Botley	26	63.35	17.40	45.95	3.41	10.20	12.35	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Bramford 1	31	62.20	16.97	45.22	3.50	10.16	11.56	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Bramford 2	28	62.60	17.24	45.37	3.50	10.16	11.71	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Busby	45	54.35	10.91	43.44	2.73	10.49	10.21	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Grange Lane	36	61.73	22.84	38.90	2.23	10.64	6.02	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Hockcliffe	34	62.00	16.92	45.09	3.41	10.20	11.48	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Legacy	17	69.32	30.57	38.75	1.90	10.89	5.96	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Market	32	62.10	16.69	45.41	3.41	10.26	11.74	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Navenby	29	62.60	17.61	44.99	3.41	10.20	11.38	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Norwich	46	52.83	10.53	42.29	5.47	7.08	9.74	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Pelham	27	62.73	17.28	45.44	3.55	10.14	11.76	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Weaver	39	59.12	19.59	39.53	2.30	10.73	6.50	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Willington	48	50.17	6.06	44.11	2.19	10.69	11.24	20.00	0.00	0.00
Frontier Wymondley	30	62.36	17.15	45.21	3.41	10.20	11.61	20.00	0.00	0.00
Glenmuckloch	23	64.06	25.51	38.54	5.59	15.59	6.26	11.11	0.00	0.00
Gretna	42	55.66	35.49	20.17	2.26	2.75	13.49	0.00	0.00	1.67
Hagshaw	55	47.84	9.70	38.14	4.12	8.42	8.10	16.67	0.00	0.83
Hawthorn Pit	61	45.34	13.82	31.52	5.35	5.33	14.72	4.44	0.00	1.67

Hunterston	10	84.77	0.00	84.77	43.65	16.02	9.44	14.81	0.00	0.83
Killingholme 1	11	77.80	0.88	76.92	43.65	15.99	1.63	14.81	0.00	0.83
Kincardine	13	73.35	54.46	18.89	2.26	2.40	12.57	0.00	0.00	1.67
Lapwing	67	42.73	17.61	25.12	11.67	5.03	7.59	0.00	0.00	0.83
LDES Barry	51	48.76	15.35	33.41	4.77	8.02	3.12	16.67	0.00	0.83
LDES Roosecote	63	44.04	9.99	34.05	4.77	7.98	3.80	16.67	0.00	0.83
Loch Kemp Storage	1	180.12	100.00	80.12	26.64	21.07	18.45	13.70	0.26	0.00
Loch na Cathrach	24	63.73	25.79	37.94	5.63	6.96	9.80	15.56	0.00	0.00
Middleton BESS	68	42.65	20.72	21.93	2.26	4.61	15.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mossmorran	35	61.78	40.80	20.98	2.26	2.47	14.59	0.00	0.00	1.67
Mowbray Energy Park	60	45.51	16.33	29.18	3.58	5.77	14.56	4.44	0.00	0.83
Navenby Energy Park	58	45.91	11.06	34.85	6.51	5.02	18.04	4.44	0.00	0.83
Neilston BESS 2	25	63.72	41.91	21.81	8.82	4.91	8.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
Neilston BESS 3	20	66.96	34.01	32.95	10.01	4.78	17.33	0.00	0.00	0.83
Nexus 1	53	48.37	14.42	33.96	8.10	3.95	11.59	5.19	4.31	0.83
Ocker Hill BESS	14	73.27	44.94	28.33	3.62	2.16	20.88	0.00	0.00	1.67
Old Rides	69	42.55	11.32	31.24	5.99	5.15	14.81	4.44	0.00	0.83
Plumpton Energy Park	54	48.01	11.28	36.73	7.16	4.88	21.27	2.59	0.00	0.83
Rayleigh BESS	43	55.45	31.23	24.22	3.82	2.24	16.50	0.00	0.00	1.67
Solomons Farm BESS	56	47.21	22.89	24.31	9.59	4.70	9.19	0.00	0.00	0.83
Spirebush	70	42.48	10.79	31.70	4.76	7.98	3.31	14.81	0.00	0.83
Springwell	18	69.12	27.44	41.68	12.40	3.73	23.70	1.85	0.00	0.00
Sundon Storage	15	72.14	25.19	46.95	6.23	2.38	30.00	6.67	0.00	1.67
Swinford Energy Park	64	43.41	9.57	33.84	6.29	5.11	16.33	4.44	0.00	1.67
TeesCAES	3	118.20	25.97	92.23	27.93	38.00	8.06	17.41	0.00	0.83
Thornton BESS 2	19	67.58	42.76	24.82	7.80	5.02	11.17	0.00	0.00	0.83
Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	52	48.50	17.31	31.19	7.53	3.66	16.48	1.85	0.00	1.67

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	38	60.22	15.09	45.12	8.91	2.09	21.46	1.85	9.98	0.83
Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	22	65.38	12.52	52.85	14.22	0.00	25.97	1.85	9.98	0.83
Westport Energy Storage	47	51.71	23.20	28.52	9.68	5.74	9.30	2.96	0.00	0.83

Appendix 4. Economic Assessment normalised outputs

A4.1 The table below presents the normalised scores for each Economic Assessment component. For each component, project scores are normalised on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest-scoring project and 100 represents the highest-scoring project. These scores are presented before the application of weighting.

Table 9: Economic Assessment normalised outputs

Project	BCR	SoS	ARC	SO	WESI	RTF	OV
Aberthaw Energy	13.41	11.34	5.04	32.6	0.0	-	-
Al Boum Photo	12.96	32.92	4.95	38.8	9.3	-	50.00
Bellmoor Energy Park	10.74	13.48	13.37	49.7	22.2	-	100.00
Branxton BESS	36.82	4.75	7.03	75.3	0.0	-	100.00
Caithness BESS	12.56	14.86	11.07	51.6	0.0	-	50.00
Canner's Lane	12.94	10.51	14.21	58.8	22.2	-	50.00
Chessington BESS	23.00	20.19	12.38	30.8	13.0	-	50.00
Chickerell Storage	29.52	7.01	8.00	40.0	33.3	-	50.00
Coire Glas Hydro	77.49	100.00	49.25	50.7	57.4	-	-
Connahs	16.33	9.39	14.52	49.4	35.2	-	50.00
Dalby Energy Storage	10.86	15.07	12.87	61.3	13.0	-	100.00
Deeside Power	5.23	-	26.29	0.0	50.0	-	50.00
Didcot Parkway	24.27	4.92	7.07	34.6	9.3	-	100.00
Drakelow (Innova)	20.70	16.13	6.23	79.5	27.8	99.93	50.00
Earba PSH	53.15	49.31	24.43	47.9	59.3	-	-
East Claydon Storage	27.55	28.28	12.95	72.2	33.3	-	100.00
Enderby (Innova)	16.20	16.13	5.92	48.9	27.8	100.00	50.00
Exeter Storage	33.60	3.12	8.41	47.2	33.3	-	100.00
Field Fyrish	32.37	40.34	27.50	54.5	40.7	75.73	-

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	BCR	SoS	ARC	SO	WESI	RTF	OV
Field Long Stratton	31.62	53.00	14.87	49.7	40.7	75.73	-
Field Netherton	39.26	42.59	25.35	57.7	40.7	75.73	-
Field New Deer	38.26	47.87	32.22	47.7	31.5	75.73	-
Field Rigifa	27.90	44.16	33.42	59.9	40.7	75.73	-
Frontier Astwood	16.86	7.48	26.67	38.4	100.0	-	-
Frontier Ayr	13.54	7.58	26.72	30.4	100.0	-	-
Frontier Botley	17.40	7.17	26.83	41.2	100.0	-	-
Frontier Bramford 1	16.97	7.38	26.72	38.5	100.0	-	-
Frontier Bramford 2	17.24	7.38	26.72	39.0	100.0	-	-
Frontier Busby	10.91	5.75	27.61	34.0	100.0	-	-
Frontier Grange Lane	22.84	4.70	28.01	20.1	100.0	-	-
Frontier Hockcliffe	16.92	7.17	26.83	38.3	100.0	-	-
Frontier Legacy	30.57	4.01	28.65	19.9	100.0	-	-
Frontier Market	16.69	7.17	27.00	39.1	100.0	-	-
Frontier Navenby	17.61	7.17	26.83	37.9	100.0	-	-
Frontier Norwich	10.53	11.52	18.63	32.5	100.0	-	-
Frontier Pelham	17.28	7.48	26.67	39.2	100.0	-	-
Frontier Weaver	19.59	4.83	28.25	21.7	100.0	-	-
Frontier Willington	6.06	4.60	28.12	37.5	100.0	-	-
Frontier Wymondley	17.15	7.17	26.83	38.7	100.0	-	-
Glenmuckloch	25.51	11.76	41.02	20.9	55.6	-	-
Gretna	35.49	4.75	7.25	45.0	0.0	-	100.00
Hagshaw	9.70	8.66	22.16	27.0	83.3	-	50.00
Hawthorn Pit	13.82	11.27	14.02	49.1	22.2	-	100.00
Hunterston	-	91.90	42.16	31.5	74.1	-	50.00
Killingholme 1	0.88	91.90	42.07	5.4	74.1	-	50.00

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	BCR	SoS	ARC	SO	WESI	RTF	OV
Kincardine	54.46	4.75	6.31	41.9	0.0	-	100.00
Lapwing	17.61	24.57	13.25	25.3	0.0	-	50.00
LDES Barry	15.35	10.04	21.10	10.4	83.3	-	50.00
LDES Roosecote	9.99	10.04	20.99	12.7	83.3	-	50.00
Loch Kemp Storage	100.00	56.09	55.44	61.5	68.5	2.60	-
Loch na Cathrach	25.79	11.84	18.33	32.7	77.8	-	-
Middleton BESS	20.72	4.75	12.14	50.2	0.0	-	-
Mossmorran	40.80	4.75	6.50	48.6	0.0	-	100.00
Mowbray Energy Park	16.33	7.53	15.18	48.5	22.2	-	50.00
Navenby Energy Park	11.06	13.70	13.22	60.1	22.2	-	50.00
Neilston BESS 2	41.91	18.58	12.91	26.9	0.0	-	-
Neilston BESS 3	34.01	21.07	12.58	57.8	0.0	-	50.00
Nexus 1	14.42	17.04	10.39	38.6	25.9	43.07	50.00
Ocker Hill BESS	44.94	7.62	5.69	69.6	0.0	-	100.00
Old Rides	11.32	12.62	13.56	49.4	22.2	-	50.00
Plumpton Energy Park	11.28	15.07	12.85	70.9	13.0	-	50.00
Rayleigh BESS	31.23	8.04	5.88	55.0	0.0	-	100.00
Solomons Farm BESS	22.89	20.19	12.38	30.6	0.0	-	50.00
Spirebush	10.79	10.01	21.00	11.0	74.1	-	50.00
Springwell	27.44	26.10	9.82	79.0	9.3	-	-
Sundon Storage	25.19	13.12	6.26	100.0	33.3	-	100.00
Swinford Energy Park	9.57	13.24	13.44	54.4	22.2	-	100.00
TeesCAES	25.97	58.80	100.00	26.9	87.0	-	50.00
Thornton BESS 2	42.76	16.43	13.20	37.2	0.0	-	50.00
Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	17.31	15.86	9.64	54.9	9.3	-	100.00
Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	15.09	18.77	5.49	71.5	9.3	99.84	50.00

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	BCR	SoS	ARC	SO	WESI	RTF	OV
Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	12.52	29.94	0.00	86.6	9.3	99.78	50.00
Westport Energy Storage	23.20	20.38	15.10	31.0	14.8	-	50.00

Appendix 5. Strategic Assessment outputs

A5.1 The table below presents the Strategic Assessment results for each project. This includes the Deliverability score and the Scenario Analysis score. The Scenario Analysis score reflects the aggregate deviation in a project's Economic Assessment ranking across alternative Future Energy Scenarios (FES) and weather year sensitivities. The scenario-specific columns show the deviation in Economic Assessment ranking under each individual scenario.

Table 10: Strategic Assessment outputs

Project	Deliverability	Scenario Analysis	Electric Engagement	Falling Behind	Weather year 1990	Weather year 1997
Aberthaw Energy	Amber	20	2	1	14	3
Al Boum Photo	Green	49	5	10	-4	38
Bellmoor Energy Park	Amber	78	30	38	9	1
Branxton BESS	Amber	-17	-4	0	-16	3
Caithness BESS	Amber	42	2	16	16	8
Canner's Lane	Amber	50	25	29	0	-4
Chessington BESS	Amber	19	-10	0	9	20
Chickerell Storage	Green	13	-4	11	5	1
Coire Glas	Green	2	1	1	0	0
Connahs	Amber	-3	-4	4	2	-5
Dalby Energy Storage	Amber	72	30	34	5	3
Deeside Power Energy Hub	Amber	0	0	0	0	0
Didcot Parkway	Amber	-1	-6	-6	16	-5
Drakelow (Innova)	Amber	-12	-1	0	-10	-1
Earba PSH	Green	1	0	1	-1	1
East Claydon Storage	Amber	1	-1	3	-6	5
Enderby (Innova)	Amber	51	12	16	4	19

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Deliverability	Scenario Analysis	Electric Engagement	Falling Behind	Weather year 1990	Weather year 1997
Exeter Storage	Green	46	16	-21	29	22
Field Fyrish	Amber	9	3	-2	5	3
Field Long Stratton	Amber	-19	-1	2	-19	-1
Field Netherton	Amber	-3	-2	0	-2	1
Field New Deer	Amber	-8	-2	0	-4	-2
Field Rigifa	Amber	4	1	-1	3	1
Frontier Astwood	Amber	-13	-13	-8	11	-3
Frontier Ayr	Green	-20	-14	-4	-1	-1
Frontier Botley	Amber	-11	-13	-6	12	-4
Frontier Bramford 1	Amber	-17	-14	-9	10	-4
Frontier Bramford 2	Amber	-15	-14	-7	11	-5
Frontier Busby	Green	-15	-7	-6	4	-6
Frontier Grange Lane	Amber	-60	-22	-23	1	-16
Frontier Hockcliffe	Amber	-13	-13	-8	11	-3
Frontier Legacy	Amber	-149	-48	-40	-51	-10
Frontier Market	Amber	3	-2	-4	5	4
Frontier Navenby	Amber	-13	-15	-9	13	-2
Frontier Norwich	Green	7	-21	-1	21	8
Frontier Pelham	Amber	-14	-14	-7	12	-5
Frontier Weaver	Green	-24	-14	-17	15	-8
Frontier Willington	Amber	0	22	-2	-19	-1
Frontier Wymondley	Amber	-16	-13	-9	10	-4
Glenmuckloch	Green	-23	11	4	-15	-23
Gretna	Amber	17	-7	-1	9	16
Hagshaw	Amber	-25	-7	2	-7	-13

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Deliverability	Scenario Analysis	Electric Engagement	Falling Behind	Weather year 1990	Weather year 1997
Hawthorn Pit	Amber	65	34	32	0	-1
Hunterston	Green	-39	1	-1	-9	-30
Killingholme 1	Amber	-61	0	-4	-23	-34
Kincardine	Amber	-156	-55	-56	-38	-7
Lapwing	Green	38	3	7	18	10
LDES Barry	Amber	-4	29	-11	-19	-3
LDES Roosecote	Amber	20	7	2	-8	19
Loch Kemp Storage	Green	-2	-1	-1	0	0
Loch na Cathrach	Green	-23	8	7	-21	-17
Middleton BESS	Amber	43	8	-2	22	15
Mossmorran	Amber	-29	-16	-29	6	10
Mowbray Energy Park	Amber	47	29	23	0	-5
Navenby Energy Park	Amber	57	28	32	-1	-2
Neilston BESS 2	Green	-123	-12	-42	-44	-25
Neilston BESS 3	Amber	-31	-16	0	-12	-3
Nexus 1	Green	22	20	30	-11	-17
Ocker Hill BESS	Amber	-55	-4	-51	8	-8
Old Rides	Amber	74	29	39	4	2
Plumpton Energy Park	Amber	63	34	32	1	-4
Rayleigh BESS	Green	51	-7	-5	34	29
Solomons Farm BESS	Amber	27	-5	2	13	17
Spirebush	Green	-3	-1	2	-2	-2
Springwell	Amber	-6	-6	6	-12	6
Sundon Storage	Amber	7	0	2	3	2
Swinford Energy Park	Amber	58	26	33	1	-2

Consultation Window 1: Minded-to decisions – Long Duration Electricity Storage

Project	Deliverability	Scenario Analysis	Electric Engagement	Falling Behind	Weather year 1990	Weather year 1997
TeesCAES	Amber	-17	0	-1	-10	-6
Thornton BESS 2	Green	-77	0	-47	-33	3
Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Green	-5	-11	8	5	-7
Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	Green	61	15	20	7	19
Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	Green	38	8	8	11	11
Westport Energy Storage	Amber	-33	-19	-16	3	-1

Appendix 6. Project Assessment Summaries

Project	Summary
Aberthaw Energy	Aberthaw Energy Ltd ranked 72nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 30.51. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 20; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Al Boum Photo	Al Boum Photo LDES Battery Energy Storage System ranked 62nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 44.79. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 49; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Bellmoor Energy Park	Bellmoor Energy Park ranked 65th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 43.26. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 78; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Branxton BESS	Branxton BESS ranked 21st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 66.00. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -17; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Caithness BESS	Caithness BESS ranked 71st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 40.15. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 42; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Canner's Lane	Canner's Lane Energy Park ranked 57th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 46.24. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 50; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Chessington BESS	Chessington BESS ranked 49th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 49.95. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 19; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor

	portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Chickerell Storage	Chickerell Storage ranked 44th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 55.38. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 13; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Coire Glas	Coire Glas Hydro Pumped Storage Scheme ranked 2nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 170.39. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 2; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Connahs	Connahs Energy Storage ranked 50th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 48.99. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -3; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Dalby Energy Storage	Dalby Energy Storage ranked 59th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 45.56. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 72; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Deeside Power	Deeside Power Energy Hub (L-Ion) DPEH (L) ranked 73rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 26.05. The Financial Assessment was not completed as the financial model was not submitted. No material concerns were identified with the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 0; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and lack of financial data is offset by its performance in the Strategic Assessment, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Didcot Parkway	Didcot Parkway LDES Facility ranked 66th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 43.17. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -1; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Drakelow (Innova)	Drakelow (Innova) ranked 16th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 70.96. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -12; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Earba PSH	Earba PSH ranked 4th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 112.09. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 1; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
East Claydon Storage	East Claydon Storage ranked 12th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 75.91. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 1; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Enderby (Innova)	Enderby (Innova) ranked 40th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 57.18. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 51; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Exeter Storage	Exeter Storage ranked 37th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 60.78. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 46; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Field Fyrish	Field Fyrish Ltd. ranked 8th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 94.04. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 9; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Field Long Stratton	Field Long Stratton Ltd. ranked 9th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 93.06. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -19; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Field Netherton	Field Netherton Ltd. ranked 5th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 102.16. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -3; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Field New Deer	Field New Deer Ltd. ranked 6th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 101.44. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -8; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Field Rigifa	Field Rigifa Ltd. ranked 7th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 95.27. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 4; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Frontier Astwood	Frontier Astwood ranked 33rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.08. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -13; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over

	projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Ayr	Frontier Ayr ranked 41st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 56.43. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -20; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Botley	Frontier Botley ranked 26th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 63.35. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -11; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Bramford 1	Frontier Bramford 1 ranked 31st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.20. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -17; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Frontier Bramford 2	Frontier Bramford 2 ranked 28th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.60. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -15; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Busby	Frontier Busby ranked 45th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 54.35. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -15; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Grange Lane	Frontier Grange Lane ranked 36th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 61.73. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -60; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Hockcliffe	Frontier Hockcliffe ranked 34th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.00. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -13; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the

	project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Legacy	Frontier Legacy ranked 17th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 69.32. However, the project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. In the Strategic Assessment the project was below the Scenario Analysis threshold with a score of -149, and received an Amber deliverability rating. Notwithstanding these factors, our minded-to decision is to include the project in the proposed portfolio for cap and floor support. We have considered its performance across the assessment criteria in the round and note that its economic performance is not materially out of line with other projects we are minded-to support. We have also taken into account the strategic benefit of increasing technology diversity, in particular by including the highest-ranking project utilising Vanadium Flow technology.
Frontier Market	Frontier Market Harborough ranked 32nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.10. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 3; Amber deliverability rating).Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Navenby	Frontier Navenby ranked 29th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.60. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -13; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over

	projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Norwich	Frontier Norwich ranked 46th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 52.83. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 7; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Pelham	Frontier Pelham ranked 27th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.73. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -14; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Weaver	Frontier Weaver ranked 39th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 59.12. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -24; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Frontier Willington	Frontier Willington ranked 48th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 50.17. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 0; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Frontier Wymondley	Frontier Wymondley ranked 30th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 62.36. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -16; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Glenmuckloch	Glenmuckloch Pumped Storage Hydro ranked 23rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 64.06. However, the project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold, indicating a higher potential reliance on floor support. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -23; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified any material evidence to justify departing from our minded-to decision not to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. This conclusion reflects, in particular, its relatively lower economic performance and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold.
Gretna	Gretna Long Duration Energy Storage Project ranked 42nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 55.66. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 17; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the

	proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Hagshaw	Hagshaw LDES ranked 55th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 47.84. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -25; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Hawthorn Pit	Hawthorn Pit Energy Storage ranked 61st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 45.34. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 65; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Hunterston	Hunterston Long Duration Energy Storage Project ranked 10th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 84.77. However, the project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold, indicating a higher potential reliance on floor support. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -39; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified any material evidence to justify departing from our minded-to decision not to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. This conclusion reflects, in particular, its failure to meet the financial threshold, notwithstanding its relatively strong economic performance.

Killingholme 1	Killingholme 1 Long Duration Energy Storage Project ranked 11th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 77.80. However, the project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold, indicating a higher potential reliance on floor support. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -61; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively positive economic ranking offsets its failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Kincardine	Kincardine Long Duration Energy Storage Project ranked 13th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 73.35, and was above the Financial Assessment threshold. However, it did not meet the Scenario Analysis threshold in the Strategic Assessment, with a score of -156, and received an Amber deliverability rating. This indicates a high degree of sensitivity across a range of plausible future scenarios, suggesting the project is unlikely to perform as strongly as indicated in the base case. Taking these factors together, the project's Strategic Assessment results support our minded-to decision not to include it in the proposed portfolio for cap and floor support.
Lapwing	Lapwing ranked 67th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 42.73. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 38; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
LDES Barry	LDES Barry ranked 51st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 48.76. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -4; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment

	threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
LDES Roosecote	LDES Roosecote ranked 63rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 44.04. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 20; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Loch Kemp Storage	Loch Kemp Storage ranked 1st in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 180.12. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -2; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Loch na Cathrach	Loch na Cathrach ranked 24th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 63.73. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold, indicating a higher potential reliance on floor support. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -23; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified any material evidence to justify departing from our minded-to decision not to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. This conclusion reflects, in particular, its relatively lower economic performance and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold.
Middleton BESS	Middleton BESS ranked 68th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 42.65. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 43; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in

	the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Mossmorran	Mossmorran Long Duration Energy Storage Project ranked 35th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 61.78. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -29; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Mowbray Energy Park	Mowbray Energy Park ranked 60th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 45.51. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 47; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Navenby Energy Park	Navenby Energy Park ranked 58th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 45.91. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 57; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Neilston BESS 2	Neilston BESS 2 ranked 25th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 63.72 and was above the Financial Assessment threshold. However, it did not meet the Scenario Analysis threshold in the Strategic Assessment with a score of -123, and received a Green deliverability rating. This indicates a high degree of sensitivity across a range of plausible future scenarios, suggesting the project is unlikely to perform as strongly as indicated in the base case. Taking these factors together, the project's Strategic Assessment results support our minded-to decision not to include it in the proposed portfolio for cap and floor support.
Neilston BESS 3	Neilston BESS 3 ranked 20th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 66.96. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -31; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Nexus 1	Nexus 1 ranked 53rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 48.37. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 22; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Ocker Hill BESS	Ocker Hill BESS ranked 14th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 73.27. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -55; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.

Old Rides	Old Rides Energy Storage ranked 69th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 42.55. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 74; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Plumpton Energy Park	Plumpton Energy Park ranked 54th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 48.01. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 63; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Rayleigh BESS	Rayleigh BESS ranked 43rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 55.45. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 51; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Solomons Farm BESS	Solomons Farm BESS ranked 56th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 47.21. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 27; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor

	portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Spirebush	Spirebush LDES (part of HEC-WE project) ranked 70th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 42.48. The project did not meet the Financial Assessment threshold. No material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -3; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking and failure to meet the Financial Assessment threshold are offset by strategic considerations, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Springwell	Springwell ranked 18th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 69.12. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -6; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Sundon Storage	Sundon Storage ranked 15th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 72.14. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 7; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Swinford Energy Park	Swinford Energy Park ranked 64th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 43.41. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 58; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

TeesCAES	TeesCAES ranked 3rd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 118.20. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -17; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Thornton BESS 2	Thornton BESS 2 ranked 19th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 67.58. The project was above the Financial Assessment threshold, and no material concerns were identified in the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -77; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are minded-to award this project cap and floor support.
Thorpe Marsh (Fidra)	Thorpe Marsh (Fidra) ranked 52nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 48.50. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -5; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova)	Thorpe Marsh 1 (Innova) ranked 38th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 60.22. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 61; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova)	Thorpe Marsh 2 (Innova) ranked 22nd in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 65.38. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of 38; Green deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are

	not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.
Westport Energy Storage Limited	Westport Energy Storage Limited ranked 47th in the Economic Assessment, with a score of 51.71. No material concerns were identified in either the Financial Assessment (above threshold) or the Strategic Assessment (Scenario Analysis score of -33; Amber deliverability rating). Taking these factors together, we are not minded-to include the project in the proposed cap and floor portfolio. We have not identified sufficient evidence that the project's relatively low economic ranking is offset by its performance in the Financial and Strategic Assessments, such that it should be prioritised for cap and floor support over projects that have performed more strongly under our assessment framework.

Appendix 7. Abbreviations

Abbreviation	**Full Meaning**
LDES	Long Duration Electricity Storage
Ofgem	Office of Gas and Electricity Markets
NESO	National Energy System Operator
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
MCA	Multi-Criteria Assessment
SSEP	Strategic Spatial Energy Plan
GW	Gigawatt
GWh	Gigawatt hour
PSH	Pumped Storage Hydro
CAES	Compressed Air Energy Storage
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System
Li-Ion	Lithium Ion
LAES	Liquid Air Energy Storage
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt hour
SQ	Supplementary Questions
DSF	Data Submission Form
Devex	Development Expenditure
Capex	Capital Expenditure
Opex	Operating Expenditure
Repex	Replacement / Renewal Expenditure

Decommex	Decommissioning Expenditure
PCC	Project Cost Ceiling
TNUoS	Transmission Network Use of System
RTE	Round Trip Efficiency
BCR	Benefit Cost Ratio
SEW	Socio-Economic Welfare
DSCR	Debt Service Coverage Ratio
ACOD	Administrative Cap and Floor Default
CFFM	Cap and Floor Financial Model
RIGs	Regulatory Instructions and Guidance
CPIH	Consumer Price Index including owner occupiers' housing costs
CfD	Contracts for Difference
EEU	Expected Energy Unserved
VoLL	Value of Lost Load
ARC	Avoided Renewable Curtailment
SoS	Security of Supply
SO	System Operability
RTF	Real Time Flexibility
WESI	Wider Economic and Social Impacts
OV	Option Value
BM	Balancing Mechanism
VFB	Vanadium Flow Battery
VFB/Zn	Vanadium Flow/Zinc Battery

Appendix 8. Privacy policy

Personal data

The following explains your rights and gives you the information you are entitled to under the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Note that this section only refers to your personal data (your name address and anything that could be used to identify you personally) not the content of your response to the consultation.

1. The identity of the controller and contact details of our Data Protection Officer

The Gas and Electricity Markets Authority is the controller, (for ease of reference, "Ofgem"). The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at dpo@ofgem.gov.uk

2. Why we are collecting your personal data

Your personal data is being collected as an essential part of the consultation process, so that we can contact you regarding your response and for statistical purposes. We may also use it to contact you about related matters.

3. Our legal basis for processing your personal data

As a public authority, the UK GDPR makes provision for Ofgem to process personal data as necessary for the effective performance of a task carried out in the public interest. i.e. a consultation.

4. With whom we will be sharing your personal data

We may share your personal data with NESO and DESNZ.

5. For how long we will keep your personal data, or criteria used to determine the retention period.

Your personal data will be held for six months after the publication of the decision for the Project Assessment for Window 1 of the LDES cap and floor.

6. Your rights

The data we are collecting is your personal data, and you have considerable say over what happens to it. You have the right to:

- know how we use your personal data
- access your personal data
- have personal data corrected if it is inaccurate or incomplete
- ask us to delete personal data when we no longer need it
- ask us to restrict how we process your data
- get your data from us and re-use it across other services

- object to certain ways we use your data
- be safeguarded against risks where decisions based on your data are taken entirely automatically
- tell us if we can share your information with 3rd parties
- tell us your preferred frequency, content and format of our communications with you
    - to lodge a complaint with the independent Information Commissioner (ICO) if you think we are not handling your data fairly or in accordance with the law. You can contact the ICO at https://ico.org.uk/ or telephone 0303 123 1113.

7. Your personal data will not be sent overseas

8. Your personal data will not be used for any automated decision making.

9. Your personal data will be stored in a secure government IT system.

10. More information For more information on how Ofgem processes your data, view our Ofgem privacy policy.