

STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION PROCESS OFFSHORE GRID NL	
Type:	Minutes of Meeting
Meeting date	09.11.2015
Meeting place	Papendal
Subject	Expert Meeting
Present	See attendance list
Filename	MOM_EM_20151109_v1
Version	1 – Public release
Pages	16

QUALITY CONTROL		
Prepared:	A. Ritzen	09.11.2015
Release	TenneT	16.11.2015

Table of Contents

0. WELCOME	2
1 GENERAL.....	2
2 HIGHLIGHTING CHANGES IN POSITION PAPERS.....	2
3 MAIN TOPICS REA, CTA, GTC.....	3
3.1 Introduction.....	3
3.2 Planning	3
3.3 Questions to OWFs	4
3.4 Compensation	5
3.5 Phasing of the agreements	6
3.6 Delivery of the Connection	7
3.7 Tariffs, fees and costs	8
3.8 Insurance.....	9
3.9 Liability	9
3.10 Overplanting.....	9
3.11 Suspension and termination.....	10
4 COMPARE POSITION PAPERS VS ANNEXES	10
5 ANNEXES TO REA AND CTA.....	10
6 LIST OF ATTENDEES	15

(Please note that the below is not a literal transcription of the comments made, rather represents the overall tone and context of the discussion)

0. Welcome

With approximately 40 participants of several backgrounds in attendance, TenneT consulted the third draft of the offshore model agreements and general terms and conditions, as well as the annexes. First, the most important changes in the position papers as well as the agreements – based on the input on the previous drafts – were discussed in general, after which the annexes were discussed page by page. TenneT introduced all topics (see presentation).

Please find below an overview of the main topics discussed. Feedback on all questions will be provided in a separate feedback document and will, if applicable, be included in the next draft of the agreements. All stakeholders are requested to submit their comments on the third drafts by 13 November 2015 at the latest. TenneT aims to publish Dutch translations of the model agreements (based on the 4 November drafts) on 13 November. Comments on this translation may be provided until 20 November 2015. Note that this enhances feedback on a correct translation only, not on content. TenneT will announce each publication via the Newsletter and website. The final model agreement will be published prior to opening of the SDE+ subsidy tender (before 1 December 2015).

1 GENERAL

Rob van der Hage opens the meeting and welcomes all attendees.

Introduction by TenneT regarding the steps since the last meeting and the way forward, see presentation.

2 HIGHLIGHTING CHANGES IN POSITION PAPERS

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

Q: Could you include cable crossings in the position papers?

TenneT: No, this will not be included in the position papers. Note that cable crossings between TenneT and the Connected Party are dealt with in the General Terms and Conditions (Article 4.2).

Q: Will there be a junction box?

TenneT: There will be no junction box, unless the winner(s) of the tender convince(s) TenneT that it needs one, then TenneT will facilitate. Note that all risks and costs for such junction box are for the Connected Party's account.

Notifications for technical topics T.13, T.14, T.15, T.17, T.18 have been communicated to the attendees.

3 MAIN TOPICS REA, CTA, GTC

3.1 Introduction

TenneT reviewed all the comments it received on the previous versions of the model agreements. Most of the comments were aimed at a few topics. TenneT selected these topics for discussion at this meeting and explained how TenneT dealt with the comments.

3.2 Planning

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: The only binding date will be the date as per the Scenario. To have the Connection ready by that date is the instruction from the Ministry to TenneT and that is also what TenneT is committing to in the model agreements. That position has not changed. TenneT did extend the list of milestones for information purposes and added that parties will prepare a joint planning. There is now an extended list of milestones and TenneT believes this will be key for the planning. There will be room for parties to agree on any further milestones for information purposes.

When entering into the agreements, TenneT already will have a planning and will share it with the Connected Party. Also, the Connected Party will share its planning with TenneT. Parties will jointly prepare a joint planning.

The milestones are not only dependent on TenneT's planning, but also on when the Connected Party wants to have its wind farm operational.

Q: The list of milestones looks good. We understand the planning is to be determined with the winner of the tender. Is there any planning we can work with for now?

TenneT: TenneT has already published its overall planning. There is no intention to deviate from that planning, but note that TenneT is not legally committing to that planning, TenneT commits to the Scenario date. The overall planning is going to be the basis for a joint planning. Note that TenneT for now is not committing legally to another date than the date in the Scenario, but has included the possibility to (after the tender) meet and agree on binding milestones, should parties come to an agreement on that topic. This process can only take place after knowing who the winner is (and his planning) and after knowing the planning of TenneT's contractors.

Q: Why is the planning not linked to RfG?

TenneT: TenneT has included EON, ION and FON in the list of milestones for information purposes. TenneT has not linked the binding date (delivery of the Connection) / border between REA and CTA to EON, ION or FON. This is because EON and ION are not only depending on TenneT's planning, but also on the planning of the Connected Party. TenneT noted the suggestion by one party that the binding date should coincide with ION (within RfG), but this would not work because the timing of ION also depends on the planning of the Connected Party. The Connected Party could decide to be connected well after TenneT has realised the Connection. In the Agreements there is only a link to the Scenario date, which according to the draft

Scenario means (i) ready for commissioning and testing of the Installation, (ii) capability to transport full power and (iii) two-way communication.

In the compliance Annex, TenneT made reference to EON, ION and FON, in line with RfG requirements.

Q: When do you expect you can conclude the milestones and plan these with the Connected Party? Is that a month after the tender is awarded?

TenneT: Two items will be necessary: knowing the winner of the tender (and his planning) and knowing the planning of TenneT's contractors. The public procurement organized by TenneT will start at the beginning of 2016. TenneT expects to know its contractors planning(s) in Q3 2016, once TenneT closes contracts with its suppliers/subcontractors. TenneT stated it will communicate with the Connected Party on a quarterly basis, the (joint) planning will be at the top of the list.

Q: Are the dates to be agreed on later legally binding or not?

TenneT: TenneT is willing to commit to legally binding dates (in addition to the Scenario date), but such dates and the exact consequences will have to be agreed on with the winner(s) of the tender. This also ties in with contracts with TenneT's contractors. Legally binding commitments, if agreed upon, will work in both directions, so not only from TenneT to the Connected Party but also from the Connected Party to TenneT.

Q: Article 6.1, sub (g), is it possible for the Connected Party to plan for an earlier connection than the Scenario date? Can TenneT facilitate?

TenneT: TenneT will try to make this possible, but TenneT is not bound to any other date than 31 August 2019.

3.3 Questions to OWFs

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: The procurement department is preparing invitations to tender. TenneT wants to create sufficient space in future contracts to provide room for activities by the Connected Party (e.g. installing equipment on the Platform while onshore or in the onshore substation). Please provide us with the requested input, so we can reflect this in our contracts.

Q: Not all parties can see the tender documents. Will TenneT publish all information for all parties?

TenneT: You have to register in the system as a potential supplier, which is then followed by a recognition scheme (erkenningregeling). TenneT understands that suppliers of TenneT can also be suppliers of the Connected Party. In that respect, there is some discussion within TenneT on how and where to publish the tender documents. TenneT will get back to this topic later.

Q: What are the expected timeframes now?

TenneT: TenneT doesn't know yet, hence the question to market parties. Please give us your experience and preference.

Q: Will the feedback on this topic be reflected in the agreements?

T: No, this feedback will not be included in the agreements. TenneT will take this into account in its request for proposals in the procurement process with its potential suppliers.

3.4 Compensation

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: TenneT has received some comments on the wording on this topic and has adapted this wording slightly. The overall idea has not changed, these contracts are not going to extend or reduce the statutory compensation scheme.

Q: How do you see this in the view that parties will strive for the lowest cost price possible, are other dates possible to agree on relating to the compensation scheme? The risks should be for parties that can manage that risk, meaning TenneT.

TenneT: What the binding date(s) should be is being intensively discussed, and is something which has resulted in the choice in the Scenario for one specific date. The Scenario is according to the Ministry in line with the Energy Agreement (Energieakkoord). The view of TenneT is to follow the Scenario, because the Scenario is what the Ministry decided on. TenneT doesn't want to get into a political discussion on this topic. Economic Affairs came to a decision. This choice is not to be discussed here today.

Q: The Ministry will decide on compensation, not TenneT. Also, TenneT cannot decide on what to include in the tariffs by means of compensation.

TenneT: The compensation scheme is determined in the STROOM Act. TenneT pays the compensation, but inclusion in the tariffs is determined by ACM.

Q: How does it work with delays? The Connected Party will send a claim to TenneT, and then?

TenneT: The procedural requirements will be in a ministerial decree. TenneT foresees that there will be a framework to evaluate compensation claims, which may be comparable to the framework for the repayment of system service tariffs. This is the only way TenneT can deal with this, because this gives upfront a framework on which a Connected Party can rely, to see how claims will be evaluated. This framework still has to be developed. If TenneT awards claims that are not covered by the ACM's decision, then it's TenneT's risk.

Q: Do the Agreements contain exceptions to statutory compensation?

TenneT: No, the Agreements do not affect the statutory compensation. It is noted that the compensation scheme only applies to delays or unavailability of the Connection. So e.g., not for accidents where two ships collide. Liability for such other causes are determined in accordance with the GTC.

Q: Could the binding milestones include liability?

TenneT: Yes, this could be the case and this would also be separate from and not affect the compensation

under the STROOM Act.

Q: Do we understand correctly that that any binding milestones agreed upon later will not include 31 Augustus 2019?

TenneT: Yes, this is correct, as this is already a binding milestones for which consequences for not adhering to this have been set (statutory compensation scheme). There will be no other liability linked to the date of 31 August 2019.

3.5 Phasing of the agreements

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

Q: could you explain why Article 4.3 REA is added?

TenneT: this has been included to give the OWFs comfort that the requirements for the Connection are not limited to what is in the Scenario, but also include the contractual requirements. The agreements cover more detail than the Scenario. TenneT has included article 4.3 in the Realisation Agreement to confirm the fact that TenneT meets the Scenario does not mean that TenneT will stop there. If there were some minor points which do not affect transmission of energy, TenneT will rectify these points at a later stage, even though the Realisation Agreement would have already ended. Even though TenneT has to meet the Scenario date and requirements, that does not mean that TenneT will not rectify those minor defects or could not be liable for non-compliance (*wanprestatie*) (taking into account the GTC).

Q: It is odd that TenneT is not willing to have an expert assess if the Connection is according to the Realisation Agreement.

TenneT: It is TenneT's expectation that the independent expert will also look at other items than the Scenario items. TenneT only wanted to clarify in the Realisation Agreement that items which are not relevant for the Scenario (because they do not prevent transmitting energy), will not make those other items irrelevant. The question that will be relevant for the Minister and the independent expert is: even though there may be a few shortcomings, do they prevent transmission of full power, do they prevent 2-way communication, do they prevent testing? If not, the Connection is ready within the meaning of the Realisation Agreement and the Scenario and we move on to the Connection and Transmission Agreement. That doesn't mean that other shortcomings will be irrelevant.

Q: What if TenneT does not deliver the Connection according to the specifications?

TenneT: That the Connection meets the Scenario does not mean that TenneT could not have contractual liability. If the Connected Party has extra costs because of TenneT not meeting the specifications, in principle this could lead to liability for TenneT.

Q: TenneT has to change the Agreements so they state that TenneT is liable if the Connection does not meet the specifications.

*TenneT: This has not been included; TenneT refers to general Dutch contract law which already provides for the possibility of liability for non-compliance (*wanprestatie*). The General Terms and Conditions further*

regulate liability. The Dutch Civil Code has a broader range of types of liabilities, the General Terms and Conditions specify what types of damages are eligible for liability.

Q: Liability for extra costs etc. for OWF are excluded in 11 of the General Terms and Conditions.

TenneT: TenneT will look at the wording and clarify the provision.

Q: 'connection ready' will be agreed upon with an independent party - some things may only be tested with full power. Will this independent party will also be involved during full power and what will happen in case the platform was agreed upon to be ready but at full power doesn't seem to comply?

TenneT: to our knowledge the compensation still kicks in – this has to be confirmed with EZ who is responsible for the compensation scheme.

Q: Is this a delay or interruption compensation?

According to TenneT this should be a 'delay' compensation. This should be confirmed by the ministry.

TenneT: The Realisation Agreement ends when an independent expert confirms that the Connection is in accordance with the Scenario.

Q: We appreciate the changes. No expert is able to assess all requirements at that moment. Could the expert also assess later in the process?

TenneT: The Realisation Agreement will end when the independent expert believes that the Connection is ready according to the Scenario. When you put full power on the Connection (which is not to be tested earlier), that could lead to a situation in which you conclude afterwards that the Connection was not ready before, even though expert thought it was. This could trigger the compensation scheme, which is also to be discussed with the Ministry.

Q: What happens if you enter into discussions if the Connection is ready or not?

TenneT: If there is a dispute as to whether the Connection is ready or not this could be dealt with under the dispute resolution already provided for (court or ACM)The Ministry and the ACM may be involved in such discussions .

3.6 Delivery of the Connection

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: We cannot consult/decide right now on the criteria for the independent expert, because not all specifics of the Platform are available yet. The Ministry will also be consulted on the criteria.

Q: Will there be acceptance tests?

TenneT: These are to be discussed in the consultation process.

Q: What if we afterwards realise that the Connection was not ready?

TenneT: In the previous drafts, TenneT envisaged that the agreements could work simultaneously, for some cables under the Realisation Agreement and for some under the Connection and Transmission Agreement. TenneT received quite a lot of comments, people wanted to have a clear answer that they are in the Realisation or the Connection and Transmission phase. So now, TenneT made a clear distinction between the Realisation and the Connection and Transmission phase. There could have been other possibilities, leading to different questions. Now these coincide with the moment when the Platform is ready for transmission/testing/communication. This is in line with the Scenario and with what TenneT is doing.

Q: If everybody thinks that the Connection is ready, but later you conclude that system is not working (maybe 6 months later), what would be the legal consequences? Back into the Realisation Agreement?

TenneT: No, you will be and remain in the Connection and Transmission phase. Otherwise, we would have to include transmission provisions in the Realisation Agreement. Once the Realisation Agreement has ended, we are not going to reactivate the Realisation Agreement. Also, the Connection and Transmission Agreement provides for fixing defects. If it becomes clear at a later stage that the Connection was not ready yet, we will still be in the phase of the Connection and Transmission Agreement.

Q: If the Realisation Agreement is phased out, is liability not solved?

TenneT: The fact that a contract has ended does not mean that any liabilities under that agreement also end when the agreement ends. That is just as per any normal contract. That a contract has ended does not mean that contractual claims arising during the agreement are gone. There is a one-year period to submit claims after the liability causing fact.

Q: Shouldn't annexes to the Realisation Agreement and the Connection and Transmission Agreement be the same?

TenneT: They are almost identical.

3.7 Tariffs, fees and costs

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: There are two types of costs regarding compliance tests: (i) operational costs to be borne by every CP when testing and (ii) costs for hiring an external expert to perform the compliance testing. And the amount? Onshore, normally for new connection costs for an expert varies between EUR 12,000 and 20,000; TenneT does not know the costs offshore. Note that occasionally the costs could amount up to EUR 60,000 onshore, if things are not going smoothly. It is unknown what to add when testing offshore. This refers to total costs for testing activities. Costs for measures that should be taken in order to become compliant will be borne by the party upon who the particular obligation rests. TenneT bears its own costs for compliance on its own side (for instance investments elsewhere in the grid), those costs will not be charged to CP.

It's all about compliance with the requirements. This has been set out as well as possible in the annexes, which refers to the public codes.

Q: About paying for costs of shared data (e.g. from RWS): what are they and how much?

TenneT: TenneT does not know either. Not all the costs are known yet.

Consumption tariffs are set by the ACM annually, so the 2019 tariff will be set in 2018. We don't expect a separate offshore consumption tariff. There is no tariff structure applicable offshore yet, still to be decided by the ACM or the Minister of Economic Affairs. Expectation is that the EHS tariff category will apply. Annex 7 will not be included when signing the CTA; this will be known by the end of 2018, 2019 could be applicable at the earliest. We included the tariff sheet as an example. The current EHS tariffs in accordance with the tariff decisions by ACM may provide some guidance as what range the consumption tariff would be in, although it is not possible to predict the 2019-tariffs.

3.8 Insurance

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: There is no CAR insurance prescribed because parties will not work under each other's CAR insurances.

The three insurances are common offshore. If you have any thoughts, please feel free to indicate these.

Q: Is this the most cost-effective solution?

TenneT: Parties have been discussing using the same CAR insurance for both parties. Insurance brokers indicated that a CAR insurance would not be the right format to do that.

Q: Is it required that the insurances are taken out as separate insurances?

TenneT: As long as these insurances are covered, it's fine; they could also be part of a complete package. They do not necessarily need to be different insurances, but all three elements should be there. TenneT has included the question on thresholds and welcomes input on this point.

3.9 Liability

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: TenneT will look at how additional costs incurred by the Connected Party fit in with article 11 GTC, and will provide you with clarification.

TenneT: Do you expect that both parties would have an overall liability cap and if so, what should that cap be? We assume a mutual cap that would apply to both parties. If a liability cap were introduced, there will be a link with insurance caps. Please provide us with input.

3.10 Overplanting

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

TenneT: If overplanting capacity is curtailed, there will be no compensation.

Q: How about system security, how is this defined?

TenneT: This is the same as onshore, for balancing reasons. That is dealt with in the System Code. So there is no particular curtailing regime of this contract, the NCC can do this (curtailing) all the time, not just offshore, but also onshore.

Q: Is the priority for green principle applied?

TenneT: That principle applies at congestion management only.

Q: Is that reflected in the contract?

TenneT: No, this is according to the codes, so there is no need to include this in the agreements.

Q: Article 3.6 CTA: maximum quantity states contracted capacity and not overplanting capacity – please explain.

TenneT: In terms of overplanting capacity 3.5 applies, 3.6 does not apply to overplanting capacity. There is a distinction between contracted and overplanting capacity. Note that article 3.6 does not deviate from 3.5.

Q: Do restrictions with overplanting have to do with land connection? In other words, can we assume that the downstream system is not blocking the transmission (plus overplanting)?

TenneT: Yes and otherwise you will go into the congestion system/mode which is similar to any other connection. The onshore connection is expected to have enough capacity in order to transmit all capacity including overplanting.

3.11 Suspension and termination

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation.

Q: Why is this clause introduced?

TenneT: You can't continue not paying your bills forever. At a certain time, TenneT could terminate the agreement.

4 COMPARE POSITION PAPERS VS ANNEXES

Introduction by TenneT, see presentation. This document is to be downloaded after this meeting.

5 ANNEXES TO REA AND CTA

During the last part of the expert meeting, all annexes were discussed.

Annex 2

Q: could you add a system drawing of the whole system?

OWP expects problems with switching with low impedance. Issues with the design of the standard cable are expected. This will add costs for additional length of array cables. OWP will hand in detailed feedback via the online feedback form.

Annex 3

Q: Why is a minimum of 4 cables specified with regards to J-tubes and bays?

TenneT: Please refer to the position paper. This has already been specified before.

Sub 6 Protection

Q: Could you please explain in further detail which special protection is required by OWP. Also who supplies the protection?

TenneT: WPO will design, supply and install the system and TenneT will operate and maintain the system. In case an additional system is installed this is the responsibility of the OWP.

Q: Is this different from what has been discussed before summer?

TenneT: No, this is the same discussion as before summer. The standard protection system is owned and taken care of by TenneT – additional system is owned (and operated) by WPO.

Sub 7. Reactive power compensation

Q: The position paper mentions much more detail and supplemental information to the annex. Could you add this?

TenneT: is already added in Annex 4

Q: Are reactive power capabilities defined in a sufficient matter?

TenneT: According to TenneT yes it is. OWP is not obliged to request additional specs to the WTG.

Sub 8. SCADA, communication interface and data links

Q: The third bullet is confusing, could you clarify this?

TenneT: That's correct and should be changed into "The amount is to be agreed upon with a maximum of 24." In case of two string per one bay there will be 2x 24 strings available.

Per wind farm 24 fibres (redundant) per export cable are available. One patch panel with 48 patches. This will be made more explicit.

Overplanting:

Q: Why is 90°C already stated and is this is fixed value?

TenneT: This is an international standardised value for this type of cable.

Q: Will TenneT provide additional information on the (potential) specifications of the cable?

TenneT: Yes separate information bulletins will be provided including cable specs.

Sub 9 shared data

Q: It is difficult to assess the costs for this shared data – there is also another interdependency with regards to the other connected WPO. Who decides which costs to pay/ and how does TenneT expect the WPO to include this in the business case?

TenneT: unfortunately RWS will be the only party to provide guidance on costs. WPO's might be able to extrapolate from previous experiences.

Q: but then how come TenneT makes a statement on behalf of a third party if it is the case that RWS decides?

TenneT: TenneT can only facilitate the process.

Q: TenneT will make available the WPO room on the offshore platform and an onshore control room. Will this be at no costs or including a rental agreement with rules/regulations/house rules and costs?

TenneT: costs have not been decided yet. Grid manager has to incur all costs which are not part of the grid connection. In other words – normally the connected party has to pay a fee for this. But no decision has been made yet on who bears which costs.

WPO: Will this be decided before December 1st?

TenneT: Yes it will.

Q: Would TenneT have the plot plans for platform available?

TenneT: yes it is still the intention to include these (for information) in the final versions of the annex.

Q: Is metering missing in Annex 3?

TenneT: this is included in the Agreements.

Reactive power capability and voltage stability requirements

Q: It is expected that it is not possible to comply to the +/- 10% requirement. The problem is that the interface is at medium voltage. If this was at high voltage it wouldn't be a problem. Could you make a statement that under certain circumstances WPO can deviate from this +/- 10%?

TenneT: TenneT is open for changes and will check if a potential deviation is possible.

Q: The reactive power setpoint at 0-load in case the wind turbine cannot comply is missing

TenneT: this is stated in Annex 3

Q: It is stated that the OWP HAS to provide 0.1 bandwidth not depending on the amount of wind turbines being active. This should be depending on the amount of wind turbines producing electricity? Could TenneT change the wording on this?

TenneT: valid point - but this can only be done after the wind turbine type and amount of strings and wind turbines are known. TenneT will adjust its reactors and compensation onshore accordingly (at no load situation).

Q: And this will not only be at the bottom part but at the whole section?

TenneT: TenneT will verify the phrasing and will rephrase this section including the potential costs for the WPO. If WPO cannot compensate at low loads TenneT will do so onshore. Costs will be charged to WPO.

4. Harmonic emission limits

Q: Why does TenneT apply harmonic limits to each string/feeder (THD)? OWP suggests to make this requirement at busbar level. For example it could be possible that one complies at busbar level but not at string level. What will happen in such a situation?

Q: In the case OWP is compliant on a separate wind farm level and after that is connected to the second wind farm is could be that the first OWP is not compliant anymore. Being connected is not a reason not to measure voltage.

TenneT: that is correct. Good point. TenneT will check and revise the text.

Q: When is the third party going to do its calculations (refer to point C page 22/41)? This should be before the OWP makes the bid. The OWP needs to know if additional equipment is necessary or not.

The problem is that two parties will be connected and one is independent of the other.

OWP can only be responsible for its own wind farm. If after that two OWP and TenneT are combined and not compliant this should not be the single OWP problem.

TenneT: Point is taken and understood. TenneT will revise exact wording.

TenneT: will come back on when root loci will be available

Q: Specifications on harmonic limit calculations/models for harmonic studies where promised to be available. They are not to be found. Will this become available? OWP is especially interested in what kind of model TenneT will expect OWP to use in order to validate harmonic compliance.

Q: Also the request was made for a reasoning on why conservative (onshore) approach is chosen.

Q: In the case the OWP does not fulfil the grid code what will happen?

TenneT: It depends on during which point in time this happens: before connection-> not to be connected – after connection and fully operational-> plan how to comply as quickly as possible. In the last situation the TSO will discuss a plan on how to become compliant as quickly as possible. This could indeed lead to a situation of not (or no longer) being connected.

Q: Why are two ION's issued (p.24/41)? Why is there a second ION?

TenneT: This needs to be consulted with operations department

Q: On page 24-25/41 several moments during the testing phase are mentioned. Is it possible to provide an overall test schedule with all the moments included?

TenneT: WPO can incorporate this in its own planning. Detail will be specified by WPO and TenneT later in

time. Planning of testing depends also on WPO.

Annex 6

Q: Could TenneT add response times with regards to access to platform in case TenneT needs to accompany WPO.

TenneT: Please provide TenneT with information on what is requested with regards to response time. Would two hours be possible for emergencies? WPO two hours seems to be acceptable. TenneT will add statement.

Q: (p.33/41) OWP makes request for monthly update of the programme instead of quarterly and makes a request for including separate design meetings.

TenneT: it seems premature to already list the agenda of the meetings but the goal is to indeed line up together with WPO and keep updating each other.

Q: (p.34/35) How does TenneT handle simultaneous works by two WPO parties?

TenneT: this is a valid point and still needs to be determined

Q: How will the coordination of the works (work permit systems) be arranged (by TenneT)?

TenneT: this has to be determined and will not be in this agreement.

p. 34: Could a list of all costs for WPO be made?

Q: What is the response time of switching operation?

TenneT: TenneT has a 24hour service available so this should be direct. Only in the case of a major disturbance this could take longer but in general this will be immediate.

Annex 7:

Q: Does the tariff sheet include only regulated fees or also testing etc costs?

TenneT: Testing costs will not appear on the tariff sheet, as these are fees which are not determined in advance (fees/vergoedingen).

Last remarks/comments

With regards to the models, please set up a chapter including the models you would like the OWP to use for its simulations.

Further comments will be provided via the online form.

TenneT: Correction regarding the junction box on p.27 of annex to realisation agreement and p.33 of connection agreement (fifth bullet). The position of TenneT will be 'no junction box on offshore platform' The design of TenneT will provide for direct pull in of cables. Cable deck is part of jacket and topside is placed on top.

Overall comment by some of the participants:

This was the last technical meeting and still additional comments have been given. Some participants are not in favour of this being the last meeting. Spirits have been and are good but if the last moment for feedback is this Friday (13/11) this seems to be insufficient. The final result will be published to soon without the possibility of given feedback.

Other participants: very positive about the process and the fact that feedback can be given and solution is sought.

TenneT: Thank you very much for your cooperation and investment in time for these expert meetings since November last year. We highly value your contribution and appreciate the comments with regards to the timeline of this process. TenneT is of the opinion that sufficient time has been invested in this process and the timeline has been communicated during every session, and adapted where possible to accommodate you. The content of the model agreements has been discussed extensively during the expert meetings and the WPO's online feedback has been taken into account. The aim has always been, and will remain, to finalise the model agreement prior to the opening of the subsidy tender (1st of December).

6 LIST OF ATTENDEES

Name	Company
Ars, Martin	NUON Vattenfall
Bergvoll, Øyvind	Statoil
Braekt, Martin In de	Stibbe
Bouwmeester, Christian	GDF Suez
Burger, Bastiaan	Essent
Donders, Thomas	TenneT
Elsevier van Griethuysen, Dolf	Van Oord
Elskamp, Fokke	TenneT
Engels, Steven	DONG
Feld, Jacqueline	CMS-DSB
Hage, Rob van der	TenneT
Harrewijn, Ralph	TenneT
Hoeven, Claire van der	DBBW
Holmstrom, Ole	DONG
Hommel, Guido	NWEA
Hulst, Bart van	TenneT
Hulst, Muriel van der	Volker Stevin
Jaarsma, Saskia	TenneT

Jacobs, Jos	Eneco
Kleinhout, Arjan	DBBW
Klok, Hilbert	NWEA
Kraijenbrink, Sjoerd	GDF Suez
Kyrberg, Lars	Two Birds
Maas, Jan	Delta
Moolenaar, Hanne	Boskalis
Mueller, Michiel	Ecofys
Muller, Hannah	ACM
Oosterhuis, Max	Loyens Loeff
Pedersen, Gordon	DONG
Pellens, Joost	Essent
Pennink, Andreas	NUON Vattenfall
Rijke, Michelle	Bird & Bird
Ritzen, Anna	Ecofys
Runge, Jörn	RWE Innogy
Schepers, Jörg	EON
Starink, Frans	RWE
Tahmaz, Nachaat	Statoil
Trepte, Karsten	EON (DNV GL)
Vermeulen, Joost	MinEZ
Vlam, Ronald de	Loyens&Loeff
Vree, Daniël	TenneT
Wester, Frank	TenneT