

Document Name	Date
20231120_Public consultation report TF-PEZ_EN_vfinal	20/11/2023



No	Page	Section	Topic	Priority 1: Urgent 2: In Tender Docs	Comment
1	37	2.6.1	Buildings & amenities	2	"Besides the switchgear, there are rooms foreseen for utilities, control and protection cabinets and one room for each OWF." What are the amenities (HVAC, fire fighting, desk space, floor characteristics, access facilities, etc.)? Only provision of aux.power is mentioned in 2.9.4..
2	37	2.6.1	Buildings & amenities	2	Is (part of) the warehouse also available for the OWFs?
3	37	2.6.1	Buildings & amenities	2	"One of the modules will be equipped with a heli deck." Looking at phasing of works, is it the intention to have the heli deck on one of the phase 1 modules, (i. e. ready to use for Construction works of the 1st concession?) Besides that, the heli deck is indicated on Facility Module and not on an AC module as described. Please clarify.
4	38	2.7.1	Cable corridors	1	"Currently, no offshore crossings within close proximity of the island are foreseen. However, offshore crossings cannot be avoided for future interconnectors."  Please define all cable corridors and safety zones in the entire PEZ, which includes the area between 'kavel 1' on one hand and PEZ 'kavels 2 & 3' on the other hand. What will be the exact routing of the Nautilus and Triton connection in de PEZ? In other words, can you provide a zoom out of Figure 25 so we can see cable routes until border of concession zones?  Are crossings foreseen with future interconnectors? If so, are there specifications to take into account, e.g. for IAC thermal design?  Please issue more detailed cable routing drawing indicating interdistances between different cable immediately leaving the island and after eg 100, 200m? Is there an AutoCad or GIS file available?
5	39	2.7.1	Cable corridors	1	Why are Corridor for inter-array cables parcel 1 and Corridor DC interconnectors (Nautilus + Triton) not centered in corridor between parcel 2 and 3 + corridor width has potential to enlarge resp.cable corridors ?
6	41	2.7.4	Cable corridors	1	What is ELIA's vision on cable repairs and requirement for spares? Was an assessment performed by an experienced party how to repair a cable (WTG 1 - island) in current set-up with the limited interdistance between the cables as we get closer to PEI?
7	39	2.7.1	Cable corridors & interface	1	Figure 25: Corridor for inter-array cables parcel 2: Not sure why the southern corridor is split. Is this because cables of the PEZ kavel 2 south-west part need to be routed to Phase 1 module AC?  In case the capacity of PEZ kavel 2 north-east is below 350MW (see Arcadis permit application figure 3 page 12, indicating 260MW). Are crossings in the culverts to be expected while routing towards the Phase 1 AC Module? Impact? Proximity agreements to be foreseen in such cases?
8	39	2.7.2	Cable interface	1	Scour protection design and CPS rock berm protection design of incoming cables (if deemed required?) must have combined design. Please clarify whether this will be foreseen by Elia.
9	39	2.7.2	Cable interface	1	We understand from recent press announcements, that ELIA is considering to include 'chaotic scour protection' and 'place large boulders here and there': ( <a href="https://www.elia.be/en/news/press-releases/2023/11/20231113_elia-takes-seven-measures-to-enhance-biodiversity-around-the-princess-elisabeth-island">https://www.elia.be/en/news/press-releases/2023/11/20231113_elia-takes-seven-measures-to-enhance-biodiversity-around-the-princess-elisabeth-island</a> ). Please explain how this will be aligned with an efficient (and object free) cable routing?
10	39	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	Please specify number of cable and spare entries foreseen per PEZ lot for inter array cables / Interconnectors / export cables.
11	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	2	What are the means to temporary hang-off the cables?
12	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	1	Please confirm ELIA is fully responsible and liable for the design of the cable landing and routing, on the island, including J-tubes and pull-in. This responsibility must also cover any consequential damage (e.g. to connecting infield cables) including physical damage and consequential business interruption. ELIA should – in our opinion – take the lead to prepare a detailed design of this interface, which can be included in the tender documents.
13	40	2.7.3 & 2.7.4	Cable interface	1	Please provide more detailed information regarding the cable landing, -pull-in and -routing. On the basis of the current information it is not possible to evaluate the interface. This must include: - DWGs - Track record of this design (required for financing!) - 3rd party design review & certification  Can cable routing be performed on the different cables in parallel? We would expect this to be the case. In other words, please provide detailed culvert design.  Trefoil routing taking into account, which alter course/MBRs are taken along in the design?
14	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	1	Please elaborate how the recent problems with CPS has been / will be mitigated in the current ELIA design ( <a href="https://nardac.com/sharing-insight-on-defective-cable-protection-systems/">https://nardac.com/sharing-insight-on-defective-cable-protection-systems/</a> ). Solution on export and infield cables might be different, even infield cables coming from different directions might need a different solution.
15	40	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	Please issue detailed J-tube design inside the caisson including curvature / dimensions and interface with resp. scour protection / beilmouth / hang-off.
16	40	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	How is marine growth inside J-tube mitigated (e.g. pull-out discs)?
17	40	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	"It has two entry holes above each other to accommodate for installation tolerance of the scour protection." - What is anticipated scour protection installation tolerance? - Will cable stiffness allow for short (?) bend after J-tube exit and subsequent conic (?) approach towards hang-off? - Are there reference projects / lessons learned of projects with 2 entry holes located above each other?
18	40	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	Please issue scour protection design plan view and cross/longitudinal section (fig 27) including dimensions to assess cable pull-in, both length to assess vessel position vs pull-in point as well as whether CPS can avoid being dragged over scour which is ideally the case.
19	40	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	Scour protection design appears to be indicated too high compared to heading of J-tube entry, there should be more space available, especially when taking into account scour protection installation accuracies.
20	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	2	From an efficiency point of view, why does Elia not foresee pull-in means in the hang-off room? Each OWF to design/deliver/remove their pull-in means, whilst this will be similar for several cables and the means could be stored on the island? How could tripod be installed, is area large enough and has sufficient bearing force? Is there a (shared) pull-in winch available?
21	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	2	Is there a (modular) cable support system available in the hang-off room and below the GIS?
22	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	2	Aim to have cables running in trefoil or immediately untwist in separate cores in hang-off room? Please share more detailed drawings of the hang-off room to assess feasibility.
23	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	2	How can non de-armoured cable overlength be routed/guided?
24	40	2.7.2	Cable interface	2	How is a safe access guaranteed to ensure people can access the hang-off rooms? At which weather and tide criteria will the hang-off room not be accessible? Is it correct that water will be passing at the drainage channel also when performing cable pull-in/cable routing works? If these criteria are set with low workability, this will potentially have a (large) impact on the pull-in/routing duration.
25	40	2.7.3	Cable interface	2	Hang-off and earthing connections / cable support system will be subject to increased corrosion processes in comparison to climatized cable deck on OS15T. (Preventive) Maintenance frequency (in a restricted access room) to be avoided as much as possible. How will the earthing points in the hang-off room be executed by Elia?
26	41	2.7.4	Cable interface	2	Access through (1mx1mx 0.15m) lids to culverts of land area and drainage buffer zone; is this also a restricted access confined space work place?
27	42	2.7.4 figure 29	Cable interface	1	Please indicate how many sea cables/land cables are to be installed in one culvert? It appears that not each cable will have its own culvert. Thermal interference might be possible
28	42	2.7.4.1	Cable interface	1	How is the thermal conductivity of 1W/m.K defined? And is it valid over the entire cable trajectory on the island?
29	42	2.8	Cable interface	2	Gas works in case of termination plug-in and cable testing (VLF/Damped AC) are considered to be executed by Elia or Elia contractor - please confirm.
30	43	2.9	Cable interface	1	Please provide a detailed interface matrix. Currently the responsibilities are not entirely clear.
31	37	2.6.4	Crane and transport	2	The limitations of lifting capacity at the quay side are clear, but what is the view on transportation & handling of items on the island? (forklifts/cherry-pickers/cranes/dollies...) Limitations? Tools available? Who can operate and use?
32	38	2.6.3	Crane and transport	2	Can the quay side crane be operated by the OWF staff? Quid responsibilities regarding the crane/infra Elia versus the lifted 3rd party load? Quayside crane can also offload eg containers from supply vessel? Or only from CTV in CTV harbour? Please specify the crane capacity in function of reach distance (diagram)
33		SLD	Elia asset	1	Please confirm the availability of a spare transformer 220/66kV and spare of the major switchgear components as well as a shunt reactor
34		SLD	Elia asset	2	Can the 66kV voltage transformers thermally unload the length of an entire string of 66kV cables? Please provide number of sequential switching operations and cool down period
35	47	2.9.3	Fibers	2	It is assumed 48 fibers are dedicated to each OWF. Please confirm
36	47	2.9.3	Fibers	2	Please share more detailed concept / design of optical fibre interface, including a.o. routing from hang-off up to splice box.
37	47	2.9.3	Fibers	2	It is correct that the fibers will be combined in one export cable trajectory or split over multiple (min. 2) export cables for redundancy and risk mitigation? We obviously prefer the second solution.
38	36	2.6	GEZEL	1	Will there be any space on the island (or Gezelle) to include a limited operating room for the OWFs (in view of a contingency plan for a.o. cyber security and/or in case of calamities). This is highly recommended and therefore formally requested.
39	47	2.9.3	GEZEL	2	Can Elia provide the necessary high quality and redundant utilities to the OWF shelters at GEZEL?
40	55	3.1 & p.79/3.6.3	Grid compliance	1	Additional requirements related to active power oscillations: can Elia provide the requirements based on the final and agreed version of the text composed by Entso-e, WindEurope and other stakeholders? Also confirm the default values have been considered in the evaluation of the existing OWFs and will be used as standard requirement for the PEZ OWFs

No	Page	Section	Topic	Priority 1: Urgent 2: In Tender Docs	Comment
41	55	3	Grid compliance	1	The Dynamic and Harmonic requirements must be in line with normal industry practice and rest of EU without increasing the requirements and thus impacting the strike price. Please confirm.
42	58	3.1	Grid compliance	1	"1. Criteria to determine which type of simulations will be needed to prove conformity depending on the type and size of the installation and screening index accounting for the potential risk of interaction with nearby relevant assets." Please explain what a "screening index" is?
43	59	3.2	Grid compliance	1	Please explain the relevance of sub-synchronous control interactions between IBRs and series compensated lines in the Belgian context
44	63	3.4.1.1	Grid compliance	1	The 6th bullet does not comply with the VSP service in compensator mode. Please explain applicability.
45	64	3.4.1.1	Grid compliance	1	The 7th bullet: please explain the applicability of figure 45 (type C PPM) for type D PPM. It seems contradictory with bullet 1, 2 & 3.
46	66	3.4.1.3	Grid compliance	1	It seems contradictory that on one hand the voltage at 66kV will be maintained at 66kV ±1% and on the other hand the voltage control is referring to a voltage range of ±5%. Besides that the reference voltage is measured at 220kV side for voltage control. It is further explained in chapter 3.4.2, but why is the voltage control explained in chapter 3.4.1, referring to Un 66kV, as chapter 3.4.1 handles P/Q capability?
47	67	3.4.1.3	Grid compliance	1	Figure 46 & 47 refer to type C while the single strings are expected to have an installed capacity > 75MW. Reference to type D should be more correct, even if the values are the same for both types.
48	71	3.4.2.3	Grid compliance	1	Unorm_exp is that 220kV or 225kV? 1pu?
49	71	3.4.2.3	Grid compliance	1	Slope value of 2-7% is mentioned. What will be the default value?
50	71	3.4.3.3	Grid compliance	1	Please define "connection point" in this regard.
51	71	3.4.3.3	Grid compliance	1	Can it be assumed that the control mechanism is identical or comparable with the MOG I mechanism? Voltage after SP MVAR execution is the new voltage reference?
52	73	3.4.5.3	Grid compliance	1	Please explain last bullet of this page: "* Active and reactive power control should be decoupled (e.g. through automatic adaptation of the grid's R/X ratios)".
53	74	3.5.1	Grid compliance	1	Can you indicate the maximum available time to deactivate the fast reactive current injection? The OWF control rooms are generally not 24/7 manned.
54	76	3.5.2.3	Grid compliance	1	Please define "connection point" in this regard. (See also same question for paragraph 3.4.3.3)
55	80	3.7.1	Grid compliance	1	In the past meetings took place between OWF and Elia about the contribution of active power during the restoration process. Blocks of 50mW depending on wind availability were defined. Is this also applicable for PEZ?
56	80	3.7.2.2	Grid compliance	1	Response time of 30' is in theory possible, but individual WTG errors might occur that require manual reset or even a visit from the maintenance team. Hence 100% availability of the entire OWF can't be guaranteed on that short notice. Please confirm this is also understood by Elia.
57	83	3.8.1.1.3	Grid compliance	1	The ION might be required for the entire construction period. Will it be split up per string or 1 notification for the entire OWF? 1 notification per connection agreement?
58	87	3.8.1.2.3 first bullet	Grid compliance	1	As far as future connections are known, the statement makes sense, but as the wide area modeling and simulations are pushed from the TSO towards the grid users, the latter will experience the same IP problems as the TSO does. The risk for the Grid User is considered too high, non conformities discovered during simulations can't be allocated using the cloud based solution. Further it can be very time consuming for the OWF owner to perform simulations and to mitigate non conformities. For that reason, we stay at our position that the TSO should perform wide area EMT simulations as it has been done before. Otary considers this a red flag.
59	87	3.8.1.2.3 third bullet	Grid compliance	1	This is a statement that can have major impact on Committed PGM's. It should at least be subject to a well described procedure, including a CBA and that takes into account the technical (im)possibilities of the concerned PGM. Cost allocation of such adaptations to be discussed. Otary considers this a red flag.
60	89	3.8.2.2 - 2	Grid compliance	1	How will the model testing be performed? What are the criteria used?
61	91	3.8.4	Grid compliance	1	Are Snomi & Snomj to be considered at string or at OWF level?
62	93	3.8.6	Grid compliance	1	7) Which part of the grid is represented in the SMIB model in Power Factory and PSCAD provided by Elia?
63	96	3.8.8.1	Grid compliance	1	(3): "solving potential non-conformities without causing disproportionate investments" is a vague statement that offers no comfort, and creates an open-ended risk. Otary considers this as a red flag, together with comments #58, #59 & #64.
64	96	3.8.8.1	Grid compliance	1	(d) The statement "Full responsibility and cost shall be heard by the asset Owner under the following conditions" is unacceptable and Otary considers this to be a red flag. From experience we know that such changes as proposed parameter changes can be costly and time consuming. CBA should be performed amongst Elia assets and other Committed owners to look for the cheapest acceptable solution. Cost share is another option.
65	99		Grid compliance	1	Stage 2-1: PGM owner: the models to be provided include the WTG's, the inter array cables and OWF controller(s)? Please confirm
66	103	3.8.9	Grid compliance	1	Can you please explain the ratio behind the statement "Each PEZ offshore wind farm shall have a size 350 MW and shall be connected to the Elia transmission system on 66kV substation based on fully converter driven solution." ? What is the reason to only mention fully converter driven solutions? Others are forbidden?
67	103	3.8.8.2	Grid compliance	2	5C: "Ensure correct quantity and quality of high-speed measurement systems are installed in the network" Does the PGM have to foresee high speed measurement at the connection point on a permanent or temporary basis? We assume as long as required but temporary. How can this be matched with the Elia statement that CT and VT windings will not be accessible for the OWF's? Can Elia provide details about the measurement requirements and data exchange?
68	34	2.4.2	Installed capacity	1	Why is Elia stipulating limitations i.t.o. installed capacity? The decision to over-plant (and how much) should be the Developer's choice, and only limited by the FOD Energy and/or the permits. Elia should only limit injection capacity. Why is the injection of every concession limited to 700/1400MW? Is there no benefit from grouping all the connections on one island? We understand that the "guaranteed" injection would be limited to 700/1400MW respectively, but what if one OWF is temporarily down, can the available transmission capacity not be provided for another OWF if that other OWF can use it?
69	33	figure 20 & p.44/2.9.1	Looping	2	We understand that looping two IAC should be possible to, at least, support auxiliary services. Please confirm the redundant distance protection settings on the PEI are adaptable, based on the string length in looped configuration, where the loop is opened at any location and both IAC of the same loop are connected to the 66kV busbar
70	36	2.6	Marine coordination	1	"CTV and Walk to Work transfers will be possible under supervision of Elia". During OWF works, 24/7 access can be facilitated/client representative of Elia can be asked to be present? Can OWF operators and their Contractors also make use of heli transfers as from the start of OWF construction works?
71	48	2.10.	Marine coordination	2	We assume that simplified procedures will be available for emergency operations (e.g. vessel approval) and that for sailing within island boundaries (without any berthing or interventions) will be subject to a permanent waiver; this is essential for LOT 2 / 3. Moreover, it should not be more stringent than for current wind farms (e.g. ELIA getting access to REN OSS). Please elaborate.
72	48	2.10.1.2 and further	Marine coordination	2	What kind of planning is required here? We presume only for the activities that are related to the PEI (cable pull-in, termination and connection to GIS, and Energisation of WTGs). Please confirm.
73	48	2.10.	Marine coordination	2	Planning for high level RAMS seems to be requested very early, this seems too conservative.
74	49	2.10.1.4	Marine coordination	2	For example, submission of high-level RAMS 18m prior to start or 6m ahead providing list of equipment / vessels and e.g. 6-week ahead vessel inspection by Elia seems very conservative. In this respect, timing for commitment to start-up dedicated interface meetings would make more sense.
75	49	2.10.1.5	Marine coordination	2	Is it considered realistic that all involved equipment is defined 6 months in advance? A tentative list could be suggested.
76	51	2.10.2	Marine coordination	2	Vessel inspection would be required 6W in advance before commencing workscope. If this concerns a physical inspection, this is usually not feasible since vessels are usually in the vicinity only a few days before starting workscope. Vessels should not be inspected by ELIA but rather by a 3rd party and independent MWS and always in line with standard industry practice (if vessels are found suitable to work within an operational wind farm, it would be strange that they are deemed unsuitable to berth at a concrete structure). Please elaborate.
77	51	2.10.2	Marine coordination	2	Please align timing in §2.10.2.1 (e.g. MRCC permit, vessel inspection,...) with §2.10.1.
78	51	2.10.2.1	Marine coordination	2	Do Permits to Work requests need to be done by OWF or its Contractor?
79	52	2.10.2.1	Marine coordination	2	Where must the vessel be located for inspection? How will it be organized?
80	30	2.4.1	Planning	1	Bullet 4- is unclear. Does it mean that MRCC needs to provide a permit for every intervention? What is meant by exceptional marine activities? Please clarify.
81	35	figure 21	Planning	2	Kindly provide a detailed planning for the individual parts of Figure 16 (rather than the general bar chart included in Figure 21). Planning is not in line with latest tender information by the government. Even without considering (likely) delays on Ventilius, the first WTGs will only be installed in 2029.
82	33	2.4.1	Power Scada	2	The DS and ES positions will be exchanged with Elia for switching operations. It might be considered to exchange only one signal for switching release. Please elaborate
83	20	1.4.3	Proximity agreement	2	What is the level of liabilities (in €) that Elia envisages per proximity agreement? Is a template available? Who will facilitate the negotiation of the proximity agreement? Can we use a similar multi-party set-up as we did for MOGI?
84	20	1.4.3	Proximity agreement	2	"Elia grants to the cable owner a non-exclusive right of access to the Elia Domain Concession and the Island, under the terms of the Proximity Agreement." Please confirm coordinates of Elia Domain Concession.
85	48	2.10.1	Proximity agreement	2	Suggest to agree reciprocally on document submission /review timings in proximity agreement for Construction and O&M activities (as done previously, cfr. tripartite agreement).

No	Page	Section	Topic	Priority 1: Urgent 2: In Tender Docs	Comment
86	45	2.9.2	Signals	1	In order to provide an accurate voltage, reactive and active power control service, redundant real-time access to voltage and current measurements is required. The windfarm owners must receive the measurement data 1 on 1; there cannot be any differences. Hence our request towards Elia remains to install Elspec PQ analysers instead of Sineax converters to avoid OWF control problems. Statement "Other measuring converters can only be implemented when the minimum requirements have been fulfilled and validated by Elia" should allow for this, but to be executed by Elia. It should not be pushed towards the OWF owner after almost 2 years of TF discussions and OEM confirmations
87	45	2.9.2	Signals	1	Life time measurement converter of 20y seems exaggerated, why this requirement? Reference is made to comment 86 in this regard.
88	45	2.9.2	Signals	1	The statement "For all scenarios described above the offshore wind farm will be responsible for the related equipment inclusive delivery, maintenance, support and spare parts management." This seems contradictory as the OWF is not allowed to connect equipment to the secondary CT windings directly. Please clarify.
89	45	2.9.2	Signals	1	"To regulate the active power output, the Power Park Controller (PPC) shall be connected to each 66kV inter array cable bay" Does this mean from each 66kV bay, information can be retrieved via a measurement device? Preferably an Elspec analyser. Please confirm.
90	45	2.9.2	Signals	1	"the counters will be provided and maintained by Elia" We assume these will be comptable measurements and statutory certification is also part of Elia's scope. The detailed "revenue counter" high frequency data should also be available for the windfarm owners; not only the counting impulses. The counting impulses should correspond 1 on 1 with the "grey revenue counter" data as published by Elia (currently on the EVMS portal). Please confirm.
91	46	figure 33 & 34	Signals	1	We assume the positions of ES and DS are not required per string but per WTG. See former suggestion on this topic, please confirm. Please define the "Emergency Elia", "Blackout Elia" and "Grid restoration Elia" signals. These are no standard signals originating from wind turbines or park controllers. Further the list needs to be completed with signals related to change from V to Q control and vice versa and control of reactive current injection in case of grid events. Please add "Spanningsmeting 66kV Elia", "Stroommeting 66kV Elia" and "Stroommeting 220kV Elia" to figure 34. What is the function of "Host offline" for PEZ without the application of an interface cubicle offshore? Please provide network en communication architecture as requested during the TF meeting of 19/10/2023. An accurate high frequency real-time connection to reactive power measurements at the V/Q control point at 220kV is required besides the voltage measurement to properly execute set points MVAR.
92	56	3.1 & 3.4	Signals	2	Clarification related to voltage management and MVAR capability: not all requirements match the signal exchange list. Or is that not the intention? Please clarify the way Elia envisages the activation/deactivation of certain features and how to execute setpoints with services running.
93	70	3.4.2.3	Signals	1	How is change of controller setpoint (MVAR) on request of TSO communicated to OWF ? The dead band requires the park controller to switch between U-control and Q-control depending on the grid voltage. This makes the voltage service logic much more complex and will increase the failure rates. Please provide more information why the existing setup (MOG 1) is not sufficient for PEZ.
94	72	3.4.4.3	Signals	1	Commands currently not foreseen in figure 34 : List of signals exchange from offshore wind farm PPC to Elia, please elaborate
95	73	3.4.5.3	Signals	1	6th bullet "Setpoint change shall be achieved in steps not greater than 0.5% of the reactive range or 1 MVAR (the highest of the two);" indicates a rather slow set point change (0,5% or 1MVAR). For MOG 1 we receive significant set points and the speed of control is managed by an agreed ramp rate. How do we have to interpret this requirement given?
96	54	2.10.4	Training	2	Is it required to have a BA5 grade for all workers? BA4 should be sufficient in certain cases, depending on the works to be performed
97	54	2.10.4	Training	2	As mentioned under Section 2.10.2.2 "Access given to personnel", before being allowed on a Marine and Island coordination site, personnel will need to have followed adequate trainings (site and transportation mode specific induction; offshore health certificate; BOSIET or GWO, GWO Advanced First Aid for 10% of the workforce, HUET + CA-EBS in case of transfer per helicopter, Elia Electrical training and BA4/BA5, task specific trainings as displayed in Figure 40. What will the Elia electrical training be? how will it be organized and on which location?
98	38	2.6.3 & 2.6.4	Vessel constraints	2	Please list applicable (vessel) constraints for mooring at quayside. Can Crew transfer harbor be used as shelter harbor for 80 m. SOV ? Can vessel limitations be provided for the shelter harbor?
99	38	2.6.4	Vessel constraints	2	Is there any provision of power for the CTVs including fuelling/hydrogen etc?
100	38	2.6.3 & 2.6.4	Vessel constraints	2	Please issue more detailed lay-out and design of quay side and CTV harbour for access,landing/ mooring & offloading to PEI.
101	39	2.7.1	Vessel constraints	2	Figure 25 Please clarify cable free zone south-east of PEI. Is this a dedicated zone for Jack-up vessel, mitigate potential for dropped objects from quayside/CTV harbour? Is the use of a Jack-up vessel possible?
102	44	2.9.1	WTG	2	Please provide information how the Elia protection system can detect and clear secondary WTG transformer faults in case the WTG CB fails. Intertrip possibility?
103	21	2.1 & 2.4.1	Elia asset	2	Spare bays 66kV: During the TF of 19-10-2023, the amount of spare bays has been discussed and is was requested to raise this number to 2 bays per section - adding up to 10 or 1 per 350MW block, Elia spares excluded. This is not adapted nor mentioned in the MoM of this TF. See also comment for paragraph 2.7.2.
104	30	2.4.1	Elia asset	2	Please provide additional information on the N-1 situation at 220kV AC. How will this be handled and controlled?