

1 Q. Hydro states in Section 5.0 that “Teshmont’s analysis provides validation of Hydro’s
2 assumed HVdc reliability and availability parameters”. However, comparing the
3 original information provided in the response to PUB-NLH-212, Attachment 2, Table
4 3-2 (bipole outages), and the data used by Teshmont, it can be seen that Teshmont
5 used the original data, rather than the subsequent data that was provided in GRK-
6 NLH-060, Revision 1. The most significant difference between the two sets of data is
7 the overall bipole outage rate, which has been reduced from 0.7078/year to
8 0.3278/year. Please clarify.

9

10

11 A. The difference in these two data sets is that Hydro’s response to GRK-NLH-060,
12 Revision 1, is updated to reflect guaranteed performance values for the HVdc
13 converters at Muskrat Falls and Soldiers Pond, while the HVdc converter
14 performance data from the 2012 reliability study was based on CIGRE statistics.

15

16 The 2012 reliability study that was provided to Teshmont was based on a bipole
17 failure rate of 0.24 failures/year for converter station. This compares to the
18 guaranteed bipole failure rate of 0.05 failures/year guaranteed by the HVdc vendor.

19

20 The resulting difference in performance resulted in a reduction in the failure rate of
21 the composite Labrador Island Link bipole from 0.7078 to 0.3278.