Hello,

I write this with a high sense of commitment not only as a stakeholder but someone that has the genuine interest in the upliftment that comes from the socioeconomic advancement of my local community here in Scotland.

As a participant in the enhanced stakeholders engagement on the RIIOED2 DD response Workshop of SSEN held on the 27th of July, 2022. I am providing feedback based on the discussions and views articulated by myself and others at the meeting, I am a stakeholder on the basis of my community and also as a member of academia.

In response to Ofgem's decisions. on the Environmental Action Plan (EAP) of the  Business Plan of SSEN, the following are my views which were also expressed at the Stakeholders' engagement workshop regarding the disallowed items,

1. **On the Disallowed item of Curbing SF16** by elimination of assets that have the history of leakages (Proposed Expenditure £6m)

Given the danger of SF6 to the environment ( more dangerous than carbon emission), I consider the removal of the Assets that have history of leakages by SSEN not only as urgent but the right thing to do. The expenditure of £6m allocated to this item is reasonable and has an intrinsic customer value proposal to the immediate communities where these assets cut across. A reconsideration of this decision by Ofgem will further repose the confidence in RIIOED2 as a vehicle to deliver the Science-based Netzero target that has an embedded interest of customers' at its core.

2. **On the disallowed item of nature-based solution to the removal of carbon emission**(Proposed Expenditure £24m); This should be reconsidered on the basis of the socioeconomic impact on the constituent communities that will stand to gain from its implementation. The technical solution to carbon emission though a reliable approach, but presents a narrow benefit to the immediate communities. The Environmental action plan (EAP) of DNOs to tackle the issue of carbon emission removal by alternatives available (technical and nature-based approaches)  elucidate the need for it to be done based on the dynamics of the benefits of the approach adopted by respective DNO on its socioeconomic impact on the society and communities such projects cut across. The benefit which my community in Scotland stands to gain is enormous given the poor prevailing socio economic indicators. The opportunities that will come from the implementation of nature-approach on the communities over here will go a long way to give the RIIOED2 a human face and a visible element of community  welfare prioritization in the DD of RIIOED2. Where the Customer Value Proposition (CVP) methodologies used by SSEN and Ofgem differ, further consultation and deliberation should be held to synchronise the difference, at the end letting the customers and communities win.

3. **Stakeholder's education on items of the RIIOED2 DD in the area of the EAP (especially on the implications) should be further entrenched,** this is due to the obvious deficit in the knowledge of the implication of the issues which the stakeholders were engaged, especially in the area of the SF6 elimination.

4. **There should be rules for stakeholder's engagement based on expected minimal representation of respective Stakeholders's constituents**, the presence and inputs of certain stakeholders' constituencies were obviously deficient at the workshops especially that of the members of academia. I believe the drive to Netzero target is also coherent with the Sustainable Development Goal Target 17 (SDG17) that calls for collaborative effort from academic researchers, industry practitioners and policymakers.

Thanks for the opportunity to make these Inputs.

Victor Abuul