

Transforming Connections Data: outputs / next steps from Theme 1 of the connections end-to-end review

Publication date:	25 September 2026
Response deadline:	6 November 2026
Contact:	Alasdair MacMillan / Connections Policy team
Team:	Electricity Connections Policy Development
Email:	connections@ofgem.gov.uk

This consultation sets out proposals to improve the transparency, consistency, accessibility and interoperability of published electricity connections data through Ofgem's Transforming Connections Data programme. This programme has evolved from Theme 1 of the Connections end-to-end review, following consultations in November 2024 and December 2025 and extensive stakeholder engagement throughout 2026.

Stakeholders consistently told us¹ that connections data can be difficult to access, interpret and use effectively. Feedback highlighted concerns about data quality, consistency and interoperability, as well as challenges in obtaining a complete picture of connection queues, network reinforcement activity and future network requirements.

In response, we have worked collaboratively with network companies, NESO, developers, consultants and other stakeholders to identify priority improvements to published connections data. These proposals include the introduction of new datasets, targeted improvements to existing datasets, and measures to support greater standardisation and interoperability across the connections data landscape.

This consultation represents the first phase of the Transforming Connections Data programme. Responses will inform future policy development and any subsequent statutory consultations needed to implement new requirements.

¹ The terms “the Authority”, “we”, “our” and “us” are used interchangeably in this document

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

© Crown copyright 2026

The text of this document may be reproduced (excluding logos) under and in accordance with the terms of the Open Government Licence.

Without prejudice to the generality of the terms of the Open Government Licence, the material that is reproduced must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the document title of this document must be specified in that acknowledgement.

This publication is available at www.ofgem.gov.uk. Any enquiries regarding the use and re-use of this information resource should be sent to psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Table of Contents

Executive summary	5
1. Introduction	6
Background	6
Purpose of this consultation	7
Context and related publications	8
Consultation stages	10
How to respond	11
Your response, data, and confidentiality	11
How to track the progress of a consultation	12
2. Analysis of 2025 consultation responses	13
Decision 1.1	13
Decision 1.2	14
Decision 1.3	15
Decision 1.4	16
Proposal 1.1	17
Proposal 1.2	17
3. Progress made on 2025 proposals	19
Decision 1.1	19
Decision 1.2	19
Decision 1.3	20
Decision 1.4	21
Proposal 1.1	21
Proposal 1.2	22
4. Overview of 2026 workshop discussions	24
Part A: Comprehensive Connections Data: a change of approach	25
Part B: Queue transparency datasets	27
Part C: Network reinforcement datasets	40
Part D: Strategic planning and network data	46
Part E: Cross-cutting design and policy considerations	47
5. Decisions, proposals and dataset-specific questions	56
Package 1. New: Demand Capacity Register (DCR)	56
Package 2. New: Distribution Works Report (DWR)	63
Package 3. Improvements to the Embedded Capacity Register (ECR)	71
Package 4. Improvements to the Transmission Works Report (TWR)	73
Package 5. Improvements to the Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instruction (TORI)	77
Package 6. Improvements to the Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register	83
Additional and overarching questions	88
Send us your feedback	89
Appendix 1. Privacy policy	90

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Personal data 90

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Executive summary

This consultation proposes a major expansion of Ofgem's work on electricity connections data through a new standalone programme, Transforming Connections Data, which has evolved from Theme 1 of the Connections end-to-end review. The programme aims to improve the transparency, consistency, accessibility, interoperability and quality of published connections data, supporting better customer decision-making, network planning, strategic investment and delivery of wider energy system reforms.

Building on extensive stakeholder engagement during 2026, Ofgem has prioritised a targeted package of high-value dataset reforms.

The consultation's principal proposals are:

- **Creation of a new Demand Capacity Register (DCR)** to provide standardised visibility of demand connections across transmission and distribution networks, including consultation on project inclusion thresholds, governance arrangements, storage treatment and technology categorisation.
- **Creation of a new Distribution Works Report (DWR)** to provide visibility of reinforcement activity on distribution networks.
- **Targeted improvements to existing datasets**, including the Embedded Capacity Register (ECR), Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register, Transmission Works Report (TWR) and Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instruction (TORI), with a strong focus on interoperability, common identifiers, improved locational information, and data quality.

Overall, the consultation represents the first phase of a longer-term programme intended to establish a more coherent, standardised and interoperable ecosystem of connections data across Great Britain, providing greater visibility of connection queues, network reinforcement activity and future network needs.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

1. Introduction

This chapter explains the development of Ofgem's **Transforming Connections Data (TCD)** programme and its focus on improving published connections datasets. It places the work in the context of wider reforms, including strategic planning, Common Information Model (CIM), data governance and National Energy System Operator's (NESO) Data Sharing Infrastructure (DSI). The consultation timetable is confirmed at the end of this chapter.

Background

- 1.1. The Connections End-to-end review ("the review") was first announced as part of the joint Ofgem and Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) Connections Action Plan (CAP) in November 2023². The review was established to consider whether the regulatory framework governing electricity connections remained fit for purpose in the context of increasing demand for network connections, growing connection queues, and wider ambitions around Clean Power 2030³, net zero, and economic growth.
- 1.2. On 8 November 2024, we published our initial consultation on the review⁴. This was structured around seven themes representing key aspects of the connections customer journey. Theme 1, *Visibility and accuracy of connections data*, considered whether connecting customers had access to the data they needed to make informed decisions throughout the connections process, and whether improvements were required to the quality, accessibility, consistency and transparency of connections data.
- 1.3. Stakeholder feedback demonstrated strong support for improvements to connections data and highlighted concerns relating to data quality, consistency, interoperability, and the availability of data across both transmission and distribution networks. Stakeholders also emphasised the importance of data in supporting strategic planning, improving customer decision-making, and enabling more efficient operation of the reformed connections process.
- 1.4. In response, a second consultation was published in December 2025⁵ which included updated proposals and next steps. Under Theme 1 specifically, a series of decisions and proposals were set out, including work to identify useful connections datasets, improve data quality, develop a Demand Capacity Register (DCR), improve interoperability between existing tools, and establish more consistent approaches to data sharing and triage.

² [Electricity networks: connections action plan - GOV.UK](#)

³ [Clean Power 2030 Action Plan - GOV.UK](#)

⁴ [Connections end-to-end review of the regulatory framework | Ofgem](#)

⁵ [Connections end-to-end review: updated proposals and next steps | Ofgem](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 1.5. Since publication of the December 2025 consultation, Ofgem, NESO, network companies and wider industry stakeholders have undertaken an extensive programme of collaborative engagement to further develop these proposals. Through a series of Ofgem-led workshops, stakeholders have helped identify priority datasets, define data requirements and design principles, and explore opportunities to improve the consistency, accessibility and usability of published connections data.
- 1.6. As this work progressed, it became clear that the opportunity to improve connections data extended beyond the scope originally envisaged under Theme 1 of the review. While Theme 1 initially considered both published connections data and regulatory reporting data provided to Ofgem by network companies, stakeholder engagement demonstrated a strong appetite for a broader programme focused on improving the transparency, consistency and interoperability of publicly available connections datasets.
- 1.7. The programme subsequently evolved into what we are now referring to as “Transforming Connections Data” (“TCD”), formerly Theme 1 of the review. TCD focuses on delivering improvements to published connections data through the introduction of new datasets, enhancements to existing datasets, and the adoption of more consistent data standards and approaches across the sector. The programme has been developed alongside wider industry initiatives, including work relating to the CIM⁶, Digitalisation Strategy and Action Plans⁷ and DSI⁸, helping to support greater interoperability and consistency across the electricity sector.
- 1.8. Given the breadth of the work and the differing implementation timescales involved, TCD is now progressing separately from the wider review⁹. The programme adopts a phased approach, prioritising those datasets and data improvements expected to deliver the greatest value to stakeholders and consumers.

Purpose of this consultation

- 1.9. This consultation builds on the proposals and engagement undertaken through Theme 1 of the review and represents the first phase of the TCD programme. The proposals presented in this consultation focus on the highest-priority connections datasets identified through stakeholder engagement following the December

⁶ CIM is an industry data standard that provides a common structure and terminology for electricity network data, helping to improve consistency, interoperability and data exchange across organisations.

⁷ [Digitalisation Strategy and Action Plan Guidance | OFGEM](#)

⁸ [Data Sharing Infrastructure \(DSI\) | National Energy System Operator](#)

⁹ Themes 2 to 5 and Theme 7 of the review are now being progressed through the Transforming Connections Experience (TCE) programme. Theme 6 (Minor Connections) is being progressed separately by a dedicated team. A consultation on TCE is being published alongside this document.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

2025 consultation on electricity connections data and subsequent Ofgem-led workshops.

- 1.10. A range of datasets are already published by network companies and NESO to provide information on the electricity connections queue and associated network developments. These include the Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register¹⁰, Embedded Capacity Registers (ECRs)¹¹, and information on transmission reinforcement works through publications such as the Transmission Works Report (TWR)¹² and the Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instruction (TORI)¹³.
- 1.11. However, responses to the December 2025 consultation highlighted that stakeholders continue to face challenges in obtaining a complete and consistent picture of the connections queue and associated network developments. Respondents identified a number of data gaps and suggested that both new datasets and improvements to existing published datasets could enhance transparency and usability¹⁴.
- 1.12. Through this consultation, we are seeking stakeholder views on proposals to introduce new connections datasets and improve existing published datasets. The proposals are intended to improve transparency of the connections process, support more informed customer decision-making, and enable more effective network and strategic planning across the electricity system. We are also seeking views on a number of cross-cutting issues that affect the proposed datasets, including approaches to project inclusion thresholds.
- 1.13. Responses received through this consultation will inform the next phase of policy development and future statutory consultations to introduce new requirements. This consultation, therefore, represents an important step towards establishing a longer-term framework for improving the visibility, consistency and accuracy of published connections data.

Context and related publications

- 1.14. The proposals set out in this consultation sit within a wider landscape of connections reform, strategic network planning, data standardisation and energy data governance. Across these areas, recent publications and initiatives point to a common theme: **the electricity system is becoming increasingly reliant on**

¹⁰ [Transmission Entry Capacity \(TEC\) register | National Energy System Operator](#)

¹¹ Ofgem approved a code modification proposal DCP350, requiring Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and Independent Distribution Network Operators (IDNOs) to create a public standardised register of all sites larger than 1MW with DERs that are connected to or have an agreement to connect to their networks and influence the GB power system. See [DCP350 – Creation of Embedded Capacity Registers | Ofgem](#)

¹² [Reports and registers | National Energy System Operator](#)

¹³ Published voluntarily by SP Transmission and SSEN Transmission

¹⁴ See Chapter 2 for further detail on December 2025 consultation responses

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

accurate, consistent, accessible and interoperable data. This section summarises related work that has informed our approach to TCD.

Strategic planning initiatives

1.15. Initiatives such as the Centralised Strategic Network Plan (CSNP)¹⁵, Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP)¹⁶ and Regional Energy Strategic Planning (RESP)¹⁷ reflect a growing focus on more coordinated and strategic planning of the future energy system. These developments increase the importance of high-quality, consistent and accessible information about connection requirements, network constraints and network reinforcement activity. Improving the quality, consistency and interoperability of published connections data can, therefore, support more effective strategic planning and investment decisions across the electricity system.

Data standardisation and exchange initiatives

1.16. Alongside wider reforms to the connections process, there has been an increasing focus across the energy sector on improving the standardisation, interoperability and machine-readability of data. Examples include reforms to the Long-Term Development Statements (LTDS)¹⁸, which introduced CIM-based outputs, and Grid Code modification GC0139¹⁹, which supports a more structured approach to planning data exchange between NESO and network operators. These developments reflect a broader move towards data that can be more readily exchanged, linked and reused across organisations.

1.17. Ofgem's Data Best Practice Guidance²⁰ provides further context by promoting principles such as standardisation, interoperability, accessibility and discoverability. Together, these initiatives demonstrate an increasing recognition that the value of published data depends not only on its availability, but also on its consistency, usability and ability to be used alongside other datasets. The proposals set out in this consultation have been developed in this wider context.

Data sharing and governance

1.18. There is an increasing expectation that energy system data should be published in ways that maximise its value to consumers and stakeholders. Ofgem's Data Best Practice Guidance promotes a presumption of openness and encourages data to be made available in accessible, interoperable and reusable formats where appropriate.

¹⁵ [Centralised Strategic Network Plan \(CSNP\) | National Energy System Operator](#)

¹⁶ [Strategic Spatial Energy Planning \(SSEP\) | National Energy System Operator](#)

¹⁷ [Regional Energy Strategic Planning \(RESP\) | National Energy System Operator](#)

¹⁸ [Long Term Development Statement direction | Ofgem](#)

¹⁹ [Grid Code GC0139: enhanced planning-data exchange to facilitate whole system planning Authority Decision | Ofgem](#)

²⁰ [Data Best Practice guidance | Ofgem](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 1.19. At the same time, wider work on data sharing and governance, including NESO's DSI and Ofgem's consultation on securing open data in energy²¹, recognises that some information may require safeguards because of commercial, security or confidentiality considerations.
- 1.20. These initiatives provide important context for the TCD programme, which seeks to improve the transparency and accessibility of connections data while at the same time recognising that some datasets or data fields may require a considered, proportionate approach to publication and sharing.

Evidence of demand for improved connections data

- 1.21. Recent industry publications and engagement exercises have highlighted the challenges stakeholders face in obtaining clear and up-to-date information on connection opportunities, network constraints and reinforcement activity to inform their connection applications and investment decisions. For example, Yottar's analysis²² of grid capacity visibility highlighted the potential economic benefits of improving the accessibility, interoperability, quality and machine-readability of network data. The report argues that limited visibility of available network capacity can lead to less efficient investment, siting and network planning decisions, and estimates that poor grid capacity visibility may impose substantial costs on the wider economy.
- 1.22. Similarly, Ofgem's Demand Connections Reform Call for Input²³ and subsequent summary of responses²⁴ demonstrated stakeholder interest in greater transparency of connections queues, available capacity, network constraints and reinforcement requirements.
- 1.23. These findings reinforce Ofgem's view that improving the quality, accessibility and interoperability of connections data has the potential to deliver significant benefits for consumers, connecting customers, network operators and the wider energy system. Enhanced transparency can support better-informed investment decisions, improve understanding of network constraints and opportunities, facilitate more efficient use of network capacity, and strengthen network planning processes. Together, these benefits can contribute to a more efficient connections regime, reduce unnecessary costs and delays, and support the timely delivery of the infrastructure needed for economic growth and decarbonisation.

Consultation stages

Stage 1: Consultation open: 25 September 2026

²¹ [Securing open data in energy: triage in data best practice guidance | Ofgem](#)

²² [Invisible Constraints: The Economic Impact of Limited Grid Capacity Visibility](#)

²³ [2026-02-12-Demand-Connections-Call-for-Input.pdf](#)

²⁴ [summary-of-call-for-input-responses-demand-connections-reform.pdf](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Stage 2: Deadline for responses: 6 November 2026

Stage 3: Responses reviewed and published: December 2026

Stage 4: Consultation outcome: Spring 2027

How to respond

To support efficient analysis of consultation responses and ensure that views on individual proposals and questions can be compared consistently across respondents, **Ofgem requests that responses to this consultation are submitted using the response template provided alongside this document.** Responses submitted in alternative formats may be more difficult to analyse and may require additional clarification from respondents.

The template is designed to enable respondents to indicate which consultation questions they are answering, provide supporting evidence and explain the reasoning behind their views. Respondents are encouraged to answer only those questions that are relevant to their organisation, expertise or interests. There is no requirement to respond to every question.

Where respondents wish to provide comments that do not relate directly to a specific consultation question, the response template includes space for additional observations. We welcome evidence, examples and supporting analysis wherever possible, as these can assist us in understanding the practical implications of the proposals and informing future policy development.

Completed response templates should be submitted by the consultation deadline using the contact details provided on the front page of this document.

We will publish non-confidential responses on our website.

Your response, data, and confidentiality

You can ask us to keep your response, or parts of your response, confidential. We will respect this, subject to obligations to disclose information. For example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, statutory directions, court orders, government regulations, or where you give us explicit permission to disclose. If you do want us to keep your response confidential, please clearly mark this on your response and explain why.

If you wish us to keep part of your response confidential, please clearly mark those parts of your response that you do wish to be kept confidential and those that you do not wish to be kept confidential. Please put the confidential material in a separate appendix to your response. If necessary, we will contact you to discuss which parts of the information in your response should be kept confidential and which can be published. We might ask for reasons why.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

If the information you give in your response contains personal data under the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) as retained in domestic law following the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union ("UK GDPR"), the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority will be the data controller for the purposes of GDPR. Ofgem uses the information in responses in performing its statutory functions and in accordance with section 105 of the Utilities Act 2000. Please refer to our Privacy Notice on consultations, see Appendix 4.

If you wish to respond confidentially, we will keep your response confidential, but we will publish the number, but not the names, of confidential responses we receive. We will not link responses to respondents if we publish a summary of responses, and we will evaluate each response on its own merits without undermining your right to confidentiality.

How to track the progress of a consultation

1. Find the web page for the call for input you would like to receive updates on.
2. Click 'Get emails about this page', enter your email address and click 'Submit'.
3. You will receive an email to notify you when it has changed status.

A consultation has three stages: 'Open', 'Closed (awaiting decision)', and 'Closed (with decision)'.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

2. Analysis of 2025 consultation responses

This chapter provides analysis of the responses received to our 2025 consultation for *Theme 1: improving the visibility and accuracy of connections data*. Respondents were broadly supportive of the decisions and proposals consulted on, while highlighting a range of implementation considerations relating to standardisation, governance, proportionality and data quality.

- 2.1. Decisions reflect areas where we had identified a proposed direction of travel and sought stakeholder views. Proposals relate to potential future policy or regulatory interventions that required further development. We summarise the key themes raised by respondents under each decision and proposal in turn.

Decision 1.1

Network groups to convene workshops with industry stakeholders to agree a comprehensive list of useful connections data for network companies to publish.

- 2.2. Support for Decision 1.1 was received across a range of stakeholder types, with no respondents clearly disagreeing.
- 2.3. Many respondents considered improved connections data important for supporting investment decisions, site selection, project planning and visibility of network capacity, constraints and reinforcement requirements.
- 2.4. Respondents identified a range of data they considered useful for publication, including information on network capacity, network asset information, reinforcement works, enabling works, project dependencies, constraints and connections queue information. Some respondents also highlighted the importance of improving existing datasets, including the TEC register, ECR, TWR, TORI, Electricity Ten-Year Statement (ETYS)²⁵ and LTDS tables.
- 2.5. Greater standardisation was a recurring theme. Respondents called for common data standards, consistent naming conventions, standardised formats and machine-readable²⁶ data. Several respondents also noted that the value of published data would depend on its accessibility and usability, not solely its availability.

²⁵ [Electricity Ten Year Statement \(ETYS\) | National Energy System Operator](#)

²⁶ Data published in a structured, standardised format that can be automatically processed, exchanged and analysed by computer systems without requiring manual interpretation or re-entry. Machine-readable data enables automated workflows, integration with planning and modelling tools, interoperability between datasets, and more efficient data sharing across organisations. Examples of machine-readable formats include CSV, JSON, XML and APIs.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 2.6. Some respondents raised caveats around proportionality, resource requirements and the limitations of published data. These respondents noted that published data should support effective engagement between parties and should be developed in a way that reflects different customer needs and use cases. They also highlighted the need to ensure the scope of published data remains proportionate and takes account of implementation costs, noting that published data should complement, rather than replace, effective engagement between network companies and customers.
- 2.7. Several respondents emphasised the importance of broad stakeholder participation in the workshops, suggesting representation should extend beyond network companies to include developers, Independent Distribution Network Operators (IDNOs), electrical vehicle (EV) charge point operators and other users of connections data.

Decision 1.2

A new requirement for network companies to publish a Demand Capacity Register, with a minimum data update frequency of monthly. NESO to liaise with network companies and developers to determine an appropriate home for this requirement.

- 2.8. Most respondents supported the introduction of a DCR and agreed that improved visibility of current and future demand would support more informed investment, development and network planning decisions.
- 2.9. Standardisation was identified as an important consideration, including common data formats, definitions, identifiers and naming conventions to ensure the register is easy to use and comparable across network areas.
- 2.10. Machine-readability and, where possible, integration with existing datasets and reporting tools were also identified as important considerations.
- 2.11. Several respondents supported monthly publication as a minimum requirement, although some suggested that more frequent or near real-time updates should be considered where feasible.
- 2.12. Respondents emphasised that the value of the register would depend on the quality, completeness and accuracy of the underlying data and the presence of appropriate governance and oversight arrangements.
- 2.13. While generally supportive, some network companies and developers highlighted the potential resource and implementation burden associated with developing and maintaining the register and suggested that costs and benefits should be carefully considered.
- 2.14. A small number of respondents sought further clarity regarding the scope, design and purpose of the DCR, including how it would interact with existing datasets and reporting arrangements.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 2.15. One respondent expressed concerns that publishing demand capacity information could create commercial confidentiality risks.

Decision 1.3

Network groups to work with industry to agree ambitious timelines for the interoperability of existing digital tools and implementation of a single digital view across transmission and distribution. NESO/ENA to undertake a Five Case Business Case for the single digital view ahead of any implementation decision.

Interoperability of existing digital tools

- 2.16. Respondents generally supported improving interoperability between existing digital tools, recognising the benefits of greater consistency, accessibility and usability of connections data.
- 2.17. Common data standards, machine-readable formats and consistent identifiers were considered essential for enabling data to be more easily shared and compared across platforms.
- 2.18. Several respondents highlighted the benefits of improving interoperability between existing datasets and tools before progressing to the implementation of a single digital view²⁷ (discussed below). Some respondents also noted that interoperability should focus on improving access to, and navigation between, existing datasets rather than creating additional standalone platforms.
- 2.19. While supportive of the overall objective, some respondents highlighted the potential implementation costs, complexity and resource requirements associated with delivering interoperability.
- 2.20. A small number of respondents emphasised that improvements to interoperability should be accompanied by improvements to the quality, accuracy and completeness of the underlying datasets.

Single digital view

- 2.21. Respondents who commented on a single digital view were generally supportive of the objective of improving access to connections data and reducing the need to navigate multiple datasets and platforms.
- 2.22. Respondents highlighted the potential benefits of providing a more accessible and user-friendly view of connections information. However, support was often

²⁷ A single digital view refers to an interactive data visualisation platform that brings together connections and network capacity information from multiple existing datasets and sources, enabling users to access relevant information through a single point of access.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

conditional on improvements to interoperability, standardisation and data quality across existing tools and datasets.

- 2.23. Some respondents expressed a preference for improving and linking existing tools rather than developing a new centralised platform. Several also highlighted the importance of maintaining flexibility in how data is accessed and presented.
- 2.24. Several respondents questioned whether a single digital view would deliver sufficient benefits to justify the anticipated implementation costs, complexity and resource requirements.
- 2.25. A number of respondents welcomed the proposal for a business case assessment, considering this an important step in determining whether a single digital view represents the most effective solution for industry and users.

Decision 1.4

Network groups to convene workshops to agree data triage processes for connections, with the intention of developing a consistent, robust, security-minded process that can be used across transmission and distribution. Guidance for this process should clearly set out which types of data should not be shared publicly.

- 2.26. Respondents were generally supportive of developing a consistent and robust approach to data triage across transmission and distribution networks.
- 2.27. Several respondents supported the distinction between open and sensitive data, recognising the need to balance transparency with appropriate protection of commercially sensitive, confidential and security-critical information.
- 2.28. A number of respondents, particularly renewable energy developers, trade associations and not-for-profit industry bodies, stressed that the process should maintain a strong presumption towards openness and avoid classifying data as sensitive unless there is a clear justification for doing so.
- 2.29. Clear and consistent guidance, supported by appropriate governance arrangements, was identified as important to ensuring data triage decisions are applied consistently across network companies.
- 2.30. Some respondents, including network companies, noted the challenges associated with defining what information should be considered sensitive and emphasised the need for appropriate legal, security and data protection considerations.
- 2.31. A small number of respondents raised concerns that an overly restrictive approach could reduce transparency and limit the value of the wider data reforms, while others highlighted the need for specific protections for particularly sensitive or security-critical information.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Proposal 1.1

We will explore the introduction of a new licence condition requiring connections data to be: (a) accurate and complete, and (b) as close to real-time as is feasible, bearing in mind any potential security risks of real-time data, with monthly update at a minimum. This requirement will apply to both the data that feeds into the data visualisation tools and the system-level data compiled for publication.

- 2.32. Respondents generally supported the objective of improving the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of connections data, recognising the importance of high-quality data for customer decision-making, investment planning and the wider connections process.
- 2.33. Many developers, generators, suppliers, trade associations and digital innovators supported the introduction of a new licence condition, viewing this as a means of driving greater consistency, accountability and transparency across the industry. Several respondents also emphasised the importance of robust monitoring and enforcement arrangements.
- 2.34. Several respondents supported a minimum monthly update frequency, with some developers, trade associations and digital innovators advocating publication as close to real-time as reasonably practicable.
- 2.35. A number of respondents stated that any future requirements should apply consistently across relevant organisations, including network operators and NESO, to support a coordinated approach to data quality and transparency.
- 2.36. While supportive of the underlying objective, some network companies and energy suppliers questioned whether a new licence condition is necessary. These respondents generally favoured strengthening existing obligations through improved accountability, visibility and enforcement rather than introducing an additional licence requirement.
- 2.37. Some respondents also highlighted the need to carefully consider implementation costs, resource requirements and proportionality when developing any future obligations.
- 2.38. A small number of respondents expressed concerns that new requirements could duplicate existing obligations or create unnecessary complexity if not clearly aligned with existing governance and regulatory arrangements.

Proposal 1.2

Ofgem will explore leveraging Ofgem’s Data Best Practice Guidance to ensure that all useful connections data is ‘presumed open’. Sensitive data should be exchanged using the DSI when the solution is live.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 2.39. Respondents generally supported a presumption of openness for connections data and the use of the DSI to share genuinely sensitive information. Support was expressed across developer, renewable energy, EV charging, trade association and network company respondents.
- 2.40. Many respondents supported the proposed distinction between open and sensitive data, but emphasised the need for clear, consistent and proportionate classification criteria. Several respondents suggested a risk-based approach to determining data sensitivity. This view was particularly reflected among renewable energy developers, network companies and trade associations.
- 2.41. A common view across respondent groups was that the threshold for classifying data as sensitive should remain high. Respondents cautioned against overuse of the sensitive category and stressed that openness should remain the default position.
- 2.42. Several respondents highlighted the importance of strong governance arrangements for the DSI, including clear access arrangements, accountability mechanisms and transparent decision-making. Some respondents also emphasised the need for sensitive data to remain accessible to legitimate users and trusted third parties where appropriate.
- 2.43. Some network companies and infrastructure stakeholders supported the distinction between open and sensitive data but sought further detail on how the DSI would operate in practice, including its maturity, functionality, governance arrangements and whether alternative mechanisms may still be required for certain security-critical datasets.
- 2.44. A small number of respondents expressed concerns that an open-versus-sensitive approach may be overly simplistic. One not-for-profit respondent argued that data sensitivity should be assessed through a more nuanced classification framework, while another respondent raised concerns that greater publication of data could undermine commercial confidentiality.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

3. Progress made on 2025 proposals

This chapter sets out a high-level summary of the actions taken in 2026 with respect to the Theme 1 decisions and proposals set out in the 2025 consultation. More detail on progress and policy development considerations can be found in Chapter 4 of this document.

Decision 1.1

Network groups to convene workshops with industry stakeholders to agree a comprehensive list of useful connections data for network companies to publish.

- 3.1. Between March and August 2026, Ofgem convened an extensive programme of ten stakeholder workshops to identify, assess and prioritise improvements to published connections data. The workshops brought together network companies, NESO, developers, engineers, consultants, digital innovators, government representatives, trade associations and other users of connections data. They covered both transmission and distribution, with some workshops focused on individual sectors and others bringing participants together to consider cross-cutting issues.
- 3.2. Stakeholders considered existing publications, identified gaps in the data available and explored opportunities to improve the visibility, consistency and usability of connections data. This work informed the development of the new datasets and improvements to existing datasets presented in this consultation.
- 3.3. The workshop programme resulted in a prioritised framework of data improvements, grouped into Priorities 1, 2 and 3. This consultation focuses on the Priority 1 improvements expected to deliver the greatest value to stakeholders and consumers. Priority 2 and 3 improvements will be considered through future phases of the TCD programme.
- 3.4. The workshops also explored cross-cutting design and policy considerations, including standardisation, interoperability, machine-readability, data quality and the treatment of sensitive data. Chapter 4 provides further detail on the workshop programme, prioritisation methodology and discussions relating to individual datasets. Chapter 5 sets out the resulting policy proposals, proposed data schemas and consultation questions.

Decision 1.2

A new requirement for network companies to publish a Demand Capacity Register, with a minimum data update frequency of monthly. NESO to liaise with network companies and developers to determine an appropriate home for this requirement.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 3.5. Following publication of the 2025 consultation, Ofgem worked with stakeholders to further develop the proposed DCR. Feedback received through the consultation process informed subsequent workshop discussions and helped shape the development of the proposed register.
- 3.6. A draft DCR schema was developed and refined through engagement with network companies and data users. This included consideration of the information that should be published, how data should be structured, and the design principles needed to support consistency and usability across network areas.
- 3.7. Further policy development considered practical implementation issues, including publication cadence, threshold options for inclusion within the register and potential regulatory implementation approaches.
- 3.8. The resulting DCR proposal, draft schema and associated consultation questions are set out in Chapter 5.

Decision 1.3

Network groups to work with industry to agree ambitious timelines for the interoperability of existing digital tools and implementation of a single digital view across transmission and distribution. NESO/ENA to undertake a Five Case Business Case for the single digital view ahead of any implementation decision.

Interoperability

- 3.9. Throughout the TCD programme, consideration has been given to how new and enhanced connections datasets can support improved interoperability between platforms. Interoperability was discussed extensively through the 2026 workshop programme and was identified by stakeholders as an important enabler of improved accessibility and usability of connections data.
- 3.10. The proposed data schemas presented in this consultation have been developed with interoperability in mind. This includes consideration of common identifiers, consistent data structures and improved linkage between datasets. For example, we are consulting on the introduction of linked queue project identifiers, where possible, to support navigation between related datasets and improve visibility of project progression through the connections process.
- 3.11. The TCD programme has also considered alignment with wider data standardisation initiatives. This includes consideration of CIM principles where appropriate, particularly in relation to distribution-level asset data and future opportunities to support greater consistency across datasets.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 3.12. Further detail on the interoperability considerations reflected in the proposed dataset improvements and data schemas can be found throughout Chapters 4 and 5.

Single digital view

- 3.13. Consistent with feedback received through the 2025 consultation, we have prioritised improvements to existing datasets before progressing consideration of a single digital view. We consider that improvements to data quality, standardisation and interoperability should be progressed first to ensure any future consideration of a single digital view is informed by a stronger and more consistent data foundation.

Decision 1.4

Network groups to convene workshops to agree data triage processes for connections, with the intention of developing a consistent, robust, security-minded process that can be used across transmission and distribution. Guidance for this process should clearly set out which types of data should not be shared publicly.

- 3.14. Discussions during the workshop programme included the role of data triage processes in supporting a consistent and proportionate approach to connections data publication across transmission and distribution.
- 3.15. These discussions were informed by wider data governance and digitalisation activities across the energy sector, including Ofgem's Data Best Practice Guidance, associated work on data triage²⁸, and industry-led guidance developed through the ENA²⁹.
- 3.16. Responsibility for further development of data triage approaches sits outside the TCD programme and is being progressed through separate work within Ofgem and across the wider energy sector. Therefore, the proposals presented in this consultation have been developed on the basis that network companies will continue to apply existing data governance, security and triage requirements when determining how data should be published and managed, including decisions relating to data accessibility and sensitivity.

Proposal 1.1

We will explore the introduction of a new licence condition requiring connections data to be: (a) accurate and complete, and (b) as close to real-time as is feasible,

²⁸ See Chapter 1, 'Other publications and related work' for further detail on how these publications related to TCD

²⁹ [ENA Data Triage and Metadata Management Playbook – Energy Networks Association \(ENA\)](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

bearing in mind any potential security risks of real-time data, with monthly update at a minimum. This requirement will apply to both the data that feeds into the data visualisation tools and the system-level data compiled for publication.

- 3.17. Following publication of the 2025 consultation, Ofgem undertook further policy development and stakeholder engagement to explore the practical implications of introducing requirements relating to the quality, completeness and timeliness of connections data.
- 3.18. Through this work, it became apparent that a single high-level requirement for data to be accurate, complete and timely would not fully reflect the differing characteristics, update frequencies and operational requirements of individual datasets. Stakeholders also highlighted that a single high-level requirement could be difficult to monitor and enforce consistently across different datasets.
- 3.19. As a result, the TCD programme has focused on developing more granular dataset-specific proposals through the proposed data schemas and associated policy requirements presented in this consultation. This includes consideration of appropriate publication frequencies, opportunities for event-driven updates where appropriate, and mechanisms for identifying and communicating known data quality issues.
- 3.20. The consultation proposals presented in Chapters 4 and 5, therefore, place greater emphasis on improving the quality and transparency of individual datasets, while recognising that further work will be required to develop a more comprehensive approach to data quality governance across the wider connections data landscape.

Proposal 1.2

Ofgem will explore leveraging Ofgem’s Data Best Practice Guidance to ensure that all useful connections data is ‘presumed open’. Sensitive data should be exchanged using the DSI when the solution is live.

- 3.21. During 2026, Ofgem continued to consider the role of data accessibility, openness and proportionate safeguards within the context of connections data reform. This included ongoing consideration of how useful connections data can be made more readily available to stakeholders while ensuring appropriate protections are maintained for commercially sensitive, confidential and security-critical information.
- 3.22. The TCD programme has been developed having regard to wider data governance initiatives across the energy sector, including Ofgem's Data Best Practice Guidance and associated work relating to data transparency and accessibility. Consistent with these principles, the proposals presented in this consultation

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

seek to improve visibility of connections data while recognising the need for proportionate protections where appropriate.

- 3.23. Ofgem and industry continue to engage with wider work relating to the DSI. The DSI is currently progressing through its Minimum Viable Product (MVP) phase, with initial participation focused on regulated network companies and other digitally ready organisations. Future public beta and live releases are expected to support broader participation across the energy sector³⁰.
- 3.24. While the DSI remains at an early stage of development, it has the potential to provide a future mechanism for the secure exchange of sensitive information where publication through open datasets would not be appropriate. Further information regarding data accessibility, sensitive data considerations and associated governance arrangements is provided throughout Chapters 4 and 5.

³⁰ [Data Sharing Infrastructure \(DSI\) | National Energy System Operator](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

4. Overview of 2026 workshop discussions

This chapter summarises the 2026 workshop programme that informed Ofgem’s TCD proposals, including discussions with network companies, NESO, developers, consultants, digital innovators and government stakeholders.

It explains the move from a broad “comprehensive connections data” requirement towards a prioritised set of new and improved datasets, including:

- the proposed DCR and the Distribution Works Report (DWR)
- improvements to the ECR, the TWR, the TORI and the TEC register

The chapter highlights recurring themes from the workshops, including the need for standardised schemas, machine-readable data, common identifiers, stronger links between datasets, and alignment with CIM and wider digitalisation initiatives.

It also summarises key policy and implementation debates, including thresholds for inclusion, treatment of quoted and contracted projects, sensitive data, and data quality.

Overall, the chapter explains how stakeholder evidence and co-design have shaped Ofgem’s proposed approach while identifying issues on which further consultation views are sought.

- 4.1. Between March and August 2026, Ofgem convened a programme of ten workshops to explore issues relating to electricity connections data. Nine of these were half-day online workshops, with a final full-day pre-consultation workshop held to discuss emerging proposals and bring together learning from the wider programme. Participants included network companies, developers, consultants, engineers, digital innovators, NESO and DESNZ.
- 4.2. Ofgem would like to thank all those who contributed their time, expertise and constructive challenge throughout the workshop series. The discussions were consistently thoughtful, insightful and forward-looking, and played an important role in shaping our understanding of stakeholder priorities and user needs. We are particularly grateful to those organisations and individuals who volunteered to co-chair sessions or provide presentations, including NESO, Nadara, Northern Powergrid, UK Power Networks, Yottar, Roadnight Taylor, DNV and the GB CIM Working Group.
- 4.3. Throughout the programme, Ofgem's role was to present policy objectives and emerging options, facilitate discussion, and gather evidence and stakeholder views to inform policy development. The proposals set out in this consultation have been developed through extensive engagement with industry and reflect a collaborative process of co-design. They have been informed and refined through partnership with those who will publish, use and rely on the data, while remaining subject to Ofgem's independent assessment of how best to meet our statutory objectives.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 4.4. In what follows, where we refer to a data schema, we mean a tabular list of the data fields that a network company will be required to publish, together with a description of what those fields represent and why they are needed. To be clear, the purpose of this consultation is to define what information should be made available in order to meet user needs and policy objectives. It does not seek to prescribe how that information should be represented, exchanged or implemented technically.
- 4.5. It is beyond the scope of this work to prescribe the detailed technical architecture required to support publication of the data. This includes areas such as machine-readable formats, APIs, data models, ontologies, semantic standards, identifier frameworks, validation rules and common naming conventions. While these matters are important to achieving interoperability and maximising the value of published data, we consider they are most effectively addressed through industry-led technical design and implementation processes rather than through regulatory policy development.
- 4.6. Detailed specifications and implementation guidance will, therefore, need to be developed collaboratively by network companies and, where relevant, NESO, drawing on existing standards and digitalisation initiatives.³¹ While Ofgem is willing to participate in and support these discussions, responsibility for detailed technical design and implementation rests with industry.
- 4.7. The remainder of this chapter summarises the key themes arising from the workshop programme and explains how those discussions have informed the proposals presented in this consultation.

Part A: Comprehensive Connections Data: a change of approach

- 4.8. Our December 2025 consultation announced plans to convene workshops in 2026 to identify a comprehensive list of connections data that should be published by network companies. The intention was that this work would inform a new minimum data publication requirement, supported by licence obligations and guidance.
- 4.9. The objectives of this work included:
 - standardising data provision across network companies

³¹ Consistent with the principles of the Energy Digitalisation Framework ([Energy digitalisation framework: a vision for a coordinated and connected energy system - GOV.UK](#)), Ofgem's role is to establish policy objectives, outcomes and governance expectations, while industry is responsible for developing and maintaining the detailed technical standards and implementation arrangements needed to deliver those outcomes. Ofgem expects implementation to have regard to the Energy Digitalisation Framework, Ofgem's Data Best Practice Guidance ([Data Best Practice guidance | Ofgem](#)) and other relevant industry standards.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- providing more granular data to support capacity assessments and network planning
 - enabling connection customers to make better-informed decisions
 - supporting local authorities and other stakeholders in coordinating enabling works
 - improving environmental and planning outcomes through better information sharing
 - creating a clearer legal basis for the publication of commercially useful connections data
- 4.10. Given the strong support expressed in responses to the December 2025 consultation, the first workshop on the “comprehensive connections data” requirement was held in April 2026.
- 4.11. At that workshop, Ofgem presented all data requests received through previous consultations and calls for input. The initial intention was to assess each request individually and determine whether it should be included in the new requirement. However, participants quickly identified limitations with this approach. In particular, it was noted that it risked giving equal weight to all requests without adequately considering:
- whether the requested data would actually address the problem identified
 - whether the requested information was already published
 - the value likely to be created by publication of the data
 - any legal, technical or implementation barriers
- 4.12. Participants also highlighted a broader issue that this approach did not adequately address: the lack of standardisation across existing connections datasets. Consultation responses had repeatedly pointed to challenges arising from differing formats, definitions, naming conventions and levels of interoperability. Workshop discussions, therefore, expanded beyond identifying additional data fields to consider how datasets could be made more consistent, machine-readable and easier to integrate.
- 4.13. Following the April workshop, Ofgem developed an alternative methodology based on categorising connections data and identifying gaps within existing publications. This approach involved:
- grouping connections data into categories
 - mapping existing datasets against those categories
 - identifying data gaps by comparing stakeholder requests with existing published data
 - determining whether gaps could be addressed through improvements to existing datasets or required the creation of new datasets
 - prioritising potential improvements within each category

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

4.14. This methodology was tested at the second April 2026 workshop and received strong support from participants. It resulted in the creation of seven thematic categories:

- strategic planning data
- network data
- network usage data
- queue data
- network reinforcement data
- network operation data
- commercial data

4.15. Data improvements within each category were split into priorities 1, 2 and 3. Participants agreed that only Priority 1 improvements should be considered as part of Ofgem's 2026 policy consultation. On the whole, these Priority 1 improvements fell into the following categories: network data, queue data and network reinforcement data.

4.16. The exercise identified two areas where new datasets were required: the DCR and the DWR. It also identified improvements to four existing datasets: the TEC register, the ECR, the TWR and the TORI.

Part B: Queue transparency datasets

4.17. Queue transparency datasets play an important role in supporting a more efficient and informed connections market. By providing visibility of projects seeking connection to the electricity network, these datasets enable network users, developers, investors, local authorities and other stakeholders to better understand emerging demand for network capacity, identify potential competition for access to constrained parts of the network, and make more informed investment and strategic planning decisions.

4.18. This section considers a suite of queue transparency datasets, including the ECR, the TEC register, and the proposed DCR. The following sections summarise the discussions that took place during Ofgem's "comprehensive connections data" workshop series and set out the key themes, opportunities and challenges identified by stakeholders in relation to existing and proposed queue transparency datasets. These discussions have informed the development of the proposals presented later in this consultation.

Part B.1 - Creation of a Demand Capacity Register (DCR)

4.19. Workshops to discuss the proposed DCR took place in March and April 2026. These workshops were convened as there was strong support for a new requirement for publication of a DCR in responses to the following Ofgem consultations and calls for input:

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- November 2025: Demand connections update.³²
- December 2025: Connections end-to-end review next steps consultation.³³
- February 2026: Demand connections call for input.³⁴

4.20. Creation of a DCR seeks to address the following problems:

- poor visibility of demand connection offers, with no standardised view of accepted demand projects, their location, or their scale
- limited visibility of demand connections hinders effective network planning and reinforcement decision-making
- demand connections data is inconsistent, fragmented and published at varying levels of granularity across network companies
- data publication is not sufficiently frequent to reflect changes in the demand connections queue

4.21. The objective of the DCR is to provide transparent, standardised, up-to-date data on existing and proposed demand connections to support third parties, including developers, grid consultants, policy makers and digital innovators, to accurately understand and model connections and network impacts.

4.22. We see the benefits of the DCR as being:

- helping connection customers identify suitable grid entry points
- establishing a common evidence base for connection customers, network companies and system planners
- reducing uncertainty and improving investment, planning and queue-management decisions
- supporting more effective operational, commercial and policy decision-making

Unified or separate DCRs

4.23. At the first DCR workshop in March 2026, Ofgem led a discussion on whether demand connections data should be published through a single GB-wide DCR or through separate transmission and distribution DCRs. Participants recognised that a unified DCR would provide superior whole-system visibility through a single access point. However, the consensus view was that separate DCRs would be simpler and quicker to implement.

4.24. Participants, particularly those with engineering and grid consultancy backgrounds, strongly favoured separate transmission and distribution DCRs. The principal reasons cited were:

- different governance arrangements across transmission and distribution sectors

³² [Demand connections update.pdf](#)

³³ [Connections end-to-end review: updated proposals and next steps | Ofgem](#)

³⁴ [Demand connections reform | Ofgem](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- concerns that aggregating datasets could reduce granularity and result in the loss of useful information
 - the additional effort required from network companies and NESO to implement and maintain a unified publication process
- 4.25. Accordingly, participants supported a model in which NESO publishes a Transmission DCR and each Distribution Network Operator (DNO) publishes its own Distribution DCR.
- 4.26. Participants also supported the publication of a common data schema in a standardised format. This would allow users requiring a whole-system view to combine the separate datasets more easily.
- 4.27. Network companies raised concerns that prescribing a standardised data schema could increase implementation timescales. Two potential challenges were identified.
- First, some required information may be dispersed across multiple internal systems, requiring data engineering work to automate extraction and reporting. While participants acknowledged this challenge, the prevailing view was that the benefits of standardisation outweighed the associated costs.
 - Second, some data fields may not have been collected consistently for historic projects, making retrospective population time-consuming and costly. Participants considered that such fields could be left blank for historic projects, provided processes are established to capture the information for all new demand connection applications.
- 4.28. The proposed data schema is presented in Chapter 5 of this consultation document.

Machine readability and CIM

- 4.29. At the March DCR workshop, participants unanimously supported the DCR being published in both human-readable³⁵ and machine-readable³⁶ formats, or in a machine-readable format with a human-readable overlay.
- 4.30. Attendees recognised that machine-readable data would:
- enable automation of analysis and business processes
 - support integration with planning and modelling tools
 - improve interoperability between datasets
 - reduce manual processing and the risk of human error

³⁵ **Human-readable data** refers to information presented in a format that can be easily understood by users without specialist software, such as webpages, dashboards or spreadsheet views.

³⁶ **Machine-readable data** is data published in a structured and standardised format that can be readily ingested, processed and analysed by software applications. This contrasts with data that is only intended for human consumption, such as unstructured text or PDF documents.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- facilitate more frequent and scalable data updates

4.31. Several participants, particularly digital innovators, also supported enabling links between the DCR and CIM, a network model being developed through the LTDS programme.³⁷ This would involve including a network model identifier (CIM identifier) for the project's point of connection, where one exists. At present, this would generally apply only to connections at primary busbar level and above.

4.32. Participants considered this linkage valuable because it would:

- connect demand connection data directly to network topology
- support more automated network analysis and capacity assessment
- improve whole-system planning by enabling integration with digital network models

Voltage and capacity threshold for inclusion

4.33. Prior to the workshops, Ofgem decided that the initial iteration of the DCR should focus on demand projects connecting at High Voltage (HV) and Extra High Voltage (EHV). While most demand connection applications are made at Low Voltage (LV) (e.g., by small commercial premises, EV charging installations and electrification projects), the majority of demand capacity is associated with a much smaller number of HV and EHV projects. Therefore, focusing initially on HV and EHV, captures most network impact while keeping implementation proportionate and practical.

4.34. Ofgem recognises that LV customers would also benefit from improved visibility of network capacity. We, therefore, intend to consider the feasibility and value of extending the DCR to LV as part of future phases of the TCD programme.

4.35. The capacity threshold for inclusion in the DCR was discussed throughout the workshop series. Ofgem's initial proposal was a threshold of 1 MVA. Network companies generally considered this an appropriate starting point, noting that lowering the threshold further could adversely affect data quality and reporting practicality. Several participants cited the experience of the ECR, where expanding coverage to smaller projects had created data quality challenges.

4.36. Engineers and grid consultants broadly agreed that, for most planning and capacity assessment purposes, visibility below primary substation level is rarely required. Some participants, therefore, suggested that a higher threshold, such as

³⁷ The **Common Information Model (CIM)** is an internationally recognised data standard that provides a common structure and terminology for representing electricity network data. By enabling network assets, connections and system characteristics to be described using consistent formats and identifiers, CIM improves interoperability between organisations and software tools. Through reforms to the LTDS, Ofgem has introduced CIM-based network models for GB distribution networks, supporting greater machine readability, standardisation and data exchange across the electricity sector. [LTDS Grid Modelling Guidelines.pdf](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

5 MVA, could still provide much of the insight needed to understand demand-driven network impacts while reducing implementation complexity.

- 4.37. Some participants also suggested that projects below the chosen threshold need not be excluded entirely from public reporting. Instead, they proposed that lower-capacity demand could be reported in aggregated form, providing visibility of emerging demand trends without the burden associated with project-level publication. **We welcome stakeholder views on whether such an approach would add value.**

Storage projects

- 4.38. There was debate at the August workshop as to whether storage projects should also be included in the DCR.
- 4.39. Some contributors argued that storage should be included because, when charging, storage assets consume network capacity in much the same way as other demand connections. From this perspective, excluding storage would provide an incomplete picture of utilisation of the network and could make it more difficult for users of the DCR to assess demand at specific points on the system.
- 4.40. Others argued against this approach on the grounds that storage projects are already represented in the ECR and that including them in the DCR would create duplication across datasets.
- 4.41. The majority agreed that storage occupies a unique position within the connections landscape, acting as both a consumer and producer of electricity, and, therefore, does not sit neatly within either traditional demand or generation categories.
- 4.42. There was consensus that any approach adopted should ensure that users are still able to identify the import capacity associated with storage projects, regardless of whether this information is provided through the DCR, the ECR, or another linked dataset. **We welcome respondents' views on whether storage projects should be included within the DCR, and, if not, how the demand associated with storage projects should be represented to ensure an accurate picture of network utilisation.**

Design of regulatory framework

- 4.43. A key implementation question for the DCR is where the requirement to publish the register should sit within the regulatory framework. During workshops and subsequent stakeholder engagement, two principal options emerged:
- the introduction of a new licence condition requiring publication of the DCR
 - implementation through an industry code modification, most likely under the Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA)³⁸

³⁸ [Home - DCUSA](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 4.44. Stakeholders recognised that either approach could establish an enduring publication obligation; however, it was noted that the choice of governance mechanism could have implications for regulatory oversight, flexibility, consistency and implementation timescales.
- 4.45. The existing ECR provides a precedent for a code-based approach. The publication requirement for the ECR currently sits within DCUSA, having been introduced through an industry modification process. Some stakeholders suggested that a similar route could be adopted for the DCR, arguing that this would align governance arrangements across comparable queue transparency datasets and enable future changes to data fields and publication requirements to be managed through established industry processes.
- 4.46. Other stakeholders expressed a preference for a licence-based approach. Workshop discussions identified several potential advantages, including stronger regulatory oversight, greater consistency of implementation across network companies, and a clearer legal basis for publication of information that may otherwise raise concerns under section 105 of the Utilities Act 1989. Ofgem's engagement with network companies indicated that some participants viewed a licence obligation as providing greater confidence that publication of mandated data would be permissible.
- 4.47. A licence condition could also be supported by an accompanying guidance document setting out the required data schema, publication format and associated governance arrangements, enabling implementation details to evolve over time while preserving the underlying publication obligation. Workshop discussions generally indicated support for this approach, and several workshop outputs recorded majority support for a new licence condition linked to guidance.
- 4.48. Stakeholders also noted that a hybrid approach may be possible. Under such an approach, a licence condition could establish the overarching obligation to publish the DCR, while detailed requirements regarding schema design, reporting standards and implementation could be maintained through industry governance processes and supporting guidance. It was noted that this could combine the greater regulatory certainty associated with a licence obligation with the flexibility of industry-led governance arrangements. However, participants recognised that care would be required to avoid duplication or overlap between licence and code obligations.
- 4.49. We welcome stakeholder views as to the most appropriate place in the regulatory framework for the requirement to publish a DCR.**

Part B.2 - Categorisation of demand technologies

- 4.50. A recurring theme throughout the workshop programme was the importance of introducing a consistent and standardised approach to classifying demand projects. Workshop participants noted that demand technologies are currently described in different ways across network company datasets, making

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

comparison between networks difficult and reducing the value of published demand connections data. They, therefore, supported the inclusion of a demand classification field within the proposed DCR to improve transparency, consistency and data quality.

4.51. During the workshops, three possible approaches to categorisation were discussed:

- Technology-based classification
- Sector-based classification
- Standard Industrial Classification (SIC)-based classification³⁹

4.52. At present, Ofgem has not reached a view on which approach should be adopted and is consulting on all three options. **Stakeholders are invited to consider which approach would provide the greatest value to users of the DCR while remaining proportionate and practical to implement.**

Option 1: Technology-based classification

4.53. Under this approach, projects would be classified according to the technology or infrastructure creating the electricity demand. Examples might include:

- data centres
- electrolyzers
- EV charging infrastructure
- rail traction
- direct air capture facilities
- steelworks

4.54. Workshop participants generally considered this to be the most mature and widely understood approach. Supporters argued that it aligns closely with how network companies assess demand on the system and provides valuable information regarding the likely characteristics of a connection, including its potential load profile, flexibility potential and impact on the network. They also noted that a technology-based approach is consistent with the way generation projects are commonly categorised and would make it easier to identify trends in emerging forms of electricity demand.

4.55. The principal disadvantage identified was that some technology classifications may be commercially sensitive. For example, the technology type associated with a connection application may reveal information about a developer's business plans or commercial strategy. Participants also recognised that some projects may incorporate multiple technologies, making classification less straightforward in practice.

³⁹ [Standard industrial classification of economic activities \(SIC\) - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/standard-industrial-classification-of-economic-activities-sic)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

4.56. Despite these concerns, there was strong support within the workshops for technology-based classification, with many participants considering it the approach that would provide the greatest value for network planning, modelling and policy analysis.

Option 2: Sector-based classification

4.57. Under this approach, projects would be classified according to the economic sector or activity of the organisation seeking the connection. Examples might include:

- retail
- hospitality
- real estate
- utilities
- manufacturing
- public sector

4.58. Supporters of this option argued that it may better reflect how government, regulators and businesses often discuss economic activity and growth. A sector-based approach could support wider economic analysis and may be easier to align with industrial policy initiatives. Participants also suggested that sector-based classifications may be less commercially sensitive than technology-based classifications when published openly.

4.59. However, participants identified a number of challenges. Sector boundaries can be unclear, particularly where organisations undertake multiple activities. In addition, technologies such as data centres, electrolyzers and EV charging infrastructure may cut across several sectors, making consistent classification more difficult. Participants generally considered this approach to be less mature than a technology-based approach and less directly useful for network planning purposes.

Option 3: Standard Industrial Classification (SIC)-based classification

4.60. A third option would be to classify projects using SIC codes. SIC codes are an established government standard used by Companies House and many public bodies when categorising economic activity. Examples range from high-level categories, such as manufacturing or transportation, to highly specific business activities.

4.61. Workshop participants identified a number of benefits. A SIC-based approach would utilise an existing national standard, avoiding the need to develop a new classification framework. It could support alignment with DESNZ, Office for National Statistics (ONS) and wider government datasets, facilitate economic analysis, and make use of information that many organisations already hold.

4.62. However, participants also expressed concerns that SIC codes may be either too granular or insufficiently relevant for network planning purposes. They noted that

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

SIC classifications often describe the economic activity of an organisation rather than the physical infrastructure responsible for electricity demand. As a result, they may not provide the level of technical insight required to understand future network requirements. There was also concern that emerging technologies may not be well represented within existing SIC classifications.

Workshop views

- 4.63. While all three approaches were considered viable and are presented for consultation, workshop participants generally favoured a technology-based classification model. This was viewed as the most mature and practical option currently available, with clearer definitions, stronger alignment to existing planning and modelling practices, and greater value for forecasting future network needs.
- 4.64. To support discussion, NESO presented an illustrative demand taxonomy developed through engagement with Ofgem, DESNZ, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT), Department for Transport (DfT) and the Energy Networks Association (ENA) Data Subgroup. This grouped projects into a number of technology-based categories, including data centres, transportation, hydrogen infrastructure, commercial and industrial demand, offshore electrification and other emerging demand types. Within these categories, more detailed sub-categories were proposed, such as hyperscale and co-location data centres, EV charging infrastructure, electrolyzers, rail traction and direct air capture facilities. Participants generally supported this hierarchical structure as a useful example of how a technology-based classification could be implemented in practice.
- 4.65. Regardless of the option ultimately adopted, participants recognised that any classification framework will need to evolve alongside changes in the energy system. New forms of demand are emerging rapidly, and there was broad agreement that sufficient flexibility should be retained to accommodate technologies and business models that do not yet fit neatly within existing categories.

Part B.3 - Improvements to the Embedded Capacity Register (ECR)

- 4.66. As Ofgem considers the introduction of a DCR, it is important that existing queue transparency datasets, including the ECR, continue to evolve in a coordinated manner so that users can navigate and analyse information consistently across the connections landscape.
- 4.67. The ECR is a publicly available dataset that provides information on generation and storage projects that have accepted a connection offer on the electricity distribution network. The register was introduced to improve transparency of the connections queue and to provide network users, developers, investors, local authorities and other stakeholders with greater visibility of future network utilisation and potential competition for capacity. It has become an important

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

source of information for understanding the pipeline of projects seeking connection across Great Britain and is widely used alongside other network planning and queue transparency datasets.

- 4.68. The ECR is published by DNOs using a common industry template. Governance of the template sits within industry processes, with changes to the published data fields typically considered through the relevant DCUSA governance arrangements. Recent enhancements to the template, some of which are touched on below, demonstrate that the ECR continues to evolve in response to stakeholder feedback and changing industry requirements.
- 4.69. Throughout Ofgem's workshop series, participants broadly supported retaining and enhancing the ECR as a key source of queue transparency information. Discussions focused not on whether the register should continue to exist, but on how it could be improved to better meet user needs, support data quality, facilitate linkage with other datasets and reflect recent developments in connections reform. The remainder of this section sets out the principal improvements identified during stakeholder engagement and seeks views on whether further changes to the ECR should be pursued.
- 4.70. Ofgem extends its gratitude to network companies for their engagement on ECR improvements and for the prompt implementation of several suggested changes ahead of this consultation.

Unique project identifier

- 4.71. An example of this prompt implementation is the inclusion of a unique project identifier field in the latest DCUSA ECR template. This was a key request from data users. Workshop participants highlighted that the absence of a consistent identifier makes it difficult to track projects over time, reconcile records between monthly ECR publications and link ECR data with other related datasets. The introduction of a unique identifier is expected to improve data quality, reduce ambiguity where projects have similar names or undergo changes during the connections process, and support more effective analysis of project progression through the queue.
- 4.72. Participants also emphasised the wider benefits of common identifiers as a foundation for improved interoperability between the ECR and other connections, planning and reinforcement datasets.

Technology type

- 4.73. Workshop participants also welcomed the recent introduction of a technology type field within the ECR, noting that this addresses a longstanding request from data users and improves visibility of the types of projects seeking connection. They highlighted the value of technology information for understanding changing patterns of network demand, supporting market analysis and distinguishing between different types of connection project.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 4.74. The workshop discussion, therefore, focused less on whether technology type information should be collected and more on how technology classifications should be defined and applied consistently across datasets. Participants emphasised the importance of aligning approaches across the ECR, the proposed DCR, and other related registers, so that information can be compared and linked more easily.
- 4.75. Several participants also noted the importance of ensuring that technology classifications can accommodate projects comprising multiple technologies at a single site, avoiding the loss of information that can occur when diverse project types are aggregated into a single category.
- 4.76. **There was a general view that further industry collaboration may be required to develop and maintain a consistent technology taxonomy and associated definitions.**

Other discussions

- 4.77. Workshop participants emphasised the importance of maintaining alignment between the proposed DCR and existing queue datasets, including the ECR. They noted that data users frequently combine information from multiple registers to understand future network requirements and, therefore, supported the use of common identifiers, standardised definitions and consistent approaches to project classification and locational information. They considered that greater alignment would reduce duplication, improve interoperability and enable projects to be tracked more easily.
- 4.78. While recognising that different datasets serve different purposes and may require dataset-specific fields, participants generally favoured a coherent family of queue datasets built on shared design principles and interoperable data schemas.
- 4.79. Workshop participants highlighted the importance of improving the consistency of locational information and network hierarchy data within the ECR. They noted that substations, network boundaries, node references and other locational attributes are often represented using different naming conventions and structures across network company datasets, making it difficult to compare information, link datasets and undertake cross-network analysis. They considered that greater standardisation would improve interoperability between the ECR and other connections, planning and network datasets, while reducing ambiguity and the need for manual data cleansing. **This issue was identified as an area where further industry coordination may be required to agree common approaches and definitions.**
- 4.80. During discussion of future queue transparency arrangements, participants raised concerns regarding the potential loss of visibility of Gate 1 projects. There was broad support for retaining visibility of Gate 1 projects within the ECR, or

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

alternatively within a complementary register linked to the ECR. Participants noted that:

- Gate 1 projects represent a valuable pipeline of potential future connections and can provide important insight into underlying demand for network capacity. Removing such projects from published datasets could reduce transparency regarding future connection requirements and diminish stakeholders' ability to understand likely future network utilisation.
- Gate 1 projects effectively form the feedstock from which future queue progression may occur, particularly where more advanced projects withdraw or fail to progress, creating capacity opportunities that earlier-stage projects may subsequently fill. Maintaining visibility of these projects was, therefore, considered important for market transparency, strategic planning and understanding the future connections pipeline.

4.81. Other requests such as a field to indicate whether an offered connection has a restriction, machine-readable topology fields, and data quality improvements are discussed in more detail in the section of this chapter which deals with **Cross-cutting design and policy considerations**, as they apply to several of the datasets under consideration.

4.82. Proposed data schema improvements are presented in Chapter 5 of this consultation document.

Part B.4 - Improvements to the Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register

4.83. The TEC register provides an official record of generation projects holding Transmission Entry Capacity agreements. The dataset is publicly available and maintained and published by NESO. The register is used to understand project status, connection dates, contracted capacity and other technical information relating to projects within the transmission connections queue.

4.84. Responses to both our 2024 and 2025 consultations demonstrated clear support for retaining and improving the existing TEC register rather than replacing it with a new dataset. Respondents considered the register to be an important source of information but highlighted several areas where improvements could be made. Key themes included:

- improving data quality
- ensuring information remains up to date
- strengthening data governance arrangements
- improving usability for both specialist and non-specialist users
- increasing interoperability with other connections datasets

4.85. Initial improvement discussions took place during the June 2026 workshop, with subsequent engagement between Ofgem and NESO to explore the feasibility of proposed improvements. The resulting proposals were presented to stakeholders

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

during the August 2026 pre-consultation workshop and have informed the proposals set out in Chapter 5.

Design principles and interoperability

- 4.86. A recurring theme throughout workshop discussions centred around improving interoperability between the TEC register and other connections datasets. Participants supported greater alignment of common fields, definitions and formatting where this would improve usability and support cross-dataset analysis. There was also support for the continued publication of the register in a machine-readable format to improve accessibility and enable self-service analysis and cross-dataset use.
- 4.87. Stable identifiers were also identified as an important enabler of interoperability. There was support for the use of unique and stable project identifiers that remain unchanged throughout a project's lifecycle, regardless of changes to project names or contractual arrangements. Stable identifiers were considered important for improving transparency, supporting interoperability and enabling users to track project progression over time, particularly following the implementation of connections reform.
- 4.88. Participants also discussed, and ultimately supported, the value of introducing additional identifiers below project-stage level, where a project contains multiple TEC register entries. This would allow multiple technology-specific entries associated with a single project to be linked through a common project identifier while retaining separate records for component-level information. Workshop participants considered this would improve traceability and provide greater visibility of component-specific information, such as project stage, capacity and planned connection dates.

Data fields

- 4.89. Participants generally supported improvements that would increase transparency, improve usability and provide users with greater visibility of how projects progress through the connections process. As such, potential enhancements to the information currently reported within the TEC register were discussed at the workshops.
- 4.90. Areas considered included:
- the treatment of connection date information
 - the introduction of additional metadata fields
 - the representation of network restrictions
 - the inclusion of location-related and geographical information
- 4.91. During the August 2026 pre-consultation workshop, NESO presented an illustrative version of an updated TEC register incorporating the improvements discussed throughout the workshop programme. Participants were generally supportive of the proposed direction of travel and identified a number of further

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

refinements. The proposed data schema, which incorporates these additional improvements, is presented in Chapter 5 of this consultation document, together with more detail on any field-specific considerations.

- 4.92. Workshop discussions also included consideration of the inclusion of data on pre-contracted connection applications in the TEC register, and data quality and governance improvements. As these discussions were repeated throughout the workshop series and in relation to several of the datasets under consideration in this consultation, details of the discussions are set out in the ***Cross-cutting design and policy considerations*** section of Chapter 4.

Part C: Network reinforcement datasets

- 4.93. While the datasets discussed above provide transparency regarding projects progressing through the connections queue, stakeholders emphasised that a complete understanding of connection timescales and network capacity also requires visibility of the reinforcement works needed to enable those connections. Several respondents to our 2024 and 2025 consultations noted that queue transparency datasets and reinforcement datasets should be viewed as complementary sources of information, allowing users to understand not only which projects are seeking connection, but also the network upgrades on which those projects may depend. As part of the broader TCD programme, Ofgem has, therefore, also considered options for improving the accessibility, consistency and usability of transmission and distribution reinforcement data. The following section explores the creation of a new dataset, the DWR, as well as potential enhancements to the existing TWR and TORI reports.

Part C.1 - Creation of a Distribution Works Report (DWR)

- 4.94. One of the highest priorities identified through consultation responses and the April and May 2026 workshops was the creation of a DWR to provide greater visibility of reinforcement activity on distribution networks.
- 4.95. Participants supported the creation of a single report combining the functions currently performed separately by the TWR and TORI at transmission level. **The DWR would, therefore, provide both project-level information on reinforcement packages and asset-level information on the individual network changes within those packages.**
- 4.96. The proposed DWR would partially replace information currently available through LTDS Appendix 9. However, Appendix 9 is expected to be retired as part of the transition to LTDS CIM. Stakeholders considered that a DWR would provide a more comprehensive and useful view of reinforcement activity, reducing the need for continued voluntary publication of Appendix 9.
- 4.97. A workshop dedicated to the DWR was held in May 2026. Participants expressed broad support for the DWR being:

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- published in both machine-readable and human-readable formats, or in a machine-readable format with a human-readable overlay
- capable of being linked to queue and planning datasets
- published quarterly as a minimum, with event-driven updates for material changes

4.98. Monthly publication was discussed but received limited support. Participants considered that reinforcement projects typically progress too slowly for monthly reporting to provide significant additional value, while the associated reporting burden on network companies would be considerable. However, participants agreed that significant changes and newly identified reinforcement schemes should be reflected in the DWR as soon as reasonably practicable. To support transparency, each record should include a "last updated" field to enable users to identify new, amended and corrected entries.

4.99. There was also support for an initial project inclusion threshold of EHV. This would align the DWR with the current scope of LTDS CIM and could be reviewed as CIM expands to include lower-voltage assets.

Key schema principles

4.100. Participants agreed that the DWR schema should:

- be standardised across all DNOs
- include CIM identifiers where available
- provide sufficient location information to identify where reinforcement works are occurring
- support clear linkage with queue datasets and transmission reinforcement datasets
- distinguish between strategic, reactive and maintenance-driven reinforcement projects
- differentiate between funded and unfunded reinforcement schemes
- include mechanisms for users to report data quality issues and be notified when corrections are made

4.101. Participants recognised that some planned assets may initially lack CIM identifiers, because reinforcement schemes are often developed further into the future than is currently represented within LTDS CIM. As the CIM model expands, coverage of these identifiers is expected to improve.

4.102. Participants also supported the inclusion of information on works spanning the transmission-distribution interface, together with clear information on the distribution-level benefits delivered by those works and links to relevant transmission datasets where appropriate.

4.103. Workshop participants generally felt that completed reinforcement projects should remain visible within the DWR rather than being removed immediately. They suggested that:

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- project-level information should remain available for at least two years after completion to support activities such as second-comer charge assessments⁴⁰
- asset-level information should remain available until superseded by the next publication of LTDS CIM

4.104. At the August 2026 pre-consultation workshop, some participants questioned whether publication of unfunded reinforcement schemes within the DWR would duplicate information already available through the Network Development Plan (NDP)⁴¹. Others argued that the DWR would offer significantly greater granularity and could ultimately replace the NDP as the primary source of reinforcement information. Ofgem has not yet explored this suggestion in detail and welcomes stakeholder views on the potential future relationship between the DWR and NDP.

4.105. Two alternative DWR schemas were considered. The first was a simple schema that reports each reinforcement scheme as a single package. The second was a two-tier schema that provides both package-level and asset-level information, allowing users to see the individual upgrades and network changes that make up a reinforcement project.

4.106. Participants recognised that the simple schema would be easier and quicker to implement. However, there was broad agreement that the two-tier approach would provide significantly greater value by enabling more detailed analysis, modelling and understanding of how reinforcement projects affect individual network assets.

4.107. On balance, Ofgem considers the two-tier schema to be the stronger long-term solution and has, therefore, chosen to include it in this consultation for stakeholder views. The proposed data schema is presented in Chapter 5 of this consultation document.

Part C.2 - Improvements to the Transmission Works Report (TWR)

4.108. The TWR, published by NESO, provides information on planned transmission network reinforcement works. The report offers a project-focused view of reinforcement activity across the transmission network, helping stakeholders understand what network upgrades are planned, the drivers behind those works, and how they relate to the wider connections landscape.

4.109. Responses to our December 2025 consultation highlighted a number of opportunities to improve the visibility, consistency and usability of transmission

⁴⁰ **Second-comer charge assessments** are processes used by network companies to determine whether a new connection should contribute towards the cost of previously completed reinforcement works from which it benefits.

⁴¹ A Network Development Plan (NDP) is a 10-year strategic blueprint used by electricity distribution operators—such as National Grid, SP Energy Networks, and SSEN—to forecast future demand, identify network constraints, and outline required reinforcements or flexibility solutions. It is published every two years and includes methodology reports, headroom analyses, and stakeholder consultation outcomes.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

reinforcement data. Stakeholders identified the TWR as an important source of information for understanding planned transmission network reinforcements, connection-related dependencies and factors that may influence project delivery timescales. They noted that the report is used alongside other connections datasets to support investment decisions, network planning activities and understanding of the wider connections process.

Relationship between the TWR and the TORI

4.110. A significant theme throughout transmission-data workshop discussions was the relationship between the TWR and the TORI reports. Participants recognised that both reports provide valuable information, but differences in structure, reporting frequency and publication can make it difficult for users to understand how information relates across the two datasets.

4.111. Three options were proposed by Ofgem:

- improving the existing reports independently
- creating a new combined transmission reinforcement dataset
- adopting a hybrid approach that would retain the TWR and TORI as separate publications while improving interoperability between them

4.112. Potential impacts, including benefits and trade-offs were discussed for each option. Majority support was received for the hybrid approach. Participants considered that this would preserve the distinct purposes of the two reports while improving consistency and ease of navigation for data users. It was also recognised that retaining separate publications would preserve the level of detail currently provided within each dataset while avoiding some of the implementation challenges associated with developing a fully integrated report.

4.113. Under the hybrid approach, the TWR would continue to provide a planning-focused view of transmission reinforcement activity, while the TORI would provide a delivery and project-status view. Participants considered that retaining separate publications would allow NESO and TOs to continue publishing information through established processes while addressing concerns raised in consultation responses regarding the poor relationship between datasets.

Cross-cutting schema and implementation considerations

4.114. Building on discussions from the June 2026 workshop, Ofgem developed a proposed common schema framework for consideration at the July 2026 workshop. The framework was designed to support the hybrid approach by identifying fields that should be reported exclusively within the TWR, exclusively within the TORI, and fields that should appear in both reports. The proposed framework introduced common identifiers, standardised data fields and clearer linkages between the TWR, the TORI and, where possible, projects in connection-queue datasets.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

4.115. Workshop participants supported the development of separate but aligned schemas for both datasets. The key principles included:

- the use of shared identifiers to enable direct project-level linkage between datasets
- greater standardisation of data fields and definitions
- improved alignment between the information reported through each publication

4.116. Workshop discussions also considered the role of CIM. While participants generally supported alignment with wider industry data standards, there is currently no equivalent transmission CIM. As such, CIM alignment for transmission-level projects is not presently achievable.

4.117. Participants also discussed the treatment of data fields where information is unavailable, not applicable, or cannot reasonably be provided for historic projects. There was broad agreement that not all fields will be capable of being populated in every circumstance and that a pragmatic approach is required. See '*Improvements to the TWR*' in Chapter 5 for further detail.

4.118. The proposed TWR and TORI schemas were further refined through discussions at the August 2026 pre-consultation workshop. Participants generally supported the direction of travel and the proposed data fields. Discussion focused primarily on implementation considerations, including how geographic information should be represented and whether a separate reference table linked through common identifiers may offer advantages over embedding location information directly within the dataset. A consensus was not reached on the preferred approach and Ofgem is, therefore, seeking stakeholder views through this consultation.

TWR-specific design principles

4.119. While many of the discussions described above related to the relationship between the TWR and the TORI, workshop participants also identified a number of design principles specific to the future TWR. Support was received for:

- publication in both machine-readable and human-readable formats, or in a machine-readable format with a human-readable overlay
- maintaining up-to-date and accurate information
- providing visibility of dependencies between reinforcement projects and the connections queue
- introducing mechanisms to improve transparency around data quality and error correction
- minimum monthly publication (although NESO indicated that it would seek to continue its existing practice of publishing updates more frequently)

4.120. The proposed data schema is presented in Chapter 5 of this consultation document.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Part C.3 - Improvements to the Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instruction (TORI)

- 4.121. Currently, the TORI reports are published by Scottish TOs on a voluntary basis every quarter. Responses to our December 2025 consultation highlighted the usefulness of these reports in understanding the status and delivery of transmission reinforcement projects, as well as its role in providing greater transparency of reinforcement activity.
- 4.122. Respondents expressed support for publication of a standardised TORI report by all TOs and highlighted opportunities to improve the accessibility, consistency and usability of the information currently provided. As the TORI and the TWR provide complementary information on transmission reinforcement works, consultation responses and subsequent workshop discussions highlighted the importance of ensuring that the two datasets are aligned and linkable at project level.

Design principles and report improvements

- 4.123. As discussed above, participants supported retaining the TORI as a separate publication within the proposed hybrid reporting framework. This approach was considered to preserve the distinct purposes of each report while improving interoperability between them.
- 4.124. There was broad support for publication of the TORI in a machine-readable format with a human-readable overlay. Although some Scottish TO representatives expressed reservations with changing the current format⁴², participants considered that this would significantly improve the ability of users to search, filter and analyse reinforcement project information.
- 4.125. Workshop participants also supported retaining the existing quarterly publication frequency, recognising that transmission reinforcement projects typically progress over relatively long timescales, and that quarterly reporting strikes an appropriate balance between transparency and reporting burden. During workshop discussions, TO representatives noted the multi-disciplinary processes involved in producing TORI updates and highlighted the practical challenges associated with more frequent publication. TOs will, however, be encouraged to provide event-driven updates where material project changes occur.
- 4.126. The proposed data schema is presented in Chapter 5 of this consultation document.

⁴² At current, TORI reports are published on a quarterly basis in a PDF document.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Part D: Strategic planning and network data

- 4.127. The strategic planning data workshop in July considered the future of several transmission planning datasets and publications, particularly in the context of the transition from the ETYS to the CSNP. NESO gave a presentation on this transition and took questions from stakeholders.
- 4.128. The ETYS has historically provided information on the capability, utilisation and anticipated development of the electricity transmission network, together with supporting data contained within a series of technical appendices. The CSNP is intended to provide a more integrated, whole-system approach to strategic network planning, bringing together future network needs and recommended solutions across the electricity, gas and hydrogen systems.
- 4.129. Workshop participants generally supported the transition towards a more strategic and integrated planning framework but stressed that useful data currently available through existing publications should not be lost in the process. **There was consensus that the transition to CSNP should be viewed not as an opportunity to reduce data provision, but as an opportunity to improve it.**
- 4.130. A consistent message from developers, grid consultants and network specialists was that many ETYS appendices are used extensively for practical network analysis and investment decision-making. **While participants recognised that the ETYS itself may evolve or be replaced by newer planning products, they strongly encouraged NESO and Ofgem to ensure that useful underlying datasets continue to be published.**
- 4.131. Participants also highlighted the importance of maintaining access to future scenario and planning assumption datasets. They explained that scenario data is widely used alongside network asset data to model future network conditions, test project robustness and understand the implications of alternative development pathways.
- 4.132. Several participants suggested that future transmission planning data should move beyond document-based publication towards machine-readable network models. They highlighted developments in distribution network CIM initiatives and expressed interest in similar approaches being adopted at transmission level to improve interoperability and support more sophisticated modelling and analysis.
- 4.133. Participants also highlighted challenges arising from the proliferation of strategic planning datasets and publications. They noted that network reinforcement projects are often referenced differently across planning documents, funding frameworks and network datasets, creating challenges when attempting to trace individual projects across publications. There was consensus for greater use of common identifiers and cross-referencing between datasets.
- 4.134. A portion of the workshop was devoted to discussion of the technical data currently published through ETYS appendices. Particular value was attached to datasets containing network maps, boundary flow information, fault level data,

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

substation information, circuit characteristics, transformer data, node references and transmission network topology. Participants explained that these datasets are used extensively to support network analysis, validate modelling assumptions, assess constraints and reinforcement requirements, identify connection opportunities and inform investment decisions. **There was broad support for retaining access to this information under future arrangements, particularly where it could be provided in more accessible and machine-readable formats.**

- 4.135. One of the presenters at this workshop proposed the creation of a separate geographical reference table that could be linked to multiple connections and network datasets. Under this approach, information relating to substations, nodes, circuits and planning zones (for example CP2030 and SSEP zones) would be maintained in a standalone dataset and linked via common identifiers, rather than being duplicated across multiple reports. Some stakeholders considered that such an approach could improve interoperability and create a more coherent data ecosystem. Others considered that embedding geographical information directly within each dataset may be simpler for users. **We welcome views on whether a standalone geographical reference table would be beneficial and, if so, what information it should contain.**
- 4.136. The discussion also touched on the future of planning tools and functionality currently used by industry. Participants noted that value is derived not only from published reports but also from the analytical capabilities these datasets enable. Several contributors commented that historical planning tools, such as National Grid's Research Assistant, had provided useful functionality for understanding locational constraints, network capability and the likely reinforcement requirements associated with connection projects. They encouraged NESO and Ofgem to focus not only on preserving data, but also on ensuring that future CSNP-related publications retain or improve upon the practical functionality relied upon by users today.
- 4.137. More broadly, workshop participants supported greater alignment between strategic planning data, LTDS CIM, queue datasets and reinforcement datasets. **There was strong interest in developing a more integrated and interoperable data landscape in which common identifiers and standardised formats allow users to move seamlessly between planning, network asset, reinforcement and connection datasets.** Participants considered this essential to supporting whole-system analysis and maximising the value of future planning publications.

Part E: Cross-cutting design and policy considerations

- 4.138. While the workshops included detailed discussion of individual datasets, a number of recurring themes emerged that cut across multiple proposals. The following sections summarise the principal cross-cutting issues raised throughout the workshop programme and wider stakeholder engagement. **These**

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

topics are relevant to several of the datasets considered in this consultation and, in some cases, will influence the design and implementation of multiple proposals. We, therefore, welcome stakeholder views on these issues alongside the dataset-specific proposals set out elsewhere in this document.

Part E.1 - Pre-contracted applications

- 4.139. A key area of disagreement throughout the workshop programme was whether published queue data reports, including the proposed DCR and the existing ECR and TEC register, should include only contracted projects or whether they should also include applications that have not yet reached the contract stage.
- 4.140. At the final pre-consultation workshop in August 2026, participants discussed what should be considered a "pre-contracted" application for the purposes of queue data publication. There was debate as to whether the term should encompass all applications that have entered the connections process, including those that have not yet received a connection offer, or only those that have progressed to the quotation stage but have not yet accepted a connection contract.
- 4.141. The consensus view was that the distinction most relevant to this consultation is between "quoted applications" and "contracted projects". Workshop participants generally agreed that applications which have not yet received a quotation are too numerous, subject to rapid change, and typically lack sufficient technical and engineering information to support meaningful publication within a queue dataset.
- 4.142. **The debate, therefore, centred on whether quoted applications should be included within queue datasets on a project-by-project basis, or whether their impact should instead be reflected through aggregated reporting. This consultation seeks stakeholder views on the most appropriate approach.**
- 4.143. Those opposed to the inclusion of quoted applications included a mixture of network companies, engineers, grid consultants and developers. Their primary concern was that quoted applications are inherently less certain and, therefore, risk reducing the reliability, accuracy and usability of published datasets. Other concerns included:
- Developers frequently submit multiple applications for the same project, either at different locations or for different capacity requirements, while exploring their connection options. Publishing these applications individually could overstate future demand in particular areas and create a misleading impression of network saturation, despite many applications ultimately being withdrawn.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- The inclusion of quoted applications increases the potential for commercial gaming. Under the current ENA-defined interactivity process⁴³, projects can become interdependent where they compete for the same constrained capacity. Several contributors to the discussion argued that greater visibility of quoted applications could, in some circumstances, enable strategic behaviour by competitors seeking to influence queue outcomes or create commercial disadvantage for rival projects. Smaller developers were considered particularly vulnerable to such behaviour.
- Data quality was another significant concern. Participants noted that many of the data fields proposed for queue data reporting rely on engineering assessments and detailed design work that are typically completed only once a project reaches a more advanced stage. As a result, network companies may be unable to populate key fields accurately for many quoted applications.

4.144. Several participants suggested that aggregated reporting may provide a more proportionate solution. It was considered that this would preserve visibility of emerging demand trends without creating the risks associated with project-level publication. Distribution-level aggregated reporting is currently provided through the LTDS, although this requirement will cease as the LTDS transitions to CIM. It was proposed that network companies continue to publish an aggregated view of quoted connection applications in parallel with project-level reporting of contracted projects.

4.145. Others, including digital innovators, grid consultants and developers, strongly supported the inclusion of quoted applications. Reasons included:

- Information on quoted applications provides important forward-looking visibility of the connections pipeline and helps users understand future network constraints before projects reach contract stage.
- Application-to-contract timescales can be lengthy, meaning that restricting publication to contracted projects creates a significant information gap between application and acceptance. This limits the ability of stakeholders to understand changing demand patterns and emerging network pressures.
- Concerns regarding data reliability could be managed through appropriate data fields and filtering. For example, if the stage of each application is clearly identified within the dataset, users requiring a more focused or contracted-projects-only view could simply omit quoted projects from their analysis.
- Applications influence network planning and capacity assessments from the point at which they enter the queue. Therefore, transparency should extend across the full project lifecycle, rather than commencing only when a connection application has been contracted.

⁴³ [Interactivity Process Guide 4.0 \(Mar 2023\).pdf](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- Speculative applications and gaming behaviour are symptoms of the wider connections framework rather than reasons to limit transparency. They suggested that reforms introducing stronger readiness requirements and financial commitments for applicants may reduce speculative behaviour over time, making publication of quoted applications more practical.

Part E.2 - Sensitive data

- 4.146. Another area of concern, particularly among network companies, was the risk of publishing commercially sensitive information and information relating to Critical National Infrastructure (CNI)⁴⁴.
- 4.147. Concerns were raised regarding section 105 of the Utilities Act 2000⁴⁵, which restricts the disclosure of information relating to the affairs of individuals or businesses. Several network company representatives noted that some of the data fields proposed for inclusion within, in particular, the new DCR may relate to the commercial activities, investment plans, or project strategies of connection customers; therefore, a clear regulatory requirement is likely to be necessary if such information is to be published consistently across Great Britain.
- 4.148. Ofgem agrees that a clear regulatory requirement for publication of the DCR is needed. We also note that Parliament has introduced a substantial number of statutory exemptions and disclosure carveouts over time. This suggests that section 105 should be considered carefully but not treated as an absolute barrier to publication where an appropriate legal basis and safeguards are in place.
- 4.149. The appropriate governance framework for the DCR is an important consideration in relation to the publication of potentially sensitive information. As discussed earlier in this consultation, we are seeking stakeholder views on whether any new publication requirements should be implemented through a modification to DCUSA, through licence obligations, or through a combination of both approaches. Prior to any future statutory consultation, Ofgem intends to work closely with NESO, network companies and legal specialists to ensure that the chosen mechanism provides an appropriate legal basis for publication while remaining proportionate and targeted.
- 4.150. Any new regulatory requirement we introduce should not be interpreted as an obligation to publish all information openly in every circumstance. Ofgem's Data Best Practice Guidance is founded on the principle that data should be presumed open, with restrictions applied only where a clear security, privacy, legal or commercial sensitivity risk has been identified through the process of triage. Data that cannot safely be published in its original form should, wherever possible, remain available through appropriate mitigation techniques, such as aggregation, anonymisation, pseudonymisation or redaction, rather than being withheld

⁴⁴ [Critical National Infrastructure \(CNI\) | National Cyber Security Centre](#)

⁴⁵ [Utilities Act 2000](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

entirely. This approach seeks to maximise the value of data while ensuring that legitimate security and confidentiality concerns are addressed.

- 4.151. Workshop participants were also updated on the development of the ENA Data Triage and Metadata Management Playbook⁴⁶, which has been recently updated to provide a consistent and auditable approach to assessing data sensitivity across energy networks. The playbook supports organisations in identifying potential security, commercial, privacy and operational risks associated with publication, determining whether those risks can be mitigated, and documenting triage decisions in a transparent and repeatable manner. Its purpose is not to prevent publication, but to ensure that decisions about openness are made consistently and in accordance with the principles of Data Best Practice Guidance.
- 4.152. The workshops also considered the role of NESO's DSI. The DSI is being developed as a common, secure and standardised mechanism for sharing data across the energy sector where open publication is not appropriate. Rather than relying on ad hoc bilateral agreements, the DSI is intended to provide common governance, accreditation, access controls and data-sharing processes, allowing data owners to grant access to specific users or user groups based on defined use cases. Participants noted that the DSI may provide an attractive future solution for sharing sensitive connections data with parties who have a legitimate need to access it, such as network planners, government bodies, regulators, system modellers and approved third-party service providers.
- 4.153. Consistent with earlier Ofgem proposals on connections data, some stakeholders suggested that the long-term objective should be a clear separation between open data and shared data. Under this approach, non-sensitive connections data would be published openly in accordance with Data Best Practice Guidance, while data identified through agreed triage processes as commercially sensitive or security sensitive would be shared through secure mechanisms such as the DSI. Ofgem considers that this approach has the potential to improve transparency while maintaining appropriate protections for customers, network companies and critical infrastructure.

Part E.3 - Data quality

- 4.154. Workshop participants supported the principle that published connections data should be accurate, complete and up to date. However, the discussions highlighted that an obligation framed solely in these terms would not, by itself, provide a sufficiently clear or comprehensive basis for assessing data quality.

⁴⁶ [ENA Data Triage and Metadata Management Playbook – Energy Networks Association \(ENA\)](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

4.155. Evidence presented at the June workshop demonstrated that data quality has several distinct dimensions. These include accuracy, completeness, currency and timeliness, but also:

- **Validity:** the extent to which data conforms to defined formats, e.g., a date field contains a valid date format, or a voltage field accepts only numeric values.
- **Consistency:** the extent to which data does not conflict with itself or with other authoritative datasets, e.g., a project has the same status, technology type and identifier in the DCR, ECR or TEC register as in network company source systems.
- **Uniqueness:** e.g., no duplicate records for the same connection application.
- **Integrity:** the extent to which relationships between data elements remain correct, complete and logically coherent, e.g., a reinforcement record correctly references the associated works package, affected substation and dependent connection projects.
- **Reasonableness:** the extent to which values are plausible and consistent with engineering, operational or statistical expectations.

4.156. A dataset may contain a value in every required field while still presenting quality problems, e.g., because records are duplicated, terminology is used inconsistently, relationships between data elements are incomplete, values fall outside credible engineering ranges, or information has not been updated and is no longer fit for purpose.

4.157. Participants noted that variation in published data may arise from differences in network companies' source systems, definitions and business processes. A regulatory requirement to publish accurate and complete data would set an important outcome, but would not define the standards, metrics, validation rules or assurance processes needed to achieve that outcome consistently. Therefore, there was strong support for developing a broader data quality framework covering common definitions, quality dimensions, baseline standards, measurement and reporting, validation, user feedback and the correction of identified errors.

4.158. The framework would need to distinguish between immediate improvements, such as controlled terminology, removal of duplicate records, validation rules and periodic checks, and longer-term changes to business processes, data architecture and system integration. Participants emphasised that data quality improvement should be proportionate and incremental, and that standards and measures should be sufficiently well defined before they are used as the basis for incentives or enforcement.

4.159. Having taken onboard the feedback from this workshop discussion, Ofgem will not, at this time, proceed with Proposal 1.1. from our December 2025 consultation, to introduce a new licence requirement for accurate, complete and up-to-date connections data. We consider that any future licence obligation and

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

data quality framework should perform complementary functions. The licence condition would establish the required regulatory outcome, while the framework would explain how quality should be defined, assessed, monitored and improved. Given the further work required to agree fair and meaningful standards, Ofgem does not propose to introduce a complete data quality framework through this consultation. We intend instead to develop the approach collaboratively following consultation, with a view to applying common principles across connections datasets.

- 4.160. Notwithstanding the challenges associated with broader data quality improvements, workshop participants identified a number of measures that could be implemented relatively quickly. Suggestions included mechanisms for data users to identify potential errors, clearer accountability for correcting data issues, and greater transparency regarding when records were last updated. There was consensus that such measures could be implemented in the near term and would improve user confidence in the published datasets and support their use for planning and analytical purposes.

Part E.4 - Common Information Model (CIM)

- 4.161. Workshop participants expressed strong support for the continued development of CIM capabilities across the electricity sector. Several participants highlighted the value of creating a Transmission CIM and improving alignment between queue, reinforcement and network topology datasets. They noted that this aligns closely with the objectives of GC0139 and the wider transition towards CIM-based network planning and data exchange. The ability to reference connections, network assets and reinforcement schemes using common identifiers was seen as an important enabler of interoperability, automation and whole-system analysis.
- 4.162. There was also support for extending CIM coverage to lower-voltage networks over time. Participants noted that many of the benefits envisaged for EHV-level CIM, including improved interoperability, more sophisticated network modelling and clearer links between planning datasets, could ultimately be realised at HV and potentially LV. However, participants generally recognised that such an extension would represent a significant long-term undertaking and should not be considered a near-term priority.
- 4.163. A number of participants observed that the main beneficiaries of lower-voltage CIM data are unlikely to be individual households, small businesses or other customers seeking a connection directly. Instead, it was suggested that greater value would be unlocked by grid consultants, digital innovators and software providers, who could use CIM-based data products to develop tools and services that simplify network information for end users. In this way, many customers would benefit indirectly from CIM without needing specialist modelling expertise or direct access to CIM tools.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 4.164. The consensus view was that priority should first be given to the successful delivery and embedding of LTDS CIM. Participants considered that the effectiveness of the current rollout should be assessed, and lessons learned identified, before decisions are taken on extending CIM to lower voltages or expanding its scope further. While there was broad support for such future developments, participants generally agreed that they are likely to be several years away and should build upon the experience gained through the existing LTDS CIM programme.

Part E.5 - IDNO connections data

- 4.165. Data for connections made by IDNOs is currently outside of the scope of any requirements we plan to introduce in the next 12 months; however, Ofgem are keen to hear from wider stakeholders as to how IDNO data should be treated, e.g., should IDNOs also be required to publish the same datasets as DNOs, using the same data schemas and design principles?
- 4.166. Outside of the connections end-to-end review, Ofgem is conducting a review of the IDNO regime to assess whether the current regulatory framework remains fit for purpose as the sector continues to grow. The review will consider how the framework works in practice and its effects on consumers, competition, network development, net zero ambitions and economic growth, as well as whether any changes to the existing arrangements are needed. Over the coming months, we will launch a call for input to gather evidence and support future policy development.

Part E.6 - Funding for new requirements

- 4.167. We are still considering any necessary potential funding arrangements for the new requirements proposed in this consultation, should they come into effect.
- 4.168. One potential funding route we are considering is the Digitalisation Re-opener. We consider that work undertaken to implement the requirements introduced as a result of this consultation fall within the scope of the Digitalisation Re-opener criteria set out in paragraph 3.2.59(a) of the electricity distribution (ED) licences and paragraph 3.7.4(a) of the electricity transmission (ET) licences.
- 4.169. For ED, we are currently considering whether to instigate an additional Digitalisation Re-opener application window in 2027 under paragraph 3.2.63 of the ED licenses. We will provide further updates as our consideration develops. For ET, a statutory Digitalisation Re-opener window is already available in 2028 as per paragraph 3.7.6(a) of the ET licenses.

Part E.7 - Restricted connections

- 4.170. The publication of information relating to connection restrictions was discussed in the context of the queue data reports: the ECR, the TEC register and the new DCR. Contributors to the discussion generally supported the principle that users

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

of connection data should be able to distinguish between projects with unrestricted access to the network and those whose access is subject to operational restrictions. However, there was widespread concern that the commonly used terms *firm* and *non-firm* lack a consistent industry-wide definition and are, therefore, liable to be misinterpreted.

- 4.171. Workshop participants noted that the term *non-firm* is used in different ways across the electricity sector. In some contexts, it refers to arrangements under which a customer's import or export capability may be curtailed or otherwise restricted under specified network conditions, such as Active Network Management (ANM) schemes⁴⁷, flexible connections, or curtailable contracts. In other contexts, particularly in transmission and network planning discussions, *firm* and *non-firm* are used to describe the resilience or security of supply associated with a connection, e.g., whether a customer is supplied via a single circuit or benefits from a more resilient dual-circuit arrangement. Participants considered that using the same terminology to describe different concepts could create confusion for data users.
- 4.172. As a result, there was support for replacing a *firm/non-firm* field with a simpler *restricted connection* indicator. Under this approach, a project would be identified as either subject to connection restrictions or not. Participants considered that the term *restricted connection* more clearly conveys the intended meaning, namely that the customer's access to network capacity is constrained in some way, without implying anything about network resilience or security standards.
- 4.173. Participants also questioned whether a simple yes/no indicator would provide sufficient information. Some suggested that different forms of restriction may be of interest to data users and that there may be value in distinguishing between operational restrictions, such as curtailment arrangements, and resilience-related characteristics, such as the level of network security associated with the connection. Others questioned whether resilience information is sufficiently relevant to warrant inclusion within connection registers. **Consequently, an outstanding question is whether a single *restricted connection* field is sufficient, or whether the concept should be disaggregated into separate fields describing different forms of constraint. Views on the appropriate level of detail will, therefore, be sought through this consultation.**

⁴⁷ [National Grid - Active Network Management \(ANM\)](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

5. Decisions, proposals and dataset-specific questions

The preceding chapters summarised stakeholder feedback gathered through Ofgem's "comprehensive connections data" workshop series, responses to previous consultations, and wider engagement with data users and publishers. While stakeholders expressed a range of views on individual datasets and data fields, a number of common themes emerged. These included the importance of improving transparency, supporting interoperability between datasets, adopting consistent approaches to data standards and identifiers, enhancing data quality, and ensuring that published information remains proportionate and deliverable for publishers.

Taking account of this feedback, Ofgem has developed a series of proposals intended to improve the accessibility, consistency and usability of connection queue transparency and reinforcement works data. The proposals seek to build upon existing industry arrangements where appropriate, while addressing gaps and areas for improvement we consider are needed. In developing these proposals, we have sought to balance the needs of data users with the implementation considerations raised by network companies, NESO and other industry participants.

This chapter sets out our proposed approach to the design, publication and governance of the datasets considered in this consultation, including proposed data schemas, publication requirements and overarching design principles. We invite stakeholder views on the proposals presented.

Unless otherwise stated, the data schemas presented in this chapter should be regarded as illustrative proposals intended to support consultation. We recognise that further implementation detail and supporting guidance may be required following consultation and expect this to be developed collaboratively with industry through the appropriate governance processes.

Package 1. New: Demand Capacity Register (DCR)

We have decided that the following new requirements are needed:

- a new requirement for all DNOs to publish a DCR with a minimum monthly cadence
- a new requirement for NESO to publish a Transmission DCR with a minimum monthly cadence

We are also consulting on:

- where the new requirement should sit within the regulatory framework
- a standardised data schema
- the capacity threshold for inclusion of projects in the DCR
- demand technology categorisation
- the inclusion of quoted projects in the DCR

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

The detailed reporting requirements will be informed by responses to this consultation and any subsequent statutory consultation.

Package 1: New requirements

5.1. As discussed in the previous chapter, stakeholders expressed differing views regarding the most appropriate governance framework for new data publication requirements. We are, therefore, consulting on whether any new DCR requirements should be implemented through a modification to DCUSA, through licence obligations, or through a combination of both approaches. We welcome views on the relative merits of each option, including their implications for regulatory oversight, implementation flexibility and future maintenance of the dataset.

Package 1: Design principles

- 5.2. The stakeholder workshops identified a number of core design principles that we consider should underpin the DCR. The DCR should:
- be published in a machine-readable format, supported by a human-readable overlay, to ensure that it is accessible to both technical and non-technical users
 - align with existing and emerging industry data standards, including the use of CIM identifiers where possible and appropriate
 - be interoperable with related datasets, including other queue transparency datasets, reinforcement datasets, and strategic planning publications, through the use of common identifiers, consistent definitions and aligned data structures where appropriate
 - be supported by a mechanism that enables data users to notify publishers of errors or omissions, with clear visibility of when issues have been reviewed and corrected
 - be published on a common basis across network companies, with a standardised data schema and accompanying guidance to promote consistency and comparability of published information
 - strike an appropriate balance between transparency and practicality, ensuring that published information provides value to data users while remaining proportionate and deliverable for publishers

Package 1: Data schema

5.3. To support consistent reporting practices, certain fields have been proposed as ‘conditionally applicable’. These fields may legitimately remain blank in defined circumstances and will be supported by implementation guidance setting out when information is expected to be provided and when exceptions may apply. All other fields are classified as mandatory and are expected to be populated.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Table 1.1 Proposed DCR schema

Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Unique project identifier	All projects	Provides a persistent identifier so that the project can be tracked across network company systems and linked to other datasets.	Mandatory
Project name	All projects	Provides a human-readable reference that can be cross-checked against planning applications, network development plans, Statement of Works reports and Land Registry records.	Mandatory
Unique connection identifier	All projects	Identifies the specific connection associated with the project and supports linkage across systems and datasets.	Mandatory
Applicant identifier	All projects	Enables multiple applications from the same applicant to be identified and potential duplicate entries to be removed.	Mandatory
Quote issue date	All projects	Shows when the project entered the connections process.	Mandatory
Record creation date	All projects	Shows when the record was created or added to the register.	Mandatory
Last updated date	All projects	Shows when the record was most recently updated.	Mandatory
Application status	All projects	Shows the project's current stage: e.g., quote issued, offer accepted, contracted, energised. Supports queue scenario analysis.	Mandatory
Offer acceptance date	Offer accepted, contracted projects only	Shows when the project became a contractual commitment and supports analysis of the committed queue.	Conditionally applicable
Project latitude and longitude, or centre of postcode area	All projects	Identifies the physical location of the project.	Mandatory
Licence area	IDNO-connected projects	Identifies the relevant host licence area for an IDNO-connected project.	Conditionally applicable
Capacity (MVA)	All projects; multiple entries where capacity is ramped or staged	Shows the scale and timing of the requested capacity.	Mandatory
Restricted access? (Yes/No)	Where relevant; multiple entries where access arrangements are ramped or staged	Indicates whether the connection is subject to restricted access, avoiding inconsistent use of 'firm' and 'non-firm'.	Mandatory
Load or technology type	Contracted projects only	Identifies the type of demand, such as data centre, EV charging or commercial demand	Conditionally applicable

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

		To support modelling of likely load profiles and system impacts. Categories should be standardised across network companies.	
Connection topology type	Complete once the point of connection is known	Shows how the project connects to the network, for example radially or through a looped connection.	Conditionally applicable
PoC termination CIM identifier, or upstream primary substation identifier	Complete once the point of connection is known	Links the project to the CIM network model, supporting more automated network studies.	Conditionally applicable
PoC termination latitude and longitude	Complete once the point of connection is known	Shows where the project connects to existing network assets and supports mapping, heatmaps and local authority planning.	Conditionally applicable
Project milestones	Contracted projects only	Records land rights, planning, financial close and technical design submission status to indicate development progress and support assessment of delivery likelihood.	Conditionally applicable
Reinforcement work identifier(s)	Contracted projects only	Links the project to the reinforcement schemes required to enable the connection.	Conditionally applicable
Data correction flag	All projects	Shows whether the data has been corrected since the previous update, providing visibility of the error-reporting and correction process.	Conditionally applicable

Package 1: Capacity threshold for inclusion

- 5.4. An important design consideration for the DCR is the capacity threshold above which projects should be reported on a project-by-project basis. The threshold adopted will influence the volume of data published, the comprehensiveness of the register, the ease with which users can understand emerging demand on the network, and the reporting burden placed on network companies. We are, therefore, consulting on a range of threshold options, set out in the table below, which differ both in the capacity threshold applied and in whether quoted applications should be included alongside contracted projects.
- 5.5. The options presented reflect different approaches to balancing transparency and proportionality.
- Options A and B would limit publication to contracted projects only, with Option A adopting a lower threshold of 1 MVA and Option B applying a higher threshold of 5 MVA.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- Options C, D and E would extend publication to include quoted applications, recognising that some stakeholders consider visibility of earlier-stage projects valuable for understanding emerging network demand and future capacity requirements. These options differ in the threshold applied to quoted projects, allowing respondents to express views on both the scope of publication and the degree of project maturity that should be required before information is disclosed.
- 5.6. In considering these options, stakeholders may also wish to consider recent ENA guidance⁴⁸, effective from 1 June 2026, which introduced enhanced information requirements for demand connection applications of 5 MVA and above. These requirements are intended to provide greater evidence of project maturity at the point of application. As a result, data relating to larger demand projects is likely to be more complete and reliable at an earlier stage in the connections journey.
- 5.7. We are particularly interested in stakeholder views on whether the additional transparency associated with a lower threshold outweighs the potential challenges associated with data quality, reporting burden and the publication of less mature project information.

Table 1.2 Capacity threshold for inclusion options

Option	Contracted projects	Quoted projects
Option A	1 MVA	Not included
Option B	5 MVA	Not included
Option C	1 MVA	1 MVA
Option D	1 MVA	5 MVA
Option E	5 MVA	5 MVA

Package 1: Field-specific considerations (from workshop discussions)

Demand technology type

- 5.8. This has been explored in Chapter 4 of this consultation document. Respondents to this consultation are invited to provide their views on the three outlined ways of categorising demand technologies and to state which is/are their preference(s) and why:
- 5.9. Options are:
- Technology-based classification
 - Sector-based classification
 - Standard Industrial Classification (SIC)-based classification

⁴⁸ [ena-demand-queue-entry-requirements-\(5mva-and-above\)-guidance-document.pdf](#)

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Project location and point of connection (PoC) information

- 5.10. These were among the data fields most strongly supported by workshop participants. Locational data is essential for understanding where demand is likely to materialise on the network, assessing available capacity, and undertaking more sophisticated network modelling and analysis.
- 5.11. However, network companies expressed reservations about the publication of precise project locations, highlighting both commercial sensitivity and security concerns. In particular, it was argued that detailed project latitude and longitude coordinates could enable the identification of individual developments, even where project names had been redacted, thereby revealing commercially sensitive information or, in some cases, information relevant to CNI.
- 5.12. By contrast, PoC information was generally seen as less contentious and as highly valuable to users of the register. There was broad support for including both machine-readable and human-readable PoC information, enabling the DCR to be used by both automated modelling tools and non-technical users.
- 5.13. A compromise position emerged, which Ofgem proposes is adopted, whereby PoC latitude and longitude are published where known, while project location data is treated more cautiously. Where precise project coordinates are either unavailable or considered commercially sensitive, network companies could instead publish a less granular location reference, such as the centre point of the relevant postcode area, to provide locational context without revealing the exact site.
- 5.14. Ofgem propose linking PoC information to existing network datasets, particularly LTDS CIM models where available.

Queue Management Milestones

- 5.15. This data field proved contentious during workshop discussions. Participants who supported its inclusion argued that milestone information provides an important indication of project maturity and delivery probability, helping users assess the likelihood of projects progressing and enabling a more informed understanding of future queue scenarios. Some participants also noted that milestone information is published in other sectors to support transparency and argued that the electricity connections sector should be no different.
- 5.16. Those opposed to its inclusion highlighted several concerns:
- Milestone information was considered highly commercially sensitive, particularly for pre-contracted projects, with some stakeholders arguing that publication could give rise to issues under section 105 of the Utilities Act.
 - Concerns were raised around data maintenance, as milestone information often sits outside of engineering systems and would, therefore, require input from multiple teams, increasing the administrative burden on network companies.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- Several contributors to the discussion argued that inaccurate or out-of-date milestone data could lead to disputes over data quality and potentially have adverse consequences for project developers. For example, information showing a project to be behind on planning, land rights, financing or other milestones could affect perceptions of project viability and, in some circumstances, influence access to funding.

5.17. A further consideration was whether the benefits of increased transparency outweigh the additional implementation and governance requirements associated with maintaining accurate milestone data.

5.18. **We welcome respondents' views on whether milestone information should be included in the DCR and, if so, which milestones should be disclosed and at what stages of the connections process.**

Unique identifiers

5.19. Ofgem propose the inclusion of a unique identifier field in the DCR. There was especially broad support for this during workshop discussions. Participants highlighted the benefits of being able to link DCR records to other published datasets, of deduplicating projects, and of supporting machine-readable analysis. Ofgem consider unique identifiers to be a key enabler of interoperability between datasets.

Restriction status

5.20. As highlighted in the ***Cross-cutting design and policy considerations*** section of Chapter 4, Ofgem propose including a field within all queue datasets indicating whether or not a connection is being offered on a restricted basis. This was a popular data request in 2024 and 2025 consultation responses. Respondents are invited to consider whether a simple yes/no field is sufficient, or whether more granular information is required.

Availability of data for historic projects

5.21. Network company representatives at the workshops indicated that certain data fields within the proposed schema may be difficult to populate retrospectively for historic projects, as this information was not consistently collected at the time of the original connection application. Ofgem propose that such fields are populated for all new applications, while remaining optional for historic projects where the information is not readily available. **We encourage network companies to provide examples of retrospectively unavailable data in your responses to this consultation, to assist with the development of data schema completion guidance.**

Package 1: DCR-specific questions

Q1. Where should the requirements to publish and maintain the DCR sit within the regulatory framework: licence conditions, DCUSA, or a combination of licence,

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- code and supporting guidance? Please explain the relative benefits, risks and practical implications of your preferred approach.
- Q2. Which of Options A to E provides the most appropriate approach to the project-level reporting threshold for contracted and quoted demand projects? Please explain how your preferred option balances transparency, data quality and proportionality.
- Q3. Should demand projects below the project-level reporting threshold be reported in aggregated form? If so, at what level of geographical, capacity and technology aggregation, and how frequently, should that information be published?
- Q4. Which approach, or combination of approaches, should be used to categorise demand projects: technology-based, sector-based or SIC-based classification? Please explain your preference and how the classification framework should accommodate mixed-technology projects and emerging forms of demand.
- Q5. Do you agree with the proposed DCR data schema, including the proposed distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields? Please identify any fields that should be added, removed, amended or reclassified and explain why.
- Q6. Should storage projects be included in the DCR? If not, how should their import capacity be represented so that users can obtain an accurate picture of demand-side network utilisation without unnecessary duplication between the DCR and ECR?
- Q7. Any other DCR-specific comments?

Package 2. New: Distribution Works Report (DWR)

We have decided that the following new requirement is necessary:

- a licence condition requiring each DNO to publish a DWR at least quarterly, with additional event-driven updates for the addition of new reinforcement projects and to ensure that significant changes to existing projects are reflected in a timely manner

We are also consulting on:

- a standardised data schema
- the threshold for inclusion of new reinforcement projects in the DWR

The detailed reporting requirements will be informed by responses to this consultation and any subsequent statutory consultation.

Package 2: New requirement

- 5.22. Unlike the DCR, for which we are consulting on the most appropriate governance framework, workshop participants generally supported Ofgem's proposal to introduce a new licence condition requiring publication of the DWR. Ofgem considers that a licence-based approach could provide a clear and consistent

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

obligation to publish the dataset while allowing detailed reporting requirements to be maintained through supporting guidance.

Package 2: Design principles

5.23. The stakeholder workshops identified a number of core design principles that we consider should underpin the DWR: The DWR should:

- be published in a machine-readable format, supported by a human-readable overlay, to ensure that it is accessible to both technical and non-technical users
- align with existing and emerging industry data standards, including the use of CIM identifiers where possible and appropriate
- be interoperable with related datasets, including other reinforcement datasets, queue transparency datasets and strategic planning publications, through the use of common identifiers, consistent definitions and aligned data structures where appropriate
- support, where feasible, explicit linkages between reinforcement projects and the connection projects or network needs that they are intended to address
- be supported by a mechanism that enables data users to notify publishers of errors or omissions, with clear visibility of when issues have been reviewed and corrected
- be published on a common basis across network companies, using a standardised data schema, common definitions and supporting guidance to promote consistency, comparability and ease of use
- strike an appropriate balance between transparency and practicality, ensuring that published information provides value to data users while remaining proportionate and deliverable for publishers
- clearly distinguish between distribution and transmission reinforcement activities, while supporting appropriate cross-referencing where projects span network boundaries

Package 2: Data schema

5.24. The schema comprises of:

- a **reinforcement package table**, which captures project-level information relating to reinforcement works, including project drivers, queue linkages, programme information, delivery status and headline capacity impacts
- an **asset change table**, which captures the individual asset changes associated with each reinforcement package, including whether assets have been added, removed, replaced, uprated or modified and the associated technical parameters

5.25. To support consistent reporting practices, certain fields have been proposed as 'conditionally applicable'. These fields may legitimately remain blank in defined

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

circumstances and will be supported by implementation guidance setting out when information is expected to be provided and when exceptions may apply. All other fields are classified as mandatory and are expected to be populated.

Table 2.1 Reinforcement package

Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Package ID	All packages	Persistent unique identifier for the reinforcement works package and the principal key for linking records across datasets.	Mandatory
Title	All packages	Provides a human-readable name for the reinforcement scheme and supports cross-referencing where identifiers are missing or inconsistent.	Mandatory
Responsible organisation	All packages	Identifies the DNO responsible for delivery.	Mandatory
Lifecycle stage	All packages	Shows whether the package is planned, in design, under construction, complete or withdrawn.	Mandatory
Funding status	All packages	Distinguishes funded works from planned works that do not yet have financial approval.	Mandatory
Package type	All packages	Identifies whether the works comprise a new asset, upgrade, reconfiguration or enabling works.	Mandatory
Scope summary	All packages	Provides a short, human-readable description of the works.	Mandatory
Strategic or reactive	All packages	Indicates whether the works are strategic or anticipatory, or reactive or connection-driven.	Mandatory
Region or zone	Where applicable	Identifies the relevant distribution region or planning zone, such as a RESP or SSEP zone, to support aggregation and navigation.	Mandatory
Substation nodes	Where applicable	Identifies the key substations or nodes affected, linking the reinforcement to network topology and local constraints.	Mandatory
Voltage level(s)	All packages	Identifies the voltage level or levels affected across the package.	Mandatory
Transmission-distribution interface flag	Where works affect the transmission-distribution interface	Shows that the package should be cross-reported in the corresponding transmission or distribution report using the same package ID.	Conditionally applicable

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Linked queue project identifier(s)	Where the works relate to connection projects	Links the package to relevant projects in the DCR or ECR using unique connection project identifiers.	Conditionally applicable
Linkage type	Where the works relate to connection projects	Indicates whether the works are sole-use works, shared enabling works or wider-benefit works.	Conditionally applicable
Constraint addressed	Where known and quantifiable	Identifies the reason for reinforcement, such as a thermal, voltage, fault-level or stability constraint.	Conditionally applicable
Existing capacity	Where known and quantifiable	Shows the capacity limit before the works.	Conditionally applicable
Estimated additional capacity	Where known and quantifiable	Shows the capacity following completion of the works, or the incremental capacity delivered.	Conditionally applicable
Associated flexibility	Where applicable	Indicates whether non-build solutions or operational measures form part of the solution.	Conditionally applicable
Interdependency indicator	Where works are shared or interdependent	Shows whether the package is interdependent with other connections or reinforcement works, supporting assessment of coordination and sequencing risks.	Mandatory
Delivery milestones	As milestones become applicable or known	Records key stages such as design start, consent, procurement, construction and commissioning.	Mandatory
Current forecast energisation date	All active packages, where known	Provides the current forecast energisation or completion date.	Mandatory
Actual completion date	Completed packages	Records the actual completion or energisation date once the works have been delivered.	Conditionally applicable
Delivery status	All active packages	Shows whether delivery is on track, delayed, at risk or withdrawn.	Mandatory
Delay reason	Delayed or at-risk packages	Provides a standardised reason for delay, such as planning consent, outage constraints, design change or other.	Conditionally applicable
Dependencies	Where applicable	Identifies dependencies such as upstream works, consents, outage windows or interface works.	Dependent
Quarterly update narrative	All active packages	Provides a human-readable summary of changes since the previous quarterly update.	Conditionally applicable
Record creation date	All packages	Shows when the record was created.	Mandatory

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Last updated date	All packages	Shows when the record was most recently updated and supports monitoring of the minimum update frequency.	Mandatory
Data quality status	Where an error has been reported or a check completed	Shows whether the record has been flagged for checking, corrected or verified.	Conditionally applicable

Table 2.2 Asset change

Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Package ID	All asset changes	Links the asset change to its parent reinforcement package.	Mandatory
Asset change ID	All asset changes	Provides a unique identifier for the individual asset change.	Mandatory
Asset ID	All asset changes	Provides a persistent unique identifier for the asset, including assets below current CIM coverage.	Mandatory
Asset type	All asset changes	Identifies the asset as a cable, transformer, busbar, switchgear, line, protection equipment, substation or other asset type.	Mandatory
Asset change type	All asset changes	Shows whether the asset is new, replaced, updated, removed or modified, with one row for each change.	Mandatory
Voltage level(s)	All asset changes	Identifies the voltage level or levels of the asset.	Conditionally applicable
CIM ID	Assets at or above primary bar, where available	Links the asset to the CIM network model for machine integration with models and datasets.	Conditionally applicable
Planning ID	Where planning consent is relevant	Links the asset change to relevant planning information.	Conditionally applicable
Consenting authority	Where planning consent is relevant	Identifies the consenting body associated with the planning reference.	Conditionally applicable
Connects-from existing CIM ID	Where available	Identifies the existing CIM node or asset from which the changed asset connects.	Conditionally applicable
Connects-to existing CIM ID	Where available	Identifies the existing CIM node or asset to which the changed asset connects.	Conditionally applicable
Connects-from latitude and longitude	Where required for mapping	Provides coordinates for the from-point and supports integration with GIS, planning and land-use data.	Conditionally applicable
Connects-to latitude and longitude	Where required for mapping	Provides coordinates for the to-point and supports integration with GIS, planning and land-use data.	Conditionally applicable

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Table 2.2a Asset-specific technical fields

Asset type	Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Cable	Conductor material	Cable assets	Identifies the conductor material.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Conductor size (mm ²)	Cable assets	Records the conductor cross-sectional area.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Resistance	Cable assets	Records conductor resistance per unit length.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Installation type	Cable assets	Shows whether the asset is underground or overhead.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Circuit length (km)	Cable assets	Records circuit length; an estimate may be used until an exact measurement is confirmed.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Rated capacity (MVA)	Transformer assets	Records the transformer's rated capacity.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Primary voltage (kV)	Transformer assets	Records primary winding voltage.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Secondary voltage (kV)	Transformer assets	Records secondary winding voltage.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Impedance (%)	Transformer assets	Records transformer impedance.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Cooling type	Transformer assets	Identifies the cooling arrangement.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Tap changer type	Transformer assets	Identifies the tap changer arrangement.	Conditionally applicable
Busbar	Configuration type	Busbar assets	Identifies the busbar configuration.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Switchgear type	Switchgear assets	Identifies the type of switchgear.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Rated current (A)	Switchgear assets	Records rated current.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Breaking capacity (kA)	Switchgear assets	Records breaking capacity.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Normally open or closed	Switchgear assets	Records the asset's normal operating state.	Conditionally applicable

Package 2: Voltage threshold for inclusion

5.26. As discussed in Chapter 4, workshop participants generally supported an initial focus on reinforcement works associated with the higher-voltage distribution network. We are, therefore, consulting on an initial threshold for inclusion of EHV reinforcement projects within the DWR.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 5.27. An EHV starting point would provide consistency with the current scope of LTDS CIM and would allow the DWR to focus initially on those reinforcement projects most likely to influence connection opportunities, network capacity and strategic planning decisions. It would also provide a proportionate starting point for implementation while the DWR and associated governance arrangements are established.
- 5.28. However, some stakeholders may consider that useful information relating to lower-voltage reinforcement activity should also be made available through the DWR. We, therefore, welcome views on whether the initial EHV scope is appropriate and, if so, whether the scope of the DWR should be expanded over time to include lower-voltage reinforcement works as network models, data standards and publication arrangements continue to mature.

Package 2: Field-specific considerations (from workshop discussions)

Reinforcement project identifier

- 5.29. Ofgem propose including a unique identifier for each reinforcement project or works package. Workshop participants strongly supported this. Common identifiers would enable projects to be tracked over time, facilitate data quality checks, and support interoperability with related datasets, including queue transparency publications and transmission reinforcement datasets. We consider them to be essential for linking reinforcement projects to dependent connection projects and strategic planning outputs.

Reinforcement drivers

- 5.30. We propose that, where feasible, the DWR should identify the primary drivers for reinforcement activity (e.g., strategic, connection-driven or for maintenance), and, where relevant, provide links to relevant connection projects. This is an important transparency measure that will assist developers, network users and planners in understanding why specific works are being undertaken and how they may affect future network capacity.

Location and network hierarchy

- 5.31. Ofgem considers the provision of sufficiently granular locational information to be important to enable users to understand where reinforcement works are taking place and to assess their relevance to particular parts of the network. During workshops, strong support was expressed for the inclusion of fields such as the relevant GSP, point of work location and point of work substation.
- 5.32. Ofgem propose that locational information should be structured consistently and aligned with wider efforts to improve network topology and hierarchy data across the connections data ecosystem. Where available, CIM identifiers should be used alongside human-readable location information, helping to improve interoperability between datasets, support machine-to-machine data exchange,

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

and enable reinforcement projects to be linked more easily with related network, planning and queue transparency datasets.

Capacity and network benefit

5.33. Workshop discussion highlighted the challenges associated with quantifying the impact of reinforcement works. Participants noted that some reinforcement activities do not result in a simple increase in thermal capacity and that a straightforward "capacity added" metric may not adequately capture the benefits of all schemes. There was support for ensuring that the DWR communicates the purpose and benefit of reinforcement works; however, some stakeholders suggested that a more flexible approach may be required to accommodate different project types. **We welcome stakeholder views as to how the network benefit is best represented within the data schema.**

Transmission-distribution interface projects

5.34. Participants emphasised that reinforcement works located at the transmission-distribution interface should be represented consistently across relevant datasets. Ofgem propose reporting such projects in both transmission and distribution reinforcement publications, with clear delineation of responsibilities, benefits and ownership, together with appropriate cross-referencing between datasets.

5.35. For transmission-owned reinforcement works in the DWR, the DNO need only complete the project-level information in the first table, ensuring that the relevant TORI unique ID is provided to enable data users to cross-reference and review the asset-level information should they need it.

Availability of data for historic projects

5.36. Network company representatives at the workshops indicated that certain data fields within the proposed schema may be difficult to populate retrospectively for historic reinforcement projects, as this information was not consistently collected when the project was first identified or initiated. Ofgem propose that such fields are populated for all new projects, while remaining optional for historic projects where the information is not readily available. **We encourage network companies to provide examples of retrospectively unavailable data in your responses to this consultation, to assist with the development of data schema completion guidance.**

Package 2: DWR-specific questions

- Q8. Do you agree with the proposed DWR schema? Please identify any fields that should be added, removed, amended or reclassified as mandatory or conditionally applicable.
- Q9. Do you agree that the initial DWR should cover reinforcement projects at EHV? If not, what threshold or scope should apply? Should the DWR be extended to

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

lower-voltage reinforcement over time, and what conditions should determine when this occurs?

Q10. How should the capacity or wider network benefit delivered by reinforcement works be represented in the DWR, particularly where a scheme does not produce a straightforward increase in thermal capacity?

Q11. What should the future relationship be between the DWR and NDPs? Could the DWR replace or reduce the need for some reinforcement information currently provided through NDPs, or do the publications serve distinct purposes?

Q12. Any other DWR-specific comments?

Package 3. Improvements to the Embedded Capacity Register (ECR)

We are consulting on several improvements to the ECR, including:

- improved locational and network hierarchy information
- data quality and transparency improvements
- the addition of a “restriction status” field to the ECR template
- greater schema alignment between queue transparency datasets

5.37. The ECR is an established and widely used dataset; therefore, workshop discussions focused on targeted improvements rather than wholesale redesign. There was broad support for strengthening data quality, improving interoperability with other connections datasets, increasing consistency across network companies, and introducing a small number of additional data fields to improve the usefulness of the register. The proposals set out below seek to build on the ECR's existing strengths while improving the quality, consistency and accessibility of information available to connecting customers, thereby supporting a more efficient and informed connections journey.

5.38. Ofgem is conscious that the requirement to publish the ECR, together with the specification of the ECR template, is established through DCUSA. Any changes to the content, format or scope of the ECR will, therefore, need to be progressed through the DCUSA modification process rather than being implemented directly through this consultation.

5.39. Ofgem view the proposals in this consultation as establishing the policy direction and desired outcomes for ECR reform. Should Ofgem decide to proceed with any of the proposed ECR improvements following consultation, we would expect these proposals to be developed into one or more DCUSA modification proposals for consideration by industry. This approach will enable stakeholders to assess the detailed legal drafting, implementation approach, costs and benefits through the established code governance process before any changes are implemented.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Package 3: Proposals

Improved locational and network hierarchy information

5.40. We propose to improve the consistency and granularity of locational information contained within the ECR. Workshop participants supported the introduction of a more consistently structured network hierarchy, including fields relating to the transmission boundary, intermediate network nodes, local network nodes and points of connection. Participants also supported greater use of structured, machine-readable topology information, including CIM identifiers where available, to facilitate automated analysis, improve visibility of local constraints and strengthen alignment with wider digitalisation initiatives.

Data quality and transparency improvements

5.41. We propose a series of measures to strengthen confidence in ECR data. These include introducing additional metadata relating to data maintenance, such as the date of last update, and establishing mechanisms through which data users can identify and report potential errors or omissions. Alongside these measures, we propose that the ECR should continue to be updated at least monthly and that future work within the TCD programme should consider wider data quality governance arrangements applicable across connections datasets.

Restriction status field

5.42. We propose the addition of a data field identifying whether a connection is subject to restrictions, replacing terminology relating to firm and non-firm connection, which workshop participants considered potentially ambiguous. Details of the workshop discussion on this data field are located in the ***Cross-cutting design and policy considerations*** section of Chapter 4.

Schema alignment

- 5.43. We are also considering whether greater alignment should be pursued between the ECR data schema and the proposed DCR data schema. Both datasets seek to provide visibility of projects progressing through the connections process and consequently contain a number of similar data concepts, including project identifiers, connection status, capacity information, locational information and links to reinforcement activity. Aligning the definitions, formats and terminology used across the two datasets could improve consistency for users, reduce ambiguity and make it easier to compare information across generation and demand connections.
- 5.44. Greater alignment could also support interoperability between queue datasets and facilitate future cross-dataset analysis. For example, consistent approaches to project identifiers, lifecycle stages, network hierarchy fields, location data and data quality indicators would enable users to navigate more easily between

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

different registers and build a more complete picture of network capacity, connection activity and reinforcement requirements.

- 5.45. However, we recognise that the ECR and DCR serve distinct purposes and contain information relevant to different types of connections. We are, therefore, not proposing complete convergence of the two datasets. Instead, we are seeking views on whether a common set of core fields, definitions and standards should be adopted where appropriate, while retaining flexibility for dataset-specific requirements where necessary.

Package 3: ECR-specific questions

- Q13. Do you agree with the proposed improvements to the ECR? Please identify any further targeted improvements that should be prioritised.
- Q14. To what extent should the ECR schema be aligned with the DCR schema? Please identify the core fields, definitions, formats or standards that should be common to both registers and any areas where dataset-specific treatment should be retained.
- Q15. Should information on Gate 1 projects continue to be published through the ECR, or should it be provided through a separate but linked dataset? Please explain what information should be made available and why.
- Q16. Should the ECR include quoted connection applications as well as contracted projects? If so, should quoted applications be published at project level or in an aggregated form? If at project level, what safeguards would be needed to address uncertainty, duplication, commercial sensitivity and data quality?
- Q17. Any other ECR-specific comments?

Package 4. Improvements to the Transmission Works Report (TWR)

We are consulting on:

- a common schema framework, linking the TWR and TORI
- inclusion of specific data fields within the proposed TWR schema

The detailed reporting requirements will be informed by responses to this consultation and any subsequent statutory consultation.

Package 4: Design principles

- 5.46. The stakeholder workshops identified a number of core design principles that we consider should underpin the TWR. The TWR should:
- continue to provide a planning-focused view of transmission reinforcement activity, helping users understand the need for reinforcement works, the projects driving investment requirements and the relationship between network reinforcement and the connections queue

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- be published in a machine-readable format, supported by a human-readable overlay, to ensure that information is accessible to both technical and non-technical users
- be interoperable with related datasets, including the TORI, the TEC register and wider connections datasets, through the use of common identifiers, consistent definitions and aligned data structures where appropriate
- include clear linkages between reinforcement projects and the connections queue, allowing users to understand dependencies between network investment and connected projects
- be supported by mechanisms that enable data users to identify potential errors or omissions, with clear processes for review and correction
- contain accurate and up-to-date information relating to relevant reinforcement projects, including dependency information where appropriate
- utilise a common schema framework that improves interoperability with the TORI while preserving the distinct purpose of the two reports⁴⁹
- be updated at least monthly, with scope for more frequent updates where material changes occur

Package 4: Data schema

5.47. To support consistent reporting practices, certain fields have been proposed as ‘conditionally applicable’. These fields may legitimately remain blank in defined circumstances and will be supported by implementation guidance setting out when information is expected to be provided and when exceptions may apply. All other fields are classified as mandatory and are expected to be populated.

Table 4.1 Proposed TWR schema

Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Package ID	TWR and/or TORI, as specified in guidance	Persistent unique identifier for the reinforcement works package and the principal key for linking the TWR, TORI and other datasets.	Mandatory
Title	All packages	Provides a human-readable name for the reinforcement scheme and supports cross-referencing where identifiers are missing or inconsistent.	Mandatory
Responsible organisation	All packages	Identifies the Transmission Owner responsible for delivery.	Mandatory

⁴⁹ See the TORI improvements section below for further detail on the proposed common schema framework linking the TWR and TORI.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Package type	All packages	Identifies whether the works comprise a new asset, upgrade, reconfiguration or enabling works.	Mandatory
Scope summary	All packages	Provides a short, human-readable description of the works.	Mandatory
Strategic or reactive	All packages	Indicates whether the works are strategic or anticipatory, or reactive or connection-driven.	Mandatory
Point of work	Where location information is available, or nearest substation	Provides coordinates or a named location to support mapping and integration with GIS, planning and land-use data.	Mandatory
Region or zone	Where applicable	Identifies the relevant transmission region or planning zone to support aggregation and navigation.	Mandatory
Substation nodes	Where applicable	Identifies the key substations or nodes affected, linking the reinforcement to network topology and local constraints.	Mandatory
Voltage level(s)	All packages	Identifies the voltage level or levels affected across the package.	Mandatory
Interface flag	Where works affect a transmission-distribution interface, offshore network or interconnector	Shows that the package requires cross-dataset reporting or referencing.	Conditionally applicable
Linked queue project identifier(s)	Where the works relate to connection projects	Links the package to relevant projects in the TEC register, DCR or ECR using unique connection project identifiers.	Conditionally applicable
Linkage type	Where the works relate to connection projects	Indicates whether the works are sole-use works, shared enabling works or wider-benefit works.	Conditionally applicable
Interdependency indicator	Where works are shared or interdependent	Shows whether the package is interdependent with other connections or reinforcement works, supporting assessment of coordination and sequencing risks.	Conditionally applicable
Current forecast energisation date	All active packages, where known	Provides the current forecast energisation or completion date.	Mandatory
Record creation date	All packages	Shows when the record was created.	Mandatory
Last updated date	All packages	Shows when the record was most recently updated and supports monitoring of the minimum update frequency.	Mandatory
Data quality status	Where an error has been reported or a check completed	Shows whether the record has been flagged for checking, corrected or verified.	Conditionally applicable

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Package 4: Field-specific considerations (from workshop discussions)

Shared identifiers and interoperability (TWR and TORI)

- 5.48. Workshop participants were generally supportive of the proposed TWR schema, with the majority of fields attracting little or no challenge during discussions. A key area of focus was ensuring interoperability between the TWR and the TORI through the use of common identifiers and aligned data structures.
- 5.49. In particular, there was broad support for the introduction of a shared identifier, proposed as **Package ID**, which would enable direct linkage between the TWR and the TORI. We propose that NESO take responsibility for the creation and maintenance of this identifier to ensure consistency across both reports. Pre-consultation workshop participants, including network companies and NESO, supported this approach.

Queue linkages (TWR and TORI)

- 5.50. Participants also supported the inclusion of fields that improve visibility of the relationship between transmission reinforcement projects and the connections queue, where relevant. In particular, workshop participants recognised the value of publishing linked queue project identifiers to help users understand which projects are dependent upon, or expected to benefit from, specific reinforcement activities.
- 5.51. Workshop discussions highlighted that implementation of this field would require coordination across multiple datasets and organisations. While NESO indicated that identifiers from the TEC register and Transmission DCR could be provided directly, further engagement between NESO and DNOs would be required to support linkage with relevant distribution datasets (the ECRs and the Distribution DCRs) where projects span both the transmission and distribution networks.

Data quality (TWR and TORI)

- 5.52. Stakeholders generally supported the introduction of data quality indicators and mechanisms through which users could flag potential errors. However, no clear consensus emerged regarding how data quality indicators should be represented or implemented in practice.
- 5.53. Ofgem does not propose to prescribe specific validation arrangements or implementation approaches. Instead, we encourage industry parties to work collaboratively to develop an approach that is proportionate, practical and provides value to data users.

Availability of data for historic projects (TWR and TORI)

- 5.54. At the workshops, NESO and network company representatives indicated that certain data fields within the proposed schema may be difficult to populate retrospectively for historic reinforcement projects, as this information was not

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

consistently collected when the project was first identified or initiated. There was broad agreement that such fields should be populated for all new projects, while remaining optional for historic projects where the information is not readily available. This approach applies consistently across both the TWR and TORI schemas. We encourage network companies to provide examples of retrospectively unavailable data in your responses to this consultation, to assist with the development of data schema completion guidance.

Package 4: TWR-specific questions

- Q18. Do you agree with the proposed TWR schema, including the proposed distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields? Please identify any fields that should be added, removed, amended or reclassified.
- Q19. Do you agree with the proposed common schema framework linking the TWR and TORI while retaining the distinct planning and delivery functions of the two reports? Please identify any changes needed to make the framework effective.
- Q20. Any other TWR-specific comments?

Package 5. Improvements to the Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instruction (TORI)

We have decided that a new requirement is needed to establish an obligation on TOs to publish the TORI on a quarterly basis, with scope for event-driven updates for new reinforcement projects and where material changes to existing projects occur.

We are consulting on:

- a common schema framework, linking the TORI and TWR
- inclusion of specific data fields within the proposed TORI schema

The detailed reporting requirements will be informed by responses to this consultation and any subsequent statutory consultation.

Package 5: New requirement

- 5.55. Unlike the TWR, which is published by NESO under NESO's existing licence arrangements, workshop participants generally supported the introduction of a new licence requirement relating to the publication of the TORI. Participants considered that a licence-based approach could provide a clear and consistent obligation to publish the dataset while supporting greater consistency across TOs.

Package 5: Design principles

- 5.56. The stakeholder workshops identified a number of core design principles that we consider should underpin the TORI. The TORI should:
- continue to provide a delivery and project-status view of transmission reinforcement activity, complementing the planning-focused information provided through the TWR

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- be published by all TOs using a standardised schema to improve consistency, transparency and comparability across licence areas
- be published in a machine-readable, searchable and easy-to-filter format, supported by a human-readable overlay, to improve accessibility and usability for data users
- be interoperable with the TWR and other related datasets through the use of common identifiers, consistent definitions and aligned data structures where appropriate
- provide clear visibility of reinforcement project delivery, including project status, progress and changes to relevant assets
- be supported by mechanisms that enable data users to identify potential errors or omissions, with clear processes for review and correction
- utilise a common schema framework that improves interoperability with the TWR while preserving the distinct purpose of each report

Package 5: Data schema

5.57. To support the hybrid approach discussed in Chapter 4, we are proposing a common schema framework for the TWR and TORI. The framework is intended to improve interoperability between the two reports while preserving their distinct functions.

5.58. Under this approach, the TWR would continue to act as the planning layer for transmission reinforcement activity, while the TORI would continue to provide a delivery and project-status view.

5.59. The proposed framework is built around a shared works package identifier that enables direct linkage between the TWR and TORI. This reduces duplication of information across the reports while providing users with a consistent method of tracking reinforcement projects throughout their lifecycle.

5.60. The proposed framework comprises of:

- a **reinforcement package table**, which captures project-level information relating to reinforcement works, including project drivers, queue linkages, programme information, delivery status and headline capacity impacts
- an **asset change table**, which captures the individual asset changes associated with each reinforcement package, including whether assets have been added, removed, replaced, uprated or modified and the associated technical parameters

5.61. The proposed TWR contains a **reinforcement package table**, while the proposed TORI contains both a **reinforcement package table** and an **asset change table**. The shared works package identifier (**Package ID**) would enable users to link projects between both reports while retaining the distinct planning and delivery functions of each record.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

5.62. To support consistent reporting practices, certain fields have been proposed as ‘conditionally applicable’. These fields may legitimately remain blank in defined circumstances and will be supported by implementation guidance setting out when information is expected to be provided and when exceptions may apply. All other fields are classified as mandatory and are expected to be populated.

Table 5.1: Reinforcement package

Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Package ID	TWR and/or TORI, as specified in guidance	Persistent unique identifier for the reinforcement works package and the principal key for linking the TWR, TORI and other datasets.	Mandatory
Title	All packages	Provides a human-readable name for the reinforcement scheme and supports cross-referencing where identifiers are missing or inconsistent.	Mandatory
Lifecycle stage	All packages	Shows whether the package is planned, in design, under construction, complete or withdrawn.	Mandatory
Package type	All packages	Identifies whether the works comprise a new asset, upgrade, reconfiguration or enabling works.	Mandatory
Scope summary	All packages	Provides a short, human-readable description of the works.	Mandatory
Reinforcement programme	Where the package forms part of a wider programme	Identifies the wider reinforcement programme or group of related projects, allowing associated works to be grouped and searched.	Conditionally applicable
Substation nodes	Where applicable	Identifies the key substations or nodes affected, linking the reinforcement to network topology and local constraints.	Mandatory
Voltage level(s)	All packages	Identifies the voltage level or levels affected across the package.	Mandatory
Linked queue project identifier(s)	Where the works relate to connection projects	Links the package to relevant projects in the TEC register, DCR or ECR using unique connection project identifiers.	Conditionally applicable
Constraint addressed	Where known and suitable for structured reporting	Identifies the reason for reinforcement, such as a thermal, voltage, fault-level or stability constraint.	Conditionally applicable
Existing capacity	Where known and quantifiable	Shows the capacity limit before the works.	Conditionally applicable

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Estimated additional capacity	Where known and quantifiable	Shows the capacity following completion of the works, or the incremental capacity delivered.	Conditionally applicable
Associated flexibility	Where applicable	Indicates whether non-build solutions or operational measures form part of the solution.	Conditionally applicable
Delivery milestones	As milestones become applicable or known	Records key stages such as design start, consent, procurement, construction and commissioning.	Mandatory
Current forecast energisation date	All active packages, where known	Provides the current forecast energisation or completion date.	Mandatory
Actual completion date	Completed packages	Records the actual completion or energisation date once the works have been delivered.	Conditionally applicable
Delivery status	All active packages	Shows whether delivery is on track, delayed, at risk or withdrawn.	Mandatory
Delay reason	Delayed or at-risk packages	Provides a standardised reason for delay, such as planning consent, outage constraints, design change, optimisation of network planning or other.	Conditionally applicable
Dependencies	Where applicable	Identifies dependencies such as upstream works, consents, outage windows or interface works.	Conditionally applicable
Quarterly update narrative	Active packages reported through TORI	Provides a human-readable summary of changes since the previous quarterly update.	Mandatory
Last updated date	All packages	Shows when the record was most recently updated and supports monitoring of the minimum update frequency.	Mandatory
Data quality status	Where an error has been reported or a check completed	Shows whether the record has been flagged for checking, corrected or verified.	Conditionally applicable

Table 5.2: Asset change

Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Package ID	All TORI asset changes	Links the asset change to its parent reinforcement package.	Mandatory
Asset change ID	All TORI asset changes	Provides a unique identifier for the individual asset change.	Mandatory
Asset ID	All TORI asset changes	Provides a persistent unique identifier for the asset.	Mandatory
Asset type	All TORI asset changes	Identifies the asset as a cable, transformer, busbar, switchgear,	Mandatory

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

		line, protection equipment, substation or other asset type.	
Asset change type	All TORI asset changes	Shows whether the asset is new, replaced, updated, removed or modified, with one row for each change.	Mandatory
Voltage level(s)	All TORI asset changes	Identifies the voltage level or levels of the asset.	Conditionally applicable
Planning ID	Where planning consent is relevant	Links the asset change to relevant planning information.	Conditionally applicable
Consenting authority	Where planning consent is relevant	Identifies the consenting body associated with the planning reference.	Conditionally applicable
Connects-from latitude and longitude	Where required for mapping	Provides coordinates for the from-point and supports integration with GIS, planning and land-use data.	Mandatory
Connects-to latitude and longitude	Where required for mapping	Provides coordinates for the to-point and supports integration with GIS, planning and land-use data.	Mandatory

Table 5.2a: Asset-specific technical fields

Asset type	Proposed field	Applicability	Purpose	Mandatory or Conditionally applicable
Cable	Conductor material	Cable assets	Identifies the conductor material.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Conductor size (mm ²)	Cable assets	Records the conductor cross-sectional area.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Resistance	Cable assets	Records conductor resistance per unit length.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Installation type	Cable assets	Shows whether the asset is underground or overhead.	Conditionally applicable
Cable	Circuit length (km)	Cable assets	Records circuit length; an estimate may be used until an exact measurement is confirmed.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Rated capacity (MVA)	Transformer assets	Records rated capacity.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Primary voltage (kV)	Transformer assets	Records primary winding voltage.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Secondary voltage (kV)	Transformer assets	Records secondary winding voltage.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Impedance (%)	Transformer assets	Records transformer impedance.	Conditionally applicable
Transformer	Cooling type	Transformer assets	Identifies the cooling arrangement.	Conditionally applicable

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Transformer	Tap changer type	Transformer assets	Identifies the tap changer arrangement.	Conditionally applicable
Busbar	Configuration type	Busbar assets	Identifies the busbar configuration.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Switchgear type	Switchgear assets	Identifies the type of switchgear.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Rated current (A)	Switchgear assets	Records rated current.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Breaking capacity (kA)	Switchgear assets	Records breaking capacity.	Conditionally applicable
Switchgear	Normally open or closed	Switchgear assets	Records the asset's normal operating state.	Conditionally applicable

Package 5: Field-specific considerations (from workshop discussions)**Constraint addressed, existing capacity and additional capacity**

5.63. During workshop discussions, stakeholders considered the inclusion of fields relating to the constraint addressed by a project, the existing network limitation and any resulting increase in network capacity. Participants generally recognised the value of this information in helping users understand the purpose of reinforcement projects and their anticipated network benefits.

5.64. However, views differed regarding how this information should be represented. Some supported structured data fields, noting that these would provide a consistent and machine-readable method of comparing projects; however, concerns were raised by network company representatives around the complexity of providing this data in a quantitative format. Other participants suggested replacing these fields with narrative descriptions but acknowledged that this approach could reduce standardisation and make the dataset more difficult to analyse at scale.

5.65. Alternative approaches were also discussed, including linking TORI records to existing planning and investment frameworks through common identifiers. Participants considered that this could provide users with access to additional contextual information through cross-referencing while maintaining the machine-readable nature of the dataset. As no clear consensus emerged regarding the preferred approach, Ofgem welcomes stakeholder views on how this information should be represented within the TORI.

Delay reasons and delivery risks

5.66. Stakeholders also considered the reporting of project delays and delivery risks. There was broad support for providing greater visibility of factors affecting project delivery timelines. However, views differed regarding the level of detail that should be reported.

5.67. For example, some network companies raised concerns that publication of "supply chain" as a discrete delay category could create commercial sensitivities.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Alternative terminology and categorisation approaches were discussed; however, no clear consensus emerged regarding the preferred option. Ofgem, therefore, welcomes stakeholder views on the most appropriate approach.

Quarterly update narrative

5.68. There was broad support for retaining the quarterly update narrative⁵⁰.

Respondents to the December 2025 consultation identified the narrative as a valuable feature of the existing reports and supported its retention, recognising the additional context it provides regarding project progress, delivery activities and changes since the previous reporting cycle.

5.69. Scottish TO representatives noted that producing quarterly update narratives require input from multiple internal teams and can be resource intensive. However, stakeholders generally considered that the benefits of retaining the narrative outweighed the associated reporting burden. As such, Ofgem propose this field remains within the TORI schema.

Planning and consenting information

5.70. At the July and August 2026 workshops, participants discussed strengthening links between reinforcement projects and the wider planning process. Ofgem propose the inclusion of additional fields relating to planning identification and the relevant local authority are included in the schema.

Package 5: TORI-specific questions

- Q21. Do you agree with the proposed TORI schema, including the proposed distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields? Please identify any fields that should be added, removed, amended or reclassified.
- Q22. How should the constraint addressed, existing network limitation and estimated additional capacity or network benefit be represented within the TORI?
- Q23. What information should the TORI provide on project delays and delivery risks? Should standard categories be used and, if so, which categories would be sufficiently informative without creating inappropriate commercial sensitivities?
- Q24. Any other TORI-specific comments?

Package 6. Improvements to the Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register

We have decided to improve, rather than replace, the existing TEC Register

We are consulting on:

- proposed improvements

⁵⁰ The quarterly update narrative is a project-specific update published alongside TORI data that summarises progress since the previous quarterly publication, including recent and planned project activities.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- whether certain geographic data should be included and how that should be represented
- whether data on quoted connection applications should be included

The detailed reporting requirements will be informed by responses to this consultation and any subsequent statutory consultation.

5.71. Drawing on the workshop discussions summarised in Chapter 4 and subsequent engagement with NESO, we propose a number of improvements to the TEC register. This section explains the principal changes, identifies matters on which we are seeking further views and summarises the fields that are not proposed for inclusion.

Package 6: Proposed improvements to the TEC Register

Proposed improvement	Description
Common identifiers and dataset linkage	Develop a consistent approach to identifiers that supports linkage between the TEC register and related connections datasets, including the TWR, the TORI and relevant distribution datasets.
Creation date	Include a field showing when an entry was first added to the register.
Last modified date	Include a field showing when information relating to an entry was most recently updated.
Data quality and user feedback mechanisms	Explore approaches to improving visibility of data quality issues and enabling users to identify potentially inaccurate information.
Retention of actual connection dates	Retain actual connection dates once projects have connected and explore restoration of previously removed historic dates where feasible.
Restricted connection status	Introduce a clearer indication of whether a project or stage-technology has a restricted connection.
Enhanced geographic information	Improve visibility of location-related information and strengthen linkages with other datasets, subject to consultation feedback on the preferred approach.
Renaming 'Planned connection date' (formerly 'MW Effective From')	Improves readability of the register following addition of and distinction from actual connection date.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Package 6: Field-specific considerations (from workshop discussions)

Common identifiers and dataset linkage

- 5.72. We propose that the updated TEC register should include a stable project identifier that remains unchanged throughout a project's lifecycle. This would support interoperability with related connections datasets and enable users to track projects over time, including where project names or contractual arrangements change.
- 5.73. We also propose introducing identifiers below project level where projects contain multiple technology components. This would allow multiple technology-specific entries associated with a single project to be linked through a common project identifier while retaining separate records for entry-level information. This would improve traceability and provide greater visibility of component-specific information, such as project stage, capacity and planned connection dates.
- 5.74. These proposed improvements were informed by workshop discussions, where participants highlighted the benefits of stronger cross-dataset linkage and improved visibility of how project information is structured within the register.
- 5.75. We recognise that further industry collaboration may be required to determine the most appropriate implementation approach and support consistency across organisations and datasets. We welcome stakeholder views on the proposed approach.

Date added, last updated and data quality

- 5.76. We propose including **Creation Date** and **Last Modified Date**. These fields would provide greater visibility of when information was first added and subsequently amended, helping users understand the currency of the published data and improving confidence in the register. NE SO has agreed to include these fields within the proposed TEC register schema.
- 5.77. Workshop discussions also considered whether additional data quality indicators and mechanisms for reporting potential errors should be introduced. Participants expressed differing views on whether such indicators should reflect validation activities, corrections to previously published information, changes to project data or a combination of these factors. While there was broad support for improving transparency around data quality, no clear consensus emerged regarding how such arrangements should operate in practice.
- 5.78. NESO has indicated its willingness to work with industry to explore options for improving transparency around data quality and the potential use of data quality indicators within the TEC register. As information is not derived from a single source, responsibility for validating and maintaining individual data fields may not always sit with a single party. Therefore, we do not propose to prescribe specific validation arrangements at this stage and welcome stakeholder views on

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

approaches that could improve confidence in published data while remaining proportionate and practical to implement.

Actual connection dates

- 5.79. We propose retaining actual connection dates within the TEC register once projects have connected, rather than removing this information from future reports. This would provide valuable historical context and improve transparency for users seeking to understand project delivery over time.
- 5.80. This proposal was informed by workshop discussions, where participants generally supported the inclusion of historical connection date information. NESO has agreed to retain actual connection dates within the updated TEC register and to explore whether historical connection dates that have previously been removed can be reinstated.

Planned connection dates

- 5.81. We propose renaming the current **MW Effective From** field to **Planned Connection Date**. This would improve the readability of the TEC register and provide a clearer distinction between planned connection dates and actual connection dates.
- 5.82. This proposal was informed by workshop discussions and has been agreed by NESO for inclusion in the proposed TEC register schema.

Restricted connection status

- 5.83. We propose introducing a **Restricted Connection** field within the TEC register. This would provide a clearer indication of whether a project or stage-technology has a restricted connection.
- 5.84. This proposal was informed by workshop discussions, where participants highlighted that terms such as *firm* and *non-firm* can be interpreted differently across the industry. Participants generally supported the proposed approach as a clearer and more consistent method of representing connection restrictions. Similar views were expressed through the distribution data workshops.

Geographic information

- 5.85. We propose improving the visibility of location-related information within the TEC register to support interoperability with other connections datasets and enable users to undertake geographic analysis more effectively.
- 5.86. Workshop discussions informed the development of this proposal. Participants generally supported the principle of making additional location-related information available; however, no clear consensus emerged regarding the preferred implementation approach. In particular, views differed on whether geographic information should be included directly within the TEC register or provided through a separate reference table linked by common identifiers.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

5.87. We welcome stakeholder views on the preferred approach to publishing geographic information and whether additional location-related information, including connection point information, where available, should be included.

Pre-contracted data

5.88. Views on the inclusion of data on quoted connection applications within the TEC register were mixed and reflected similar concerns to those previously raised regarding the publication of information on quotations within distribution datasets. No consensus emerged regarding the preferred approach; therefore, Ofgem welcomes stakeholder views on this issue through the consultation. Further consideration of this topic, including differing stakeholder views on the inclusion of pre-contracted data, is set out in ***Cross-cutting design and policy considerations*** section of Chapter 4.

Package 6: Fields considered but not taken forward (from workshop discussions)

5.89. Several additional fields and reporting requirements were considered during the workshop programme but are not currently proposed for inclusion within the TEC register. In some cases, this reflects practical implementation challenges or limited additional value. In other cases, while greater visibility of information may benefit stakeholders, inclusion within the TEC register was not considered consistent with the register's purpose. In such circumstances, NESO has indicated that it would support exploring alternative mechanisms for making information available, where appropriate and permissible.

Common Information Model (CIM) identifiers

5.90. Consistent with discussions relating to the TWR and the TORI, participants recognised that there is currently no transmission-specific CIM model. As a result, CIM identifiers are not proposed for inclusion at this stage.

Gate reason

5.91. We do not propose including a separate field identifying the reason a project did not receive a Gate 2 offer. Following engagement with NESO, we consider that this information can generally be inferred from other available data and that a separate field would provide limited additional value.

Delay reason

5.92. A dedicated delay reason field is not proposed for inclusion. While this option was considered as part of discussions relating to planned and actual connection dates, participants generally considered that appropriate data management arrangements and the use of separate planned and actual connection date fields would provide sufficient context for users.

Curtailed percentage

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

5.93. We are not proposing to include a curtailment percentage field within the TEC register. Practical challenges were identified in deriving a single curtailment value, as restrictions are not typically represented through a single percentage figure. A curtailment percentage could, therefore, risk oversimplifying or misrepresenting the nature of connection restrictions.

Project site address

5.94. We do not propose including a detailed project site address field within the TEC register. While this option was considered during workshop discussions, concerns were raised regarding commercial sensitivity and the potential disclosure of information beyond that required to support the register's objectives. We, therefore, consider that the existing connection site information provides an appropriate level of detail.

Package 6: TEC register-specific questions

- Q25. Do you agree with the proposed improvements to the TEC register? Please identify any further targeted improvements that should be prioritised.
- Q26. Should the TEC register include quoted connection applications as well as contracted projects? If so, should quoted applications be published at project level or in an aggregated form? If at project level, what safeguards would be needed to address uncertainty, duplication, commercial sensitivity and data quality?
- Q27. Any other TEC register-specific comments?

Additional and overarching questions

- Q28. Do you agree with the proposed common design principles for connections datasets, including standardisation, machine-readability, human accessibility, interoperability, and the use of common identifiers? Please identify any additional principles that should apply.
- Q29. Is a single “restricted connection” indicator sufficient to describe whether a customer’s access to network capacity is constrained? If not, what additional or separate fields should be included to describe different forms of restriction? (applicable to all queue transparency datasets)
- Q30. Would a standalone geographical reference table, linked to multiple datasets through common identifiers, be beneficial? If so, what information should it contain, and which information should instead remain within individual datasets?
- Q31. Should IDNOs ultimately be required to publish equivalent connections datasets using the same schemas and design principles as DNOs?
- Q32. Which additional datasets, standards, or interoperability improvements should Ofgem prioritise in future phases of the TCD programme, and why?
- Q33. Any other comments?

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

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.

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

Appendix 1. Privacy policy

Personal data

The following explains your rights and gives you the information you are entitled to under the 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 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

Your personal data will not be shared with any organisation outside of Ofgem.

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 up to six months after the programme is closed.

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

Transforming Connections Data: 2026 policy consultation

- 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](#).