The Voice of the Networks



Energy Networks Association

DNO CONWG – ICE Discussion

Date

22 January 2014

Aspects Ofgem requested feedback on



- Assessment process
 - Whether the assessment process should be annual or biennial?
 - What the timelines for submission and assessment should be?
- Assessment criteria
- Potential submission structure
- How to trial arrangements

Current status of Competition Test Notices



Demand Customers:	NWL	NPg North	NF Yo				SPN	S			VPD V Mid	SSE Hydro		-	SP Dist
(i) LV work:	Curre Appli	ent (A	urrent pplic \lt MS)	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Not passed	Not passed	Not passed	Not passed	Not passe	Not d passed	Not passe	Not d applie	Not applied	Not passed	Passed Dec 2013
(ii) HV work:	Pass May 2013	0	assed ct 012	Passed Oct 2012	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Not passed	Not passe	Not passed	Not passe	Curre Applie		Not passed	Passed Dec 2013
(iii) HV and EHV work:	Pass May 2013	A	urrent pplic	Current Applic	Passed Aug 2013	Passed Aug 2013	Passed Aug 2013	Not passed	Not passe	Passed Feb 2013	Passe Feb 2013	Curre Applio		Not passed	Not passed
(iv) EHV work and above:	Pass Nov 2011	ed A	urrent pplic	Current Applic	Passed Aug 2013	Passed Aug 2013	Passed Aug 2013	Not passed	Not passe	Passed Feb 2013	Passe Feb 2013	Curre Applic		Not passed	Not passed
Distributed Generation													_		
(v) LV work:	Curre Appli	c Ap	urrent pplic \It MS)	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Not passed x2	Not passed x2	Not passed x2	Not passed	Not passe	Not d passed	Not passe	Not d applie	Not applied	Not passed	Not passed
(vi) HV and EHV work:.	Pass Nov 2011	ed Ar	urrent pplic Alt MS)	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Passed Oct 2012	Passed Oct 2012	Passed Oct 2012	Current Applic	Currer Applic	t Curren Applic	t Curre Applic			Not passed	Not passed
Unmetered premises:													_		
(vii) LA work:	Pass May 2013	Ap	urrent pplic	Current Applic	Passed Aug 2013	Current Applic	Passed Aug 2013	Passed Feb 2013	Passe Feb 2013	Passed Feb 2013	Passe Feb 2013	Not applie	Current Applic	Passed Dec 2013	Not passed
(viii) PFI work:	Pass Nov 2011	ed A	urrent pplic	Current Applic	Passed Oct 2012	Passed Oct 2012	Passed Oct 2012	Passed Feb 2013	Passe Feb 2013	Passed Feb 2013	Passe Feb 2013	ed Not applie	Current Applic	Passed Dec 2013	Not passed
(ix) Other work:	Curre Appli	ent (A	urrent pplic Alt MS)	Current Applic (Alt RMS)	Current Applic	Current Applic	Current Applic	Not passed	Not passe	Not passed	Not passe	Not applie	Current Applic	Not passed	Not passed
Applied	1 ^		9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	4	7	9	T 9
Applied Passed	9	_	1	1	5	4	5	2	2	4	4	0	0	2	2
rasseu	6		ı	ı	L 3	4	Э			1 4	4	0	U	4	I 4

Annual Assessment





Annual assessment vs Biennial Assessment

Annual Assessment	Biennial Assessment
Shorter timescale for DNOs to implement plans.	Longer gaps between Ofgem assessment of DNO performance
Higher regulatory burden for all.	Longer period between DNO performance and when the DNO incurs any penalty.
	There could be large variation in performance over two years.

Which approach do you prefer? Why?

How much time do DNOs need to implement plans and demonstrate change?

How do we ensure that biennial assessments aren't clouded by short term memories?

Does a longer gap between performance and penalty matter?

Our current preference is for an annual assessment.

-

- All DNO prefer annual assessment
- Important to have feedback on any penalty so that changes can be undertaken to avoid subsequent penalty

Trials



- Ofgem propose trials in 2014 and 2015
- Suggestion could be
 - 2014 trial could be limited to DG as all DNOs will be producing work plans
 - 2015 trial could be extended to further segments
- Timeline needs to be a balance between
 - Enough time for both DNOs and Ofgem to process
 - Avoiding clashes with multiple submission dates
 - Ensure timely feedback to enable it to be incorporated into current year

Indicative timeline for a full year cycle eg 2016-17



Apri

• DNOs publish 'Looking Forward' 2016-17 work plan

May

• Ofgem open letter asking for comments on those plans

June

- Responses back to Ofgem on 'Looking Forward' plan
- DNOs publish 'Looking Back' report for 2015-16

July

• Ofgem consultation on 'Looking Back' report for 2015-16

Aug

Consultation responses back on 'Looking Back' report for 2015-16

Sept

- •Ofgem issue 'minded to' consultation on 'Looking Back' report for 2015-16
- •DNOs refresh 'Looking Ahead' 2016-17 plan submitted in April (if applicable)

Oct

Ofgem decision on penalty for 2015-16

Assessment criteria





Potential Assessment Criteria

·								
DNOs will be required to submit evidence to demonstrate the following criteria:								
Section	Part 1 (forward looking)	Part 2 (backward looking)						
Process	 The DNO has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders. The DNO's proposed strategy, activities and outputs been informed and endorsed by a broad and inclusive range of stakeholders. 	 The DNO has implemented a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders. The DNOs activities and outputs have taken into account ongoing feedback from a broad and inclusive range of stakeholders. 						
Activities	The DNO has a comprehensive and relevant workplan of activities.	The DNO has undertaken the activities stated in its workplan. If not the reasons provided are reasonable and well-justified.						
Outputs	The DNO has set itself outputs that it will deliver in that year (eg targets, KPIs).	The DNO has delivered the outputs that it stated that it would deliver (eg targets, KPIs) in that year. If not, the reasons provided are reasonable and well-justified.						
Ofgem will decide whether the criteria of Part 1 and 2 have been met. Our assessment will take into account feedback from stakeholders and be informed by previous years submissions.								
Should a company that fails to meet this criteria incur a penalty? Are there other criteria that we are missing? Is the separation between process, activities and outputs useful?								

- Need to develop Guidance with focus on measurement against minimum requirements
- How deal with 'hard to reach' segments eg EHV where infrequent customers
- Approach to segments that have passed would focus on ICP/IDNO engagement

Penalties





Why would we apply a penalty?

- A DNO has not engaged with connection stakeholders.
- A DNO has not secured endorsement from connection stakeholders.
- A DNO has not responded to issues raised by connection stakeholders.
- A DNO has not undertaken activities to improve performance.
- A DNO has not delivered key outputs.

.

- How split penalty across alternative market segments?
- How are the minimum requirements defined?