

## **The Questionnaire – For independent providers**

Hello. Thank you for taking the time to complete our questionnaire.

We hope all the questions are clear, but if you have any difficulties please email [connections@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:connections@ofgem.gov.uk).

Once you have completed the questionnaire please send it back to us to the email address above. You need to return the completed questionnaire to us by 31 July 2014.

After we have read your answers we might want to have a chat with you to understand a bit more. We'll try and do this during August.

### Part 1 - About you

Question	Your response
What is your name?	[REDACTED]
What is your position?	[REDACTED]
What are your contact details?	[REDACTED]

### Part 2 - About your business

Question	Your response
What is your company's name?	UK Power Solutions Ltd.
What is the nature of your company's business?	Delivering new electricity connections up to and including 66kV.
Which sections of the market for new electricity connections does your	We offer a turn key connection solution in all sectors, Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Generation etc, we offer these services to end users, developers, through consultants and partners.

business operate in?  (ie what types of connection solution do you provide?)	
What areas of the country does your business operate in?	All parts of the UK & Wales, we have our head office in Stonehouse in Gloucestershire and a delivery centre in Uxbridge to serve the London Area.
Who are your competitors?	DNO's, iDNO's and other ICP's offering a turnkey solution.
Please provide an indication of your size. Ie how much work do you do in the connections market?	We are currently running over 270 live connection projects at various different stages and sizes up to £1.5m in value, predominately these will be at 11kV.

### Part 3 - About the markets you don't operate in

Question A	Your response
Have you considered competing for work in other regions?  If so, which ones?	We are operating in most regions with the exception of Scotland for logistical reasons.
What stops you competing in other regions?	We are currently working in most areas, however it is always a battle when trying to maintain and develop the areas where we currently do less work to be able to expand and reach more customers. This is due predominantly to the behaviour towards ICP's and the difference in approach by different DNO's. It is very difficult to develop robust internal procedures when the requirements vary from DNO to DNO, which means it takes along time to get comfortable working in a DNO area because you generally only get to know their nuances by learning from mistakes which cost time and money and more importantly our ability to deliver the level of customer service that is required, there should be a reasonable level of comminality which would allow ICP's to reasonably foresee how they can deliver their projects prior to working in a new or less familiar area.

Question B	Your response
Have you considered competing for different types of connections work (e.g. different voltage work)?	We are already competing on most connection types and voltages
If so, which ones?	
What stops you offering other types of connections?	In UKPN we can no longer move an existing UKPN substation if the TX size is being upgraded introducing a level of complexity to the project and additional timescales waiting for UKPN to carry out these works, I haven't received an explanation that makes sense. This is a big consideration when trying to tender a project where you have to move an existing s/s and that some of the additional LV load on site would be best taken from upgrading the existing TX (this can be quite common).

## Part 4 – About your views on the issues we've identified.

In our letter, we identified where we have feedback from stakeholders about areas that may be an issue for competition. We provided our understanding of these issues in the letter. In this part of the questionnaire we want you to describe the issue and your experience of it. There is also a blank template for you to complete for additional issues not described by us.

4A	
Title	The DNO's level of control over the connection process
Description	<p>To safeguard network integrity, DNOs insist on controlling some of the activities associated with network connections. So competitors have to interact with DNOs at certain points of the process. This can cause tension and may make it more difficult for a competitor to win work. Some examples are given below.</p> <p>Competitors need to provide quotes to customers in order to win work. This involves designing and costing a connection. Their ability to do this independently is currently limited because:</p>

- To quote for a job a competitor will need to know where they can connect to a network. For the competitor to establish their own point of connection they will need to apply to the DNO to get access to network diagrams and information.
- The DNO must then approve the design of the competitor's connection.
- Alternatively a competitor can ask the DNO to offer them a point of connection (POC) to the existing network.

This dependency on the DNO may make it difficult for competitors to issue quotes in the same amount of time as (or faster than) a DNO. Competitors are less able to control timescales involved than the DNO and are reliant on DNOs meeting agreed timescales. We can also see that this process could lead to tension (or at worst discriminatory, anti-competitive behaviour). For instance, ICP designs may be rejected unnecessarily by DNOs. There is a risk that less favourable connection points could be issued to competitors than are issued by the DNO to its own customers.

In addition DNOs may place requirements on competitors to protect the wider network that can add to the cost associated with using a competitor. For instance -

- DNOs can ask for link boxes to be installed at the network boundary with an IDNO.
- DNOs can insist upon ICPs being subject to their own accreditation regime before they are permitted to make a 'live' connection to a DNO's network.
- DNOs can insist on their own inspection and monitoring regime to audit the work of a competitor before a connection can be made.

The above issues, either in isolation or combined, could result in difficulty for competitors to provide quotes and ultimately win work. There is also a risk that the complexity of interaction between the competitors and DNO deters customers from seeking quotes from a range of providers.

**(i) Have you experienced, or are you aware of, these issues?**

☒

YES – Please complete the sections below.

☐

NO – Please move onto the next issue

We believe that there may be a number of different ways in which the DNO's level of control over the connections process could affect a competitor's ability to compete and we've given examples of what these may be in the description above.

We'd like to try to capture each of these separately by asking you to complete the following questions. To do this we need you to identify the separate issues and respond to a set of questions based on each issue identified. Each issue should relate to the impact that DNO control over the connection process has on your ability to compete.

There is space for you to provide details of up to 5 issues, but you don't need to populate them all. Just include the things that matter to you.

### **ISSUE 1**

#### **Description of the issue:**

*Legal processes*

#### **Issue Details:**

Q. How often does the issue arise?

A. A large proportion of our projects.

Q. Where does the issues arise (DNO areas or type of work)

A. UKPN is the worst area, although we continue to have issue's with all DNO's. in UKPN just getting the legal paperwork in place to start the process can take weeks due to scrutinising legal plans to a ridiculous level which causes so many delays, most DNO's we have dealt with do not manage legals well even on their own projects, the difference is if they have underperformed on delivering the legal agreements they still have the option to energise whereas ICP's don't have that level of control.

Q. Has this affected your ability to win work?

A. Yes, if customers have had their project significantly delayed over legals it will impact on whether they feel it safer to stick with the DNO when placing their next order.

Q. Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?

A. I wouldn't say that a particular DNO has done more to solve this problem than another, many have looked at the process but as always the education of their staff and the lack of emphasis on what is a critical procedure in the connection process always ends up costing a lot of time, UKPN in particular are very poor, agreeing how a legal plan should look can sometimes take weeks, in addition long periods of inactivity on the legl process with little or no communication to move things forward.

Q. What more could be done to deal with the issue?

A. Implimenting a standard process that would work across all DNO's, one that customers could easily identify with (as they have to remain involved throughout) and ensuring there is more emphasis, and better communication in the process.

Q. Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?

A. The legals never get a high enough priority and the DNO staff dealing with the legals are very poor at communicating, maybe ofgem could implement some SLA's for the legals, it is very common for this issue to delay the connection process.

## **ISSUE 2**

### **Description of the issue:**

*Communication from the DNO's*

### **Issue Details:**

Q. How often does the issue arise?

A. Very common

Q. Where does the issues arise (DNO areas or type of work)

A. All areas and work types

Q. Has this affected your ability to win work?

A. Yes, often introducing long delays into projects to get answers to queries or not being able to talk to relevant DNO staff until very close to energisation leaving no time to solve problems. In addition to this consistency of approach can often be a problem.

Q. Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?

A. UKPN have implemented an operational liaison position for problems during the construction phase only, but one person across all ICP's and projects is just not enough.

Q. What more could be done to deal with the issue?

A. If the issue cannot be resolved with the DNO designer it would normally be escalated to the designers manager, this only leads to the Manager trying to protect the position of his designer/company and not trying to resolve the problem in the most effective way.

To ensure an effective escalation process there needs to be a point of contact independent of the day to day process that can discuss and agree resolutions in a responsive and consistent manner based on policy and reasonable engineering judgement, no one is interested in cutting corners but sometimes a engineering solution needs to be agreed when policy cannot be 100% applied.

Q. Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?

A. The problem exists due to the DNO structure and attitude of DNO's to competition.

## **ISSUE 3**

### **Description of the issue:**

### *Timescales of the Design process*

#### **Issue Details:**

Q. How often does the issue arise?

A. Most DNO's to some extent, UKPN more than most

Q. Where does the issues arise (DNO areas or type of work)

A. All elements of work

Q. Has this affected your ability to win work?

A. Yes, often a lengthy design approval process leaves the customer with a feeling of dissatisfaction and frustration early on in the project, and can put their project at risk due to not being able to start elements of their construction whilst waiting for design approval.

Q. Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?

A. Gaining design approval has many elements where problems can occur, we see this more in UKPN although these projects can be more complex. The main issues are, timescales for addressing queries, rejecting designs when a simple conversation would resolve the query straight away and allow the minor changes to be made to allow the design to be approved, consistency with what section 16 are to provide and agreeing best practice when engineering difficulty arises in a reasonable approach in line with what the DNO would ask their customer to do.

Q. What more could be done to deal with the issue?

A. Following the process that the Gas industry uses where authorised ICP inhouse staff are able to sign off designs, this would, in my opinion save a vast amount of time in the connection process and negate the need to have two design Engineers looking at the design (DNO & ICP)

Q. Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?

A. This would be a significant change to the process and could only be driven from ofgem

#### **ISSUE 4**

##### **Description of the issue:**

*Auditing and standards*

#### **Issue Details:**

Q. How often does the issue arise?

A. A large portion of the projects

Q. Where does the issues arise (DNO areas or type of work)

A. All DNO's and all elements of work from design to construction.

ICP's are so diligently policed through design and construction however we know this is not the same for the DNO's actual staff and

contractors. We are often having to design and construct connections to a standard way above what the DNO would. This is obvious in many ways from earthing requirements, over engineered cable routes, bespoke substation buildings of which our customers comment regularly that "the DNO wouldn't ask us to do that!"

In addition in UKPN they carry out the only audit on a lot of projects a day or two at most before the connection often not leaving anytime to action any points they may pickup and thus delaying the connection costing more on opening notices, excavation, client delays and generally far more time and effort than should be required to deliver the project had there been some earlier communication or an appreciation of engineering difficulties.

Q. Has this affected your ability to win work?

A. Yes, it can introduce delays into the job often at a late stage, and leave the ICP looking like they haven't managed the process effectively. It also greatly increases costs during construction due to having to cancel connections.

Q. Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?

A. nothing has been done to address this with maybe the exception being UKPN who have introduced an operational liaison position, which has been useful in a small number of cases but often with problems only being highlighted at a very late stage there is no time to react and save the outage date.

Q. What more could be done to deal with the issue?

A. The Engineers responsible for the delivery phase of the project from a DNO perspective should be available from design approval to connection this would allow a relationship to be formed and a joint understanding of what needs to be achieved for the customer and negating the requirement for last minute auditing.

DNO's should also be independently audited to ensure it is a level playing field.

Q. Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?

A. All DNO's are setup differently to deliver ICP connections, this makes it difficult to get a straight forward approach. Setting up an independent audit would need to be pushed by ofgem.

## **ISSUE 5**

### **Description of the issue:**

### **Issue Details:**

Q. How often does the issue arise?

A.

Q. Where does the issues arise (DNO areas or type of work)

A.



Q. Has this affected your ability to win work?
A.
Q. Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?
A.
Q. What more could be done to deal with the issue?
A.
Q. Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?
A.

4B	
Title	Complexity for customers
Description	<p>We have been told that some aspects of some connection process can cause confusion for customers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Transparency in quotes</u> - Competition should be most effective where customers are able to compare the costs that will be charged by the DNO against those of an independent. Stakeholders have raised concerns that quotes are difficult to understand because the content of work is not always clear. This could disadvantage customers as they might not be able to easily compare costs between the DNO and an independent.</li> </ul> <p>DNOs have improved transparency but recent responses to some competition tests suggest that there is still more to do, such as removing miscellaneous charges in quotes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Difficulty in accepting just the non-contestable part of a DNO's quote</u> - In some DNO areas, issues can arise when customers accept a non-contestable quote from a DNO, but decline the contestable element and choose to use an independent. If this happens, some DNOs may reissue the costs of the non-contestable works. This can discourage customers from using independents, as doing so will increase the time taken to receive a quote and add uncertainty to the cost of any non-contestable works. We are aware that some DNOs have introduced fully transferable quotes to address this issue. But this is not yet standard practice across the industry.</li> </ul>
A) Scale	(i) Have you experienced the issue?
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; padding: 2px 5px;">x</div> YES – Please complete the rest of this question

☐

NO – Please move onto the next issue

**(ii) Please describe the type of issue as you have encountered it.**

We have found this issue particularly on larger projects requiring reinforcement work at a Primary substation, the costs for these works can very high but little or no explanation, we did have an incident where a formal offer expired and the newly updated formal offer was substantially more and we somehow had to justify this to the customer, UKPN's reason up lifting the costs were that they didn't have time on the first formal offer to get correct costings.

**(iii) How often does the issue arise?**

We have to be diligent mainly on the larger schemes.

**(iv) Where does the issue arise? (ie is the issue more frequent in certain areas or for certain types of customers?)**

We feel this could happen in any DNO, the works in the Primary is less tangible than installing new cables etc for reinforcement.

**B) Impact**

**(i) Has this affected your ability to win work?**

Yes, these are large N/C costs and not being able to properly justify them would concern the customer prior to placing an order.

**(ii) Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?**

UKPN have tried to develop their cost matrix but there is still a lot that falls into the miscellaneous heading.

	<b>(iii) What more could be done to deal with the issue?</b>
	More detail on the elements of works and associated costs, encompassed with some comminality of charging between all DNO's.
	<b>(iv) Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?</b>
	We feel that the DNO's would not change with pressure from ofgem

<b>4C</b>	
<b>Title</b>	<b>Customer appetite for competition</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>We have been told that some customers may not be convinced of the benefits of using alternative providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Customers don't know they can use alternatives</u> - Some customers are still unaware that they can choose an alternative provider. This is a long-standing issue. We think awareness has improved with DNOs now providing information on alternative providers, but a lack of awareness remains for some types of customers (eg smaller customers) and is still impeding competition.</li> <li>• <u>Customers' willingness to use independents</u> - In response to the competition tests, some stakeholders have noted that some customers are reluctant to use competitors. Stakeholders have suggested this is because of a perception of increased risk of higher costs, extended timescales or greater 'effort' when using independents compared to the DNO. Some stakeholders have said that the cost savings of using a competitor aren't sufficiently significant. This may particularly be the case for lower value work.</li> </ul>
<b>A) Scale</b>	<p><b>(i) Have you experienced the issue?</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES – Please complete the rest of this question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NO – Please move onto the next issue</p> <p><b>(ii) Please describe the type of issue as you have encountered it.</b></p> <p>Customers are often put off using ICP's after they have had bad experiences where they have come to us as we quote a short project timescale, however all though ICP's are set up to deliver in this timescale the DNO barriers often slow the delivery of projects down either by making design approval long winded, delaying the legal agreements and delaying connection by last minute auditing leaving no time to resolve the issues.</p> <p><b>(iii) How often does the issue arise?</b></p> <p>A large percentage of projects, this is particularly prevalent in UKPN</p>

	<p><b>(iv) Where does the issue arise? (ie is the issue more frequent in certain areas or for certain types of customers?)</b></p> <p>On all projects, WPD are probably the best to work with but their processes still slow down the connection</p>
<p><b>B) Impact</b></p>	<p><b>(i) Has this affected your ability to win work?</b></p> <p>Yes, we provide a project timescale to the customer which is part of the attraction of using an ICP, however we have noticed just trying to get past the first hurdle of design approval can often leave the client frustrated and wishing he had placed an order elsewhere as he perceives this as being poor performance from the ICP rather than the DNO's procedures and attitude to ICP's.</p>
	<p><b>(ii) Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?</b></p> <p>In our experience no one DNO has done nearly enough, with the DNO's still having control over the main elements of our projects we cannot commit fully to the customer leaving them considering what the advantage is to opting for an ICP.</p> <p>Best practice would be to move towards the Gas industry model.</p>
	<p><b>(iii) What more could be done to deal with the issue?</b></p> <p>A true playing field where ICP's can control have more control, in addition maybe Lloyds, for example, could audit the quality of work carried out by DNO's to ensure they are having to maintain the same standards that we are scrutinised to.</p>

**(iv) Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?**

These changes which are probably the most important for iCP's would be a complete fundamental industry change, too big for an ICP to drive through.

<b>4D</b>	
<b>Title</b>	<b>The impact of regulatory regimes and requirements</b>
<b>Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Statutory powers</u> - Through their licence DNOs have statutory powers that make conducting street works easier than if a non-licenssee (ICP) carried out the work. This can make it more difficult for some independents and may make smaller jobs unattractive.</li> <li>• <u>Requirement for emergency response service</u> - In the event of a fault on the network, DNOs and IDNOs are required by their licence to provide certain services to customers on their network. This includes information and fault restoration. Some stakeholders argue that the requirements to provide this service imposes costs that could stop new IDNO entrants entering the market or existing participants expanding. They also note that DNOs are more easily able to cover such costs through their regulatory revenues.</li> <li>• <u>Part funded connections</u> - When conducting a connection project, a DNO may decide to carry out additional wider work on its network. If it does, the cost of reinforcement will be shared between the connecting customer and the wider customer base. If a customer contracts with a competitor for all of the work there will be no cost sharing. This may restrict the independent's ability to compete with the DNO on price for certain work.</li> <li>• <u>Pricing</u> - we want to understand the extent to which independents can compete on price in various sections of the market.</li> </ul>
<b>A) Scale</b>	<p><b>(i) Have you experienced the issue?</b></p> <p><input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> YES – Please complete the rest of this question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NO – Please move onto the next issue</p> <p><b>(ii) Please describe the type of issue as you have encountered it.</b></p> <p><u>Statutory Powers</u></p> <p>Having statutory powers is a <u>huge</u> benefit in conducting street works, not only in costs but also the ability to use definitive timescales to plan an execute the works, we find that the section 50 process is much more difficult to manage especially in the East of England as its a paper based system whereas using the eaton/symology system</p>

	allows you to post streetworks request directly on the LA's system and then complete the works in the specified timescales.
	<u>Pricing</u>  We would like to have more transparency of how DNO's are pricing their projects, it appears that particularly in WPD some of the prices that are being quoted to customers would mean we would be unable to get close enough for the customer to consider our quote a legitimate one to consider.
	<u>Part Funded Reinforcement</u>  We have not experienced this
	<b>(iii) How often does the issue arise?</b>
	<u>Statutory Powers</u>  The majority of projects in all areas  <u>Pricing</u>  More prevalent in smaller value projects
	<b>(iv) Where does the issue arise? (ie is the issue more frequent in certain areas or for certain types of customers?)</b>
	<u>Statutory Powers</u>  The statutory powers issue would be present on all jobs requiring works in the highway, which is most.
	<u>Pricing</u>  WPD mainly
<b>B) Impact</b>	<b>(i) Has this affected your ability to win work?</b>
	<u>Statutory Powers</u>



Inability to carry out streetworks within the same timescales, cost and control as the DNO's will leads to customers doubting that we can perform inline with what the DNO's can.

#### Pricing

in WPD some of the prices that are being quoted to customers would mean we would be unable to get close enough for the customer to consider our quote a legitimate one to consider, this has led to us no being able to even be considered to carry out the connection.

#### **(ii) Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?**

Some DNO's provide more information than others, but more clarity is required.

#### **(iii) What more could be done to deal with the issue?**

We believe that ofgem would have to drive through a change to the detail DNO's provide regarding their costs.

#### **(iv) Why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?**

Statutory powers would be outside of the DNO's remit although they could support the idea, asking a DNO to provide more breakdown of costs than they already do can only be enforced by ofgem in our opinion.

<b>4E</b>	
<b>Title</b>	<b>Little evidence of competition for certain types of connection</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>We have seen little evidence of competition in certain types of connection during the competition test process. No DNO passed the test in the 'distributed generation low voltage' or 'unmetered other' RMSs. There may be specific issues affecting competition for these types of connection. This could be because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the total value of the work (and high proportion of non-contestable costs);</li> <li>• the value of the work versus the costs or effort required to win it (for instance the processes complexity);</li> <li>• the sporadic nature of the work; and/or</li> <li>• high entry costs (accreditation etc).</li> </ul>
<b>A) Scale</b>	<p><b>(i) Have you experienced the issue?</b></p> <p><input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> YES – Please complete the rest of this question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NO – Please move onto the next issue</p> <p><b>(ii) How often does the issue arise?</b></p> <p>The above issues would be present for most small LV projects</p> <p><b>(iii) Where does the issue arise? (ie is the issue more frequent in certain areas or for certain types of work?)</b></p> <p>These issues arise in all areas, the need for an LV linkbox and limited capability of self connect to be a level playing field means that this would be a difficult market to expand.</p>

<b>B) Impact</b>	
	<p><b>(i) Has this affected your ability to win work?</b></p> <p>Yes, the extra costs and the lack of a level playing field makes these smaller LV connection prohibitive.</p>
	<p><b>(ii) Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?</b></p> <p>The self connect process is the only want to truly open this up to competition and this is still some way off working.</p>
	<p><b>(iii) What more could be done to deal with the issue?</b></p> <p>Improve the self connect process</p>
	<p><b>(iv) What are the mitigating arguments? ie why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?</b></p> <p>ICP's work to high standards and with all the processes that would already exist such as adoption agreements, Lloyds independent audits and processes for allowing third party contractor work on their network the concern about not being able to police us and safety is mitigated.</p>

## Part 5 –About your views on the issues we’ve not identified.

We recognise that there may be issues in the market that we did not identify under Part 4. If there are other issues please provide details of them by populating the blank issues template which is provided below. If you have more than one issue please make multiple copies of the template and complete one template for each issue that you want to highlight.

### 5 – BLANK ISSUE TEMPLATE

<b>Title</b>	<b>[Insert title]</b>
<b>Issue Description</b>	[Insert issue description]
<b>A) Scale</b>	<b>(i) Have you experienced the issue?</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> YES – Please complete the rest of this question
	<input type="checkbox"/> NO – Please move onto the next issue
	<b>(ii) How often does the issue arise?</b>
	<b>(iii) Where does the issue arise? (ie is the issue more frequent in certain areas or for certain types of work?)</b>
<b>B) Impact</b>	<b>(i) Has this affected your ability to win work?</b>

**(ii) Have certain DNOs done more than others to deal with these issues? What do you consider to be current best practice?**

**(iii) What more could be done to deal with the issue?**

**(iv) What are the mitigating arguments? ie why can't the issue be dealt with or what barriers are there to implementing change?**

## Part 6 - About other markets

Question	Your response
How does your experience of this market compare to comparable markets that you operate in, or are aware of?	I'm aware that the gas market allows the connection process to be completed with very little interaction from the existing network owner which gives full control to the independent connection provider.
Are there any aspects of those markets which you think would deal with the issues you have identified in this questionnaire?	Total control as above.

## Part 7 - Other comments

The questions we've asked have been designed for you to give us important information for our review. But you also have the opportunity to comment here on any other aspect of the market for new electricity connections and our review process.