

Open letter consultation on the Incentive on Connections Engagement:  
Looking Forward reports 2015/16

Response received by email dated 23 July 2015 from Solar Assets

**Ofgem have published an [open letter](#) seeking your views and feedback on our plans. They are keen to hear your thoughts on any aspect of our plans and specifically welcome your views on the following questions:**

- Are you satisfied that SSEPD has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders and facilitating joint discussions where appropriate?

TT - I have been to an SSE surgery and I'm satisfied that SSE can listen to customers. I'm also very pleased to see the new mechanism they have for GIS mapping their generation capacity which is hugely useful.

- Do you agree that SSEPD has a comprehensive work plan of activities (with associated delivery dates) that will meet the requirements of its connection stakeholders? If not, has SSEPD provided reasonable and well-justified reasons? What other activities should the DNOs do?

TT - I am unaware of this - largely because we (As customers) don't often have the time to look into it, we tend to only know when the system is failing - not when it's working smoothly. (Just an observation).

- Do you consider that SSEPD has set relevant outputs that it will deliver during the regulatory year (eg key performance indicators, targets, etc.)?

TT - Yes I do and we are pleased to see these - but we are well aware that the constraints in the system are not driven by the DNO's - they are caused by bad government policy regarding investment in essential growth infrastructure like energy networks - very frustrating when customers are also under such pressure regarding the planning constraints on sites - this limits the places we can connect assets drastically.

- Would you agree that the SSEPD's proposed strategy, activities and outputs have been informed and endorsed by a broad and inclusive range of connection stakeholders? If they have not been endorsed, has SSEPD provided robust evidence that it has pursued this?

TT - DNO strategies are insufficient in the light of our economic problems. New energy generation (as well as clean energy) is a critical pathway to improvements in our economy - Ofgem and central government are failing to tackle core issues such as;

1. Laws limiting DNO's from owning and operating large scale storage (And hence not even engaging with us on it).
2. Over-constricting DNO capacity on safety grounds that are more stringent than many places in the EU including Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands where renewables are heavily implemented but DNO and grid failures are no more of a problem than they are here.
3. Focussing on demand-side customers and driving network configuration and expansion that continues to ignore the planning constraints on renewable and other distributed energy technology.
4. Failing to provide 'outside-the-box' opportunities for distributed energy generators and renewables generators to work more creatively with DNO's.
5. Failing to require DNO's to limit the length of time that POC Offers can remain un-utilised. (This is debilitating the renewables industry).

These are just a few of the obvious ones that should be seriously considered and are in no way the fault of the DNO's.

Before finishing I would like to commend some of the DNO's for having worked so effectively with the NHS to help National Grid facilitate STOR systems on Hospital Generators which is going to help the NHS in no small way with its energy costs.

I would like to ask that you kindly respond to Ofgem by sending any comments to [connections@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:connections@ofgem.gov.uk) by 4<sup>th</sup> August 2015.