

I write in response to an OFGEM survey issued me recently.

I have reviewed your survey and consider only the following questions (15,16,17, 18 & 19) to be relevant to my role as a main contractor employing UKPN on Major Projects in the London areas for 33kV and 11KV supplies to my projects.

I have not included meeting minutes and programme evidence but can do so under request if required.

15. Do you consider that UKPN delivered a single point of contact for connection customers? Do you have any additional evidence to support your view?

At 22 Bishopsgate UKPN have always communicated to my team via a primary point of contact, Ian Arnold, the Project Manager. Furthermore through onsite communication, via two team leaders in both David Warner and David Merralls.

It is my experience in the last 12 years I have been engaging with the DNO that all parties attend all meetings when invited on site and attend prepared and with a positive attitude to assist me as their customer.

In my time as a client and Main Contractor for both Mace Group and Multiplex I have never had re-course to postpone or delay meetings with the DNO as a result of poor communication. Whilst not attached I can issue meeting minutes and correspondence to assist should you require.

16. Do you consider that UKPN's commitment to reduce the time to provide a quote has been delivered?

At 22 Bishopsgate UKPN have delivered their quote on time, this despite the internal changes of the project that had impacted both works extent and therefore a potential delay to their being able to produce a quote in the time frame agreed.

In addition to delivering their quote at 22BG, UKPN have offered to reduce their original cable exploration works scope relating to 22 Crosby Square area on site by offering to manage the works via our supply chain, Careys.

Careys are a supply chain member to both UKPN and Multiplex therefore this lessened the need to interface with UKPN direct and reduce the Crosby square works by 5-7 Days.

From a project perspective UKPN's actions have also removed the critical link between onsite programme changes due to interfaces with neighbouring buildings, Hiscox etc, and any potential repercussions these delays could cause the UKPN to have teams available when not planned.

Please note that UKPN still offered when required to attend site before works commence and weekly for a project briefing at no charge to Multiplex.

17. What specific actions did you expect UKPN to take to ensure this commitment was delivered?

As with all major projects in London at the early stages change is a regular occurrence.

Therefore a single cost return is not always favourable to the client as elements may be able to be value engineered or modified to lessen costs, especially with utilities.

At 22 /BG, UKPN had offered us as the client, a sectional release design and cost that has allowed on site works to commence and this had released elements of utility works earlier. As mentioned in question 16, had the utility diversions related to Crosby Square been confirmed and agreed initially the costs would be in excess of those now accepted and the time to return the costs would have impacted the project programme.

18. If applicable, do you consider that UKPN provided reasonable and justified reasons why the commitment was not delivered?

In relation to 22BG UKPN have delivered all their commitments to Multiplex. Therefore the question cannot be answered.

19. Do you consider that market segments mentioned above were the relevant ones affected? Were other market segments also affected?

In relation to 22BG UKPN have delivered all their commitments to Multiplex. Therefore the question cannot be answered.

As a closing statement I personally have dealt with UKPN for over 11 years successfully. Their key contacts such as Ian Arnold and his fellow Project Managers and their teams have been nothing other than helpful an understanding to us as their clients needs. I have not experienced any events whereby my projects have been impacted on as a direct failure by the DNO.

To the contrary of impact to cost and programme to us as clients it is worth noting that on my last 3 projects:

1. Park House ,Oxford Street, major development for Land Securities)
2. 5 Broadgate, Broadgate London, UBS head office for Britishland
3. Twentytwo (22BG), Bishopsgate, London, major development for LRD.

All works were within budget cost planning allowance for the DNO and all successfully energised ahead of programme. No small feat when considering all projects were in excess of £180 million.