

Internal Only

Further to your consultation letter of 21 August 2017, please see below my answers to your queries regarding ENW:

Q1: Do you consider that ENWL's target to achieve an average time to connect of 23 working days, or its targets for scores of 85% in customer satisfaction surveys, were ambitious?

A1: As Roadnight Taylor works predominantly in DG, and not at all in the unmetered segment, we are unable to comment in relation to this question.

Q2: How does ENWL's performance on time to connect and customer satisfaction compare with that of other DNOs you work with?

A2: As Roadnight Taylor works predominantly in DG, and not at all in the unmetered segment, we are unable to comment in relation to this question.

Q3: Do you consider that market segments mentioned above were the relevant ones affected? Were other market segments also affected?

A3: We cannot see how "Metered DG – HV and EHV work" could have been affected given that 23 days for a connection would be clearly over ambitious at these voltages

Q4: Do you consider that this issue applies to any other market segments, and in particular, either of the two market segments ENWL is eligible for penalties in ("Metered DG – LV work" and "Unmetered Connections – Other work")?

A4: No

Q5: In your experience, do you consider that ENWL has taken into account ongoing feedback from a broad and inclusive range of connection stakeholders in developing its strategy, activities and outputs?

A5: Further to your letter we have reviewed our response to your original consultation, we have re-read ENW's looking forward plan, and we have consulted with ENW. We are now more than satisfied that ENW had a comprehensive strategy for engagement. Further, we are very happy with their looking forward strategy. We now also understand how ENW's workplan actions and outputs have been informed by stakeholder feedback to date, reflect the size of their license area (relative to WPD for example) and also reflect the amount of DG embedded within their network (and in turn this reflects the relative level of constraints on the network and requirements for flexible connections). It stands to reason that the volume of DG connections feedback/actions correlates to the volume of DG connections activity. As a case in point, UKPN and WPD have had DG owner-operator panels for some time, and these panels have generated a number of actions which are contained within their respective work plans – whereas ENW's stakeholders have only recently requested there be a ENW owner-operator panel and as such the panel has not met to suggestion work plan actions (the ENW work plan is "lighter" as a result, but this is no fault of ENW).

Q6: Do you consider that ENWL should have included a commitment to provide a single point of contact for connection customers, or otherwise provide justification for not doing so?

A6: At Roadnight Taylor we deal with all the DNOs on a regular basis and do not have a single point of contact with any. I do not believe the practice of appointing a single point of contact would be considered, by nationally-active stakeholders, to be best practice. Indeed, I would rather DNO resources were directed elsewhere and that DNOs engender a culture that engagement is part of everyone's role within their organisations. I would note that WPD do offer a senior management point of contact to their large customers (this is very different from a single point of contact), and this is something that I will be happy to discuss with ENW at upcoming engagement events.

I would be very happy to discuss any of these points with you.

Internal Only

Internal Only

Internal Only