

## Scottish Power Energy Networks – Looking Back to 2019-20

About you and your work																											
1. What is the name of your company?	BUUK Infrastructure																										
2. Is your response confidential? Please explain which parts and why.  For a fair process, we prefer the DNOs to be able to respond to any comments made, particularly if they are negative. So please consider carefully before marking any part of your response confidential.'	This response is not confidential. We have not completed section 4 as this part is commercially sensitive. We feel that this has no bearing on our comments and as this is commercially sensitive, we do not feel it is appropriate to share this data widely.																										
3. Which DNO's ICE submission is your response related to?  If you wish to provide a response to the ICE submission of more than one DNO group, please use a separate template for each group.	Scottish Power Energy Networks																										
4. What type of connection do you generally require?  For each type of connection, how many connection applications, including total MVA (Mega Volt Ampere) of connections have you made in the past year?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of connection</th> <th>Total number of connections</th> <th>Total MVA of connections</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="4"><b>Metered Demand Connections</b></td> <td>Low Voltage (LV) Work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Voltage (HV) Work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>EHV work and above</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"><b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b></td> <td>LV work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and EHV work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3"><b>Unmetered Connections</b></td> <td>Local Authority (LA) work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other work</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Type of connection	Total number of connections	Total MVA of connections	<b>Metered Demand Connections</b>	Low Voltage (LV) Work		High Voltage (HV) Work		HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work		EHV work and above		<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work		HV and EHV work		<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work		Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work		Other work	
Type of connection	Total number of connections	Total MVA of connections																									
<b>Metered Demand Connections</b>	Low Voltage (LV) Work																										
	High Voltage (HV) Work																										
	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work																										
	EHV work and above																										
<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work																										
	HV and EHV work																										
<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work																										
	Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work																										
	Other work																										

Section 1: Looking Back report 2019/20								
We want your views on how well the DNOs have engaged with connections stakeholders over the last regulatory year								
5. How many of the DNO's stakeholder engagement events have you been invited to this year? (This can include engagement outside official events.) Please tick a box.	none	1	2	3	4	5	6	>6
								x
6. How many DNO Stakeholder events have you been to? This can also include meetings outside of official engagement events. Please tick a box.	none	1	2	3	4	5	6	>6
								x
7. Tell us about how the DNO engaged with you: g) What did the DNO do? h) How did the DNO do it? i) Did the DNO have a robust engagement strategy?	<p>Engagement with SPN is primarily via stakeholder workshop events where various people from our IDNO and ICP business are invited. We also have bilateral meetings with their operational teams to discuss connection issues. The structure of their engagement with us seems robust and we have found that this has also significantly improved over the last couple of years</p> <p>Without doubt SPEN have put more focus into this area and we are pleased with the efforts so far. It is good to see engagement at the highest level which has been missing in the past and we are seeing significant benefits in this added level of communication and engagement.</p>							
The DNO's work plan								
8. <i>Objectives:</i> Have you seen the DNOs work plans and the objectives they outline? e) Does it take into consideration your needs? If so, how? f) If it doesn't please explain why.	Yes, objectives and workplans are discussed at the events we attend. Workplans are also available on-line and we have added comment to these and have seen results in these areas. With regards to the content of the work plans and objectives, much of the detail is high level so not everything is relevant to us							
9. <i>Actions:</i> Do you think the DNO has delivered its work plan? e) How has the DNO done this?	Much like the other DNOs, these are not always stretched targets and are focussed on the engagement rather than actual deliverables. We are pleased to see that some of the areas we have spoken to SPEN about are being targeted and that they have accepted that some of the work they undertake							

f) If you do not think the DNO has delivered its work plan, please explain why.	<p>could be improved. We continue to work with SPEN on several areas and are pleased with their recent efforts.</p> <p>We still feel that despite many years of feedback the RADAR system is still an Achilles heel of their overall process and will keep asking them to look to improve this system.</p> <p>There is also additional significant work SPEN are carrying out with us that does not appear to be recorded in ICE. It is therefore disappointing to us that ICE is not being used effectively to reflect what SPEN are doing. Their RADAR system developments should be reflected in their ICE commitments as this needs to continue to be monitored until such time that customers are satisfied with the development.</p>			
10. Outputs: Were the outputs (KPIs, targets etc) in the DNO's work plan appropriate? Did the DNO meet these outputs? Please explain why.	Yes, whilst the outputs were not always as challenging as we would have liked, SPEN have delivered and are looking at further improvements over and above their targets.			
Your feedback on the DNOs stakeholder engagement performance				
11. Do you think the DNO's strategy, activities and outputs have taken into account ongoing feedback from a broad and inclusive range of connections stakeholders?	Yes. Various companies are invited, and we also attend their expert user panel. We are invited to submit comments and we have seen some significant improvement over the last year or so. SPEN have always been one of the poor performers with Competition in Connection but we are pleased to see that with significant Director engagement, they have improved significantly. This is most welcome, and we are pleased to spend time with the SPEN team to help to improve their processes. We are also seeing more buy in from other levels of the business involved in delivering improvements, which is encouraging.			
12. How satisfied are you with the DNO's overall engagement performance?	very unsatisfied	not satisfied	satisfied	very satisfied
			x	

13. General feedback – please provide any further feedback on the DNO's 2019/20 engagement performance not covered in your responses above.	<p>Some specific comments have been provided by colleagues within our IDNO and ICP businesses:</p> <p>Response times for looking at suggested improvements have previously been poor. We are starting to see some benefits, following discussions we have had with SPEN, around how they are handling some applications from us to amend existing agreements (for example through demand load increases or the addition of generation load to existing networks).</p> <p>Whilst we still need to use RADAR, which causes delays to the connection process, we still do not have full control of our connections. This is an issue that we hope will be addressed.</p> <p>SPEN have improved the legal process for securing land rights and we are pleased to say that they have listened and acted on several points in this area. Where this has been a major concern in the past, we are seeing significant improvements in timescales through the work they have done.</p> <p>We also now have a focused point of escalation for Scotland and Manweb which has proved useful and is good progress.</p> <p>The ICE plan layout is not particularly clear and SPEN should consider representing the data in a tabular format in a similar way to SSSEN. This would be an encouraging step for all DNOs to make reviewing the documents easier.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

**Scottish Power Energy Networks – Forward Looking to 2020-21**

**Section 2: Looking Forward plans 2020/21**

**We want your views on what the DNO aims to achieve in the coming year**

1. Are you satisfied that the DNO has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders and facilitating joint discussions where appropriate?	We appreciate that Scottish Power Energy Networks have set out the IDNO interface prominently in their work plan and have set out a specific action (number 3) to improve their interaction and engagement with us. SPEN have made considerable improvements to their engagement with us in the last year and we hope that this approach continues in 2020/21.
2. Do you agree that the DNO has a comprehensive work plan of activities (with associated delivery dates) that will meet the requirements of its connection stakeholders? If not, has the DNO provided reasonable and well-justified reasons? What other activities should the DNO do?	Yes, these seem a reasonable set of activities and clearly set out where IDNO will be affected. SPEN have significantly upped their game over the last eighteen months and we are working closely with them to identify issues and benchmarking their offerings compared to others.
3. Do you consider that the DNO has set relevant outputs that it will deliver during the regulatory year (e.g. key performance indicators, targets, etc.)?	Many of the outputs seem a little vague or involve the publication of generic documentation. This is not a specific issue to this DNO and is a criticism that we would level against the ICE plans of them all.  If improvements are identified through the ICE period, there isn't a mechanism for the DNO to amend their ICE plan. Equally, if tasks are identified that can't be completed in a 12-month ICE period then these are not recorded as the DNO knows they can't achieve them in a 12-month timescale but knows this will happen over 24 months. As this is a benefit for the customer this should be being recorded and the ICE process should accommodate this.
4. Would you agree that the DNO's proposed strategy, activities and outputs have been informed and endorsed by a broad and inclusive range of connection stakeholders?	We have been engaged with the development of their ICE strategy via their engagement days, but we have experienced that there was not a great deal of other customers present at these.

If not, has the DNO provided robust evidence that it has pursued this engagement?

Maybe a different form of engagement, co-ordinated across all DNO, with fewer meetings with multiple DNO at the same location at the same time would be a better approach to engaging customers.

It would also be useful for the DNO to meet bilaterally with more customers as we find this particularly useful. Perhaps offering to meet at their customers premises rather than asking for customers to come to them would encourage this.