

## Response template – Incentive on Connections Engagement

- 1.1. We would like to hear the views of interested parties in relation to any of the issues set out in our open consultation letter.
- 1.2. The questions we have asked are directly linked to the minimum criteria set out in the ICE guidance document. You can find this on our website [here](#).
- 1.3. If you have any questions on this document, please contact [connections@Ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:connections@Ofgem.gov.uk).
- 1.4. **Responses should be sent by e-mail by 28 August 2020 to the address above.**
- 1.5. Unless marked confidential, all responses will be published by placing them in Ofgem's library and on our website [www.ofgem.gov.uk](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk). Respondents may request that their response is kept confidential. Ofgem shall respect this request, subject to any obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.
- 1.6. Respondents who wish to have their responses kept confidential should clearly mark the document/s to that effect and include clear reasons for confidentiality. We ask you to consider this carefully as sharing the comments with the relevant DNO may help improve their performance and ensure a transparent and effective ICE process. Respondents are asked to put any confidential material in the appendices to their responses.
- 1.7. We will consider the responses to this consultation and these will be used alongside other evidence for our assessment of the ICE plans.
- 1.8. Each of the questions asked by this consultation is set out in the template below.
- 1.9. **Please ensure that you indicate the DNO or specific licence area** to which your experiences relate. Each DNO is group and individual DNO is listed on our [here](#). Please note that Northern Ireland is not subject to this consultation.

1.10. When considering your responses to these questions, please consider your experiences, the actions that the DNO has undertaken or committed to undertake, and the actions that you consider it could reasonably undertake.

1.11. **Please make sure you highlight which year a specific event happened in. The regulatory year runs from 1 April to 31 March.**

## Annex: response template

About you and your work				
What is the name of your company?	Renewable Connections Developments Limited			
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. Please consider carefully before marking any part of your response confidential.	No, it is not confidential.			
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, <b>please use a separate template for each group.</b>	SP Energy Networks SP Manweb Plc SP Distribution Plc  Please note that this is for the period September 2019 to August 2020 only when I have been working for the above company.			
What type of connection do you generally require?  For each type of connection, how many applications have you made in the past year, and what is the total MVA (Mega Volt Ampere)?	<b>Type of connection (Sept 19 – Aug 20)</b>		<b>Total number of connections</b>	<b>Total MVA of connections</b>
	<b>Metered Demand Connections</b>	Low Voltage (LV) Work	0	0
		High Voltage (HV) Work	0	0
		HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work	0	0
		EHV work and above	0	0
	<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work	0	0
		HV and EHV work	2	45
	<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work	0	0
Private finance		0	0	

		initiatives (PFI) Work		
		Other work	<b>4 (Quote+)</b>	<b>80</b>

### 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

1. 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						
2. 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							
3. Tell us about how the DNO engaged with you: <b>a)</b> What did the DNO do? <b>b)</b> How did the DNO do it? <b>c)</b> Did the DNO have a robust engagement strategy?	<p>SPEN have a couple of events a year, unfortunately the one I was due to attend was cancelled due to Covid and I haven't seen any online replacements.</p> <p>From experience, it would be good if they focussed more on stakeholder discussion than on presentations as the last one I attended missed out the part I wanted to discuss due to time.</p> <p>Following in ENW's lead and having a southern event might be helpful for London based developers, or starting the event in Chester later than 9am!</p>							

#### The DNO's work plan

4. <i>Objectives:</i> Have you seen the DNOs work plans and the objectives they outline? <b>a)</b> Does it take into consideration your needs? If so, how? <b>b)</b> If it doesn't please explain why.	Not for the previous year.
5. <i>Actions:</i> Do you think the DNO has delivered its work plan? <b>a)</b> How has the DNO done this? <b>b)</b> If you do not think the DNO has delivered its	Not enough exposure to comment.

work plan, please explain why.				
6. <i>Outputs:</i> Were the outputs (KPIs, targets etc) in the DNO's work plan appropriate? Did the DNO meet these outputs? Please explain why.				
<b>Your feedback on the DNOs stakeholder engagement performance</b>				
7. 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, wide-ranging.			
8. How satisfied are you with the DNO's overall engagement performance? Please tick one box.	very unsatisfied	not satisfied	satisfied	very satisfied
			x	
9. General feedback – please provide any further feedback on the DNO's 2019/20 engagement performance not covered in your responses above.	<p>Instead of constantly focussing on "new" targets each year, DNOs need to be more incentivised to improve on what they are already doing as there becomes a limit to the amount of new things required.</p> <p>Pre-app support is good, with surgeries readily available particularly in Scotland. Feedback is a bit more challenging in Manweb due to the complex nature of the mesh networks, however we have secured a couple of successes here with support from the planners despite the constraints.</p> <p>Post acceptance communication has been slow on one of our projects, we still have outstanding post-acceptance questions a few months later from a project that is ready to go into planning.</p> <p>Invoicing has also raised some mistakes so we are awaiting a couple of refunds.</p> <p>The RaDaR system is archaic and difficult to use, the customer is doing SPEN's work and it ought to be abolished in favour of e-mail applications like with S16. The ICP design submission milestone is unfeasible and unrealistic and involves committing spend before planning.</p>			

## Section 2: Looking Forward plans 2020/21

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

<p>10. Are you satisfied that the DNO has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders and facilitating joint discussions where appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, however they don't seem to have been pursued during the pandemic.</p>
<p>11. 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?</p>	<p>Yes, on the whole, however not many DG specific actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am pleased to see improved Quote+ pre-app support as this is important with up front CoE</li> </ul> <p>Suggested improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update the heat map, the RAG status is unhelpful, we need more granular information from the LTDS.</li> <li>- Publish spreadsheet downloads and network kmzs</li> <li>- The above was mentioned in a heat map survey as it was missed off the engagement session in 2018/19 due to time but is perhaps one of the most important things for DG.</li> <li>- Publish Appendix G data</li> <li>- Improve the Quote+ to provide network analysis, like ENW's Gen+.</li> </ul> <p>At present we use it as an "in" to speak to the engineer and obtain a queue position whilst we run our early stage feasibility. With the level of constraint in the Manweb network it is very important to have a clear idea of what could be connected as SPEN's CoE fees are some of the largest in the industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are the CoE cost reflective? A round number seems odd to arrive at.</li> <li>- Allow pre-emptive investment in Manweb to lift constraint as it is a barrier to DG development.</li> <li>- Provide a clear guide as to the SoW and BEGA/BELLA process in Scotland as this is confusing to new market entrants.</li> <li>- Abolish RaDaR for externals.</li> <li>- Abolish the 4 month milestone from OFFER for ICP design submission, this is unfeasible and unrealistic and involves committing spend before planning permission.</li> </ul>
<p>12. Do you consider that the DNO has set relevant outputs that it will deliver during</p>	<p>More limited than most DNOs but it seems to be.</p>

the regulatory year (eg key performance indicators, targets, etc.)?	
13. 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? If not, has the DNO provided robust evidence that it has pursued this engagement?	Yes