

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.
- 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. 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, please use a separate template for each group.	Northern Powergrid Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Plc Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) 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)?	Type of connection (Sept 19 – Aug 20) Metered Demand Connections Metered Distributed Generation (DG) Unmetered Connections	Total number of connections Low Voltage (LV) Work High Voltage (HV) Work HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work EHV work and above LV work HV and EHV work Local Authority (LA) work Private finance	Total MVA of connections 0 0 0 7 183 (as part of DG) 0 8 (3 cancelled before offer) 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 250 0 0

		initiatives (PFI) Work		
		Other work	1 (Gen+)	20

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: a) What did the DNO do? b) How did the DNO do it? c) Did the DNO have a robust engagement strategy?	I have not been informed of any events this year, but our transition to NPG only begun in January. Last year I attended a good event in York. The emphasis was more on presentations and the formality of the layout made asking question a little daunting. However informal conversations with staff in the sessions afterwards were good.							
The DNO's work plan								
4. <i>Objectives:</i> Have you seen the DNOs work plans and the objectives they outline? a) Does it take into consideration your needs? If so, how? b) If it doesn't please explain why.	Link on website is broken so I cannot access this in time for consultation deadline.							
5. <i>Actions:</i> Do you think the DNO has delivered its work plan? a) How has the DNO done this? b) If you do not think the DNO has delivered its work plan, please explain why.	Link on website is broken so I cannot access this in time for consultation deadline.							

<p>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.</p>	<p>Link on website is broken so I cannot access this in time for consultation deadline.</p>			
<p>Your feedback on the DNOs stakeholder engagement performance</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<p>Link on website is broken so I cannot access this in time for consultation deadline.</p>			
<p>8. How satisfied are you with the DNO's overall engagement performance? Please tick one box.</p>	<p>very unsatisfied</p>	<p>not satisfied</p>	<p>satisfied</p>	<p>very satisfied</p>
			<p>x</p>	
<p>9. General feedback – please provide any further feedback on the DNO's 2019/20 engagement performance not covered in your responses above.</p>	<p>NPG was probably the last DNO to be hit by the DG boom, as such its systems and networks appear to be playing catch-up in providing the most economic and efficient service. However things are improving.</p> <p>Pre-application engagement is good, with good info found at surgeries and e-mail consultation. In recent months feedback has been slow and I know the Commercial Engineers are pushing for a company wide two week turnaround. Sometimes this is frustrating and is causing us to lose sites to competition/interactivity. I think this is endemic in the industry at present as demand from developers has risen (a second DG boom, many more entering/re-entering the market) over the last year, but staffing levels in DNOs have not kept up.</p> <p>Heat maps, particularly the downloadable spreadsheet, are excellent.</p> <p>NPG's connection solutions, contestable works and connection applications remain some of the most expensive, particularly due to extensive fibre comms requirements and a refusal to consider radio in some areas and perhaps outdated internal mapping.</p> <p>That said, there is always excellent engagement after application with a "heads up" during the cooling off of the predicted outcome, allowing us to cancel applications without incurring fees. If cancelled later the fees are pro-rated. NPG are also flexible on letting vary reduce capacity after assessment to avoid reinforcement.</p>			

	<p>The functional specifications and detailed POC info and budget estimates during the offer process remain an industry leading practice that can inform contestable design.</p> <p>I think disappointments in NPG are more stark due to the high cost of applications.</p>
--	---

Section 2: Looking Forward plans 2020/21	
We want your views on what the DNO aims to achieve in the coming year	
10. Are you satisfied that the DNO has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders and facilitating joint discussions where appropriate?	Yes, feedback is always welcomed.
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>I have not seen them as there are few improvements to make, however some improvements are here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quicker turnaround/more formalised surgery process. - Reduce costs. - Improve asset mapping and bureaucratic systems to reduce application costs. - Remove charges for budget estimates. - Create a web-based network GIS. - Contact guides based on area to avoid us hitting the same people (and perhaps wrong) people with queries all the time. - Reduce EHV acceptance payment which is always halved on request. DNOs must be cost reflective. Responsible developers should not be punished for actions of capacity bankers who previously accepted on lower fees (so is the rationale). - Stability studies should be undertaken as part of offer. - Make full works quotes more competitive, standards dictating copper cable and complex loop substations increase cost. - Drop policy insisting on cable being laid in public highway. This contradicts the other policy to develop an efficient and economic system. Justification for insisting on this is poor when easements can be obtained.

12. Do you consider that the DNO has set relevant outputs that it will deliver during the regulatory year (eg key performance indicators, targets, etc.)?	Have not seen document.
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?	Have not seen document.