

## UK Power 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.	UK Power 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								
<i>We want your views on how well the DNOs have engaged with connections stakeholders over the last regulatory year</i>								
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: m) What did the DNO do? n) How did the DNO do it? o) Did the DNO have a robust engagement strategy?	<p>Engagement with UKPN 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 and design issues. The structure of their engagement with us seems robust and has a strategy. The most important point is that UKPN want to improve the offering that ICPs and IDNOs provide, as they see this as a long-term benefit for the industry. We do not believe that other DNOs have embraced this engagement in quite the same way. Engagement was conducted through direct contact via events team advising of dates and event topics; and emails between CIC managers and engineers.</p>							
The DNO's work plan								
8. <i>Objectives:</i> Have you seen the DNOs work plans and the objectives they outline? i) Does it take into consideration your needs? If so, how? j) If it doesn't please explain why.	<p>UKPN appear to have the largest plan. Whilst there is a lot of detail and some of the targets are not stretch targets, we have seen significant improvements in their offering over the years. Overall UKPN are best in class and are working on new areas that other DNOs have not considered yet.</p>							
9. <i>Actions:</i> Do you think the DNO has delivered its work plan?	<p>UKPN continue to deliver on their plan and achieve this with frequent customer engagement. In their sessions, they focus on customer</p>							

i) How has the DNO done this? j) If you do not think the DNO has delivered its work plan, please explain why.	requirements, then they work on these comments, and afterwards confirm to us what they have done. This, results driven approach, is an effective way of working and is useful for us to see.			
10. <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.	Yes, they obtain a lot of the work from the expert user groups and their stakeholder engagement sessions.			
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. We have been provided with access to systems which allow us to work with more autonomy and efficiency. These have been significant, and the only area left to improve is the mapping system.			
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.	Some specific comments have been provided by colleagues within our IDNO and ICP businesses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have an excellent dialogue between our design department and the CiC team. They are always willing to discuss projects and review suggestions for alternative arrangements.</li> </ul> Our Land Rights team have provided the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feedback is generally good; we do have some issues outstanding and these have been escalated for resolution.</li> <li>For works being completed on behalf of the DNO, such as substation relocation, UKPN are often willing to provide general updates only. This makes it difficult to provide an accurate programme to our client</li> </ul>			
	and we will be taking this up with UKPN during the coming stakeholder events.			

## UK Power 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?	UKPN have set out clear deliverables for IDNO in their ICE workplan for 2020/21. We appreciate the visibility that this provides and sets out our expectations for the improvements in the engagement we can expect to see in the forthcoming year.
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?	Yet again, these are a thorough and comprehensive set of activities. UKPN are quite a way ahead of their fellow DNOs. The level of detail against each initiative is excellent along with a very simple to read work plan. The work plan is set out in a table which provides clarity on who will benefit along with a clear timescale for delivery.
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.)?	Our overriding observation is that this is the most comprehensive ICE plan across all the DNOs. This is inclusive of the initiatives and the document has the best layout.  If improvements are identified through the ICE period, there is not a mechanism for the DNO to amend their ICE plan. Equally, if tasks are identified that cannot be completed in a 12month ICE period then these are not recorded as the DNO knows they are unable to achieve them in a 12-month timescale but knows this will happen over 24 months. As this is beneficial to the customer, it 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 UKPN's engagement days, but 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 the DNOs, with fewer meetings with multiple DNOs 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 with more customers bilaterally as we find this particularly useful.