Annex 6 - Response Template

Name	Simon Deacon
Title	Contestable Grid Specialist
Organisation	Renewable Energy Systems (RES)

Question	**Response**
Q1: Do you have any comments on the scope and purpose of this consultation?	RES fully supports the purpose of this consultation and agrees that data on the performance of the DNOs should be readily available to customers and stakeholders. Publishing relevant data will help customers become more aware of the value and performance they get from their DNO; this awareness can only help generate greater support and innovation amongst the stakeholder community. RES also agrees that the collection and collation of data should not be significant burden and supports the principle that the data should come from that already gathered via the RIGs if it's available.
Q2: What do you think about the information we suggest including in an infographic-style report included in Table 1?	Table 1 represents a good overview of DNO performance under the RIIO-ED1 regime. This table would probably provide greatest impact, if published as a comparison across the DNOs. As table 1 is most likely to be viewed on line, some form of 'drill down' would be useful. For example if a DNO is classed as 'red' in a certain category, clicking on the symbol would allow further exploration of the data at mid-level demonstrating why the measure is classed 'red'.
Q3: Are there any other metrics you would wish to see included in an infographic-style report and why? You will find more information on data collected in the RIGs on our website.	We believe tables 1 and 2 have good coverage of the high and mid-level measures of performance under RIIO ED1. Table 1 is most useful and powerful as a comparator, as long as the detail below is subsequently available.
Q4: Do you have any comments on the sample infographic-style report included in Annex 1 and the suggested content for an infographic-style	Annex 1 is very similar to table 1, but better suited to an individual DNO report.

report included in Annex 2?	A stakeholder finding Annex 1 on a DNO website would probably want to be able to compare that DNOs performance against others and a link to a table 1 style comparator would allow this. The table in Annex 3 demonstrates the important structure of the data. It is important that users of the data can understand the relationship and context of the data they are viewing.
Q5: Should an infographic provide information at DNO or DNO group level?	Both should be provided. Information at DNO group level provides insight into the effectiveness and efficiency of the DNO management processes whilst at DNO licensee level, some insight into the geographical and historical challenges is given. The prime information should be at the DNO licensee area level.
Q6: Are there any metrics included in Table 2 which you do not think are relevant or important? Why?	Table 2 potentially gives too much weight to the financial element of DNO performance. Arguably at this level, stakeholders simply want to be informed whether their DNO is efficient, the overall impact on their bill and that spending is under control. Measures such as RAV and RORE are relevant to only certain stakeholders who want more detail and are prepared to research and analyse more detailed sets of data. The innovation element seems also to be measured in financial terms. We would prefer to see a mix of volumetric and financial measures for example in terms of innovation projects, innovative solutions rolled out and used instead of traditional reinforcement and number of other DNO innovations used. We would also like to see links to supporting qualitative descriptions of innovation.
Q7: Are there any other metrics not included in Table 2 which you would also like to see reported in a mid-level report? Why? You can find more information on data collected in the RIGs on our website.	The information contained in Table 2 gives a good summary of more detailed (compared to Table 1) performance under RIIO-ED1. However it is important that all the further detail collected by the RIGs is also available, so that individual stakeholders can research the data they are interested in. RES would like to see CML, CI, Health Index, Load Index and Criticality Index for key plant items, made available down to primary substation level.

Q8: Would you like information and/or data published to reflect in-year performance or are you also interested in performance up to date and/or forecast or cumulative data? If so, why?	Final audited, detailed data, as gathered in the RIGS is ideal for annual publishing. Availability of previous years' data should also be standard. For the high and mid-level information much of this data information could be provided monthly, with previous month (or best available) and year to date information being offered.
Q9: Do you have any comments on the templates provided by stakeholders in annexes 2 and 3?	The annex 2 example covers the principles well, particularly at levels 1 and 2. At level 3 as mentioned previously, simply publishing the RIGs data would be RES' preference. Annex 3 similarly covers a good range of measures, mainly at level 1 and 2. Annex 3 is good example of how a DNO might present information on its own site. This information might then feed more comparative information on the Ofgem site.
Q10: Would you be interested in the bill impact of each individual incentive or is overall bill impact a more useful measure?	Overall we believe bill impact is a better measure and for the majority of customers has higher overall impact. However stakeholders with increased interest should be able to investigate the supporting data, so the information should be available at greater levels of detail.
Q11: What additional data or information submitted in the RIGs would you like to see made publically available and why? You will find more information on data collected in the RIGs on our website.	RES would like to see the majority of data collected by the RIGs publically available, as a far commercial confidentiality allows. We would be keen to see measures that relate to the amount of constrained generation on the DNO networks. The measures ideally should include the amount (MW) of constrained generation, the number and duration of occasions the constraint has been enforced and the resulting generation energy lost (MWh). We are generally interested in the health, reliability and capacity of the networks and note that a lot of data is collected in the RIGs (such as HI, LI, CI and CML metrics). Publishing of this data would help our decision making. Alternatively putting some of this data into the Long Term Development

	Statements would be similarly helpful. As regular users of connection services we are keen to see data published on this element. We note that the RIGs do not collect data on requotes or time to requote – we would like to see this information.
Q12: Do you have any preferences on the way data and information is presented?	Infographics are powerful at the highest level and help stakeholders quickly understand performance. Supporting numerical data should be provided in excel format. Performance and trends over time are also useful. A structured approach to the information is important. Highest level: Summary (Table 1) Mid-level: More detail in each area (Table 2), but being able to examine each aspect in detail Detail level: Underpinning data from the RIGs Drill down and linkages between the information and data levels would be useful.
Q13: What data should the DNOs publish?	RES believes that the DNOs should publish all the detailed data produced as part of the RIGs requirements, notwithstanding any commercially sensitive information. DNOs should also publish summary data of their performance in a format similar to Table 2. The data should be consistent across DNOs (therefore specified by Ofgem)
Q14: What are your views on what data Ofgem should publish?	RES agrees with the wider view that Ofgem should publish information and data that is comparative in nature. Ofgem should publish comparative data for each of the primary outputs and the main metrics for example CML/ CI, BMCS.
Q15: Based on the examples in annexes 1 and 4, and in tables 1 and 2 above, what do you think about using ranking and/or traffic lights? What are the	Ranking is a very powerful message to customers and stakeholders about the performance of particular DNOs. To stakeholders it provides immediate

advantages and disadvantages? Are there any alternative systems?	industry context. Ranking can drive performance, but can also stifle collaboration. Considering the example of CML/CI, a rank order can be generated against normalised data and it will give stakeholders immediate feedback on the relative reliability of each network, however there will be potentially be underlying, historic reasons for the performance; indeed the network at the bottom of the league table may still be performing above its regulatory target and vice versa. However a customer checking this information will discover whether they are connected to the best/worst/average performing network and this will be true. Traffic lighting demonstrates compliance to minimum standards and performance against predefined targets, but on its own doesn't necessarily provide the same immediate feedback with context. Customers and stakeholders may not as easily identify with the standard or target. It should be clear in any form of reporting if a DNO has fallen below definite minimum safety and environmental standards.
Q16: Are there any particular aspects of DNO performance that you are interested in and think are well-suited to ranking and/or traffic lights?	Measures relating to constrained generation, including the amount (MW) of constrained generation, the number of occasions the constraint has been enforced and the resulting generation energy lost (MWh), should lend itself to ranking and or traffic lighting. Also, as RES is predominantly seeking connections services ranking and or traffic lighting of these services would of interest.
Q17: What information or data would you like us to publish on our website?	Ofgem should have an easily identifiable area on its website for reporting performance.
Q18: Keeping in mind the reporting requirements and timings set out in Annex 5, is there any specific data or information which you would like to see reported on more than an annual basis? If so, why?	Some of the high level measures CML, CI, BMCS, and Connection times for example are likely to be measured and monitored monthly by the DNOs themselves, for governance purposes. Could this be published monthly? This would provide stakeholders with an immediate 'dip check' of performance rather than referring to the last audited data. Further, DNOs offer a variety of 'heat map' type services; could more data

	be presented in this style? For example a developer looking for a new load or generation connection might check the 'heat map' and immediately get summary information for a primary substation that shows available capacity, the current network performance at the substation (CML/CI), the heath and load indices for key items (transformers and switchgear) and even perhaps the likely turnaround for quote/connection at the site.