

Annex 1 – Open letter consultation on the Incentive of 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. We would especially welcome responses to the specific questions in our consultation, which are replicated below.
- 1.3. If you have any questions on this document please contact:

James Veaney
Head of Connections and Constraint Management
Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, SW1P 3GE
020 7901 1861
Connections@Ofgem.gov.uk
- 1.4. **Responses should be sent, preferably by e-mail by 27 July 2017 to the address above.**
- 1.5. Unless marked confidential, all responses will be published by placing them in Ofgem's library and on its 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 the reasons for confidentiality. Respondents are asked to put any confidential material in the appendices to their responses.
- 1.7. Next steps: 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 group or specific licence area** to which your experiences relate.
- 1.10. Please ensure that you indicate clearly the type of connection you generally require.
- 1.11. 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.

Response template – Incentive on Connections Engagement June 2017

Question	Response																								
About you and your work																									
1. What is the name of your company?	TriConnex																								
2. Which DNO's ICE submission is your response related to (see Annex 2 for DNO map)? Please indicate clearly in your response to the questions below whether your comments refer to the DNO's plans as a whole, or to one of the DNO's licence areas. If you wish to provide a response to the ICE submission of more than one DNO, please use a separate template for each DNO.	SSE																								
3. What type of connection do you generally require? And for each type of connection, how many connection applications, including total MVA (Mega Volt Ampere) of connections have you made in the past year? Please note that we will assess storage within the relevant metered generation market segment.	<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">Metered Demand Connections</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">Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</td><td>LV work</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>HV and EHV work</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Unmetered Connections</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	Metered Demand Connections	Low Voltage (LV) Work		High Voltage (HV) Work		HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work		EHV work and above		Metered Distributed Generation (DG)	LV work		HV and EHV work		Unmetered Connections	Local Authority (LA) work		Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work		Other work	
Type of connection	Total number of connections	Total MVA of connections																							
Metered Demand Connections	Low Voltage (LV) Work																								
	High Voltage (HV) Work																								
	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work																								
	EHV work and above																								
Metered Distributed Generation (DG)	LV work																								
	HV and EHV work																								
Unmetered Connections	Local Authority (LA) work																								
	Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work																								
	Other work																								

Consultation questions	
Section 1: Looking Back report 2016-17	
We want your views on how well the DNOs have performed over the last year	
1. Are you satisfied that the DNO had a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connections stakeholders? Do you consider that the DNO implemented its strategy? If not, are you satisfied that the DNO has provided a reasonable and well-justified explanation?	Several 'workshops' are in place, however at the these workshops frustrations and issues regarding poor performance are unwilling to be listened to by many at SSE. There are individuals who want to help and improve, but at the moment they are overpowered by those who think ICP's should 'factor in' SSE slow turnaround times and poor service.
2. Are you satisfied that the DNO had a comprehensive work plan of activities (with associated delivery dates) to meet the requirements of its connections stakeholders? Do you consider that the DNO delivered its work plan? If not, are you satisfied that the DNO has provided a reasonable and well-justified explanation?	Scheduled in workshops / connection events were carried out as planned. Wide range of topics covered, but content was not always detailed enough.
3. Do you consider that the DNO's work plan provided relevant outputs (eg key performance indicators, targets etc.)? Are you satisfied that the DNO has delivered these outputs? If not, do you view the reasons provided to be reasonable and well justified?	No Legal KPI's provided – mention of one around Wayleave Surveyors contacting Customer with status update, but this only happens when driven by ICP, and rarely at first request.
4. Do you agree that the DNO's strategy, activities and outputs have taken into account ongoing feedback from a broad and inclusive range of connections stakeholders? If not, has the DNO provided reasonable justification?	With regards to legals process, no. This has been a problem for the last 3 years, and no significant improvement seen.
The following two questions refer to the specific areas we discuss in our letter – meeting the needs of all types of connections customers, and connecting when the networks are constrained.	
5. Do you consider that the DNO's activities and outputs over the past year were	

adequate in meeting the needs of all types of connection customers, including the particular needs of newer types of connection customers?	
6. Do you consider that the DNO's activities and outputs over the past year were adequate in meeting the needs of customers looking to connect when the networks are constrained?	
<p align="center">Section 2: Looking Forward plans 2017-18</p>	
<p>We want your views on what the DNOs aim to achieve in the coming year</p>	
7. Are you satisfied that the DNO has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders and facilitating joint discussions where appropriate?	Many connection events again planned, key will be content and a non defensive attitude to improvement.
8. 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 DNOs do?	'Transform the wayleave' process is planned for Q4 2017/18 – not clear when Q4 starts. TriConnex's legal team would be very interested in being involved in helping SSE achieve this. Seems to be lacking ownership and direction – should be centrally managed and team resource increased.
9. Do you consider that the DNO has set relevant outputs that it will deliver during the regulatory year (eg key performance indicators, targets, etc.)?	Many targets set, but lack of true KPI measures. 'Reduction/Improve' used a lot, but no hard target associated with these interms of %.
10. 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 they have not been endorsed, has the	Wayleaves (and easements?) plan is ambitious, but will be welcomed by ICP's if successful. Questions regarding improvement sent out to ICP's, so can assume this has been endorsed. Would be interested to see the

DNO provided robust evidence that it has pursued this?	information that led to their published legal satisfaction score of 6.68/10, as this seems unjustifiably high.
The following two questions refer to the specific areas we discuss in our letter – meeting the needs of all types of connections customers, and connecting when the networks are constrained.	
11. Do you consider that the DNO's planned activities and outputs will be sufficient to meet the needs of all types of connection customers, including the particular needs of newer types of connection customers? What other activities should the DNO undertake in this area?	
12. Do you consider that the DNO's planned activities and outputs will be sufficient to meet the needs of customers looking to connect when the networks are constrained? What other activities should the DNO undertake in this area?	

Annex 2 - Map showing DNO licensee areas¹

Electricity Distribution



¹ Image from Electricity Networks Association (ENA) – note the ICE only applies to distribution networks operating in GB