

## Response template – Incentive on Connections Engagement July 2016

Question	Response																												
<b>About you and your work</b>																													
1. What is the name of your company?	UK Power Solutions																												
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.	SPEN Manweb Area																												
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?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">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 rowspan="4">Multiples Varying Year on Year</td><td rowspan="4">Circa 10,000 connections across all DNO areas</td></tr> <tr> <td>High Voltage (HV) Work</td></tr> <tr> <td>HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work</td></tr> <tr> <td>EHV work and above</td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"><b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b></td><td>LV work</td><td>None</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>HV and EHV work</td><td>Multiples Varying Year on Year</td><td>10MVA +- </td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3"><b>Unmetered Connections</b></td><td>Local Authority (LA) work</td><td>None</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work</td><td>None</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Other work</td><td>None</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	Multiples Varying Year on Year	Circa 10,000 connections across all DNO areas	High Voltage (HV) Work	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work	EHV work and above	<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work	None		HV and EHV work	Multiples Varying Year on Year	10MVA +-	<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work	None		Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work	None		Other work	None	
Type of connection		Total number of connections	Total MVA of connections																										
<b>Metered Demand Connections</b>	Low Voltage (LV) Work	Multiples Varying Year on Year	Circa 10,000 connections across all DNO areas																										
	High Voltage (HV) Work																												
	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work																												
	EHV work and above																												
<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work	None																											
	HV and EHV work	Multiples Varying Year on Year	10MVA +-																										
<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work	None																											
	Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work	None																											
	Other work	None																											

Consultation questions	
Section 1: Looking Back report 2015-16	
We want your views on how well the DNOs have performed over the last year	
1. Are you satisfied that the licensee had a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connections stakeholders? Do you consider that the licensee implemented its strategy? If not, are you satisfied that the licensee has provided reasonable and well justified reasons?	<p>SPEN have engaged on the process it would seem but being an area we are breaking into our interaction / inclusion in that process is very small.</p> <p><b>Whilst the greater process is moving forward we do have major issues of interaction and escalation within the SPEN area which gives us huge issues in resolving matters as they occur. We believe that the Radar system actually hinders rather than helps ICP's as it is to rigid and does not allow the required flexibility to deal with real jobs with design changes etc. We are trying to improve the relationships with SPEN but the lack of CIC focus is not healthy.</b></p>
2. Are you satisfied that the licensee had a comprehensive work plan of activities (with associated delivery dates) to meet the requirements of its connections stakeholders? Do you consider that the licensee delivered its work plan? If not, are you satisfied that the licensee has provided reasonable and well justified reasons?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally
3. Do you consider that the licensee's work plan provided relevant outputs (eg key performance indicators, targets etc.)? Are you satisfied that the licensee has delivered these outputs? If not, do you view the reasons provided to be reasonable and well justified?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally
4. Do you agree that the licensee'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?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally

## Section 2: Looking Forward plans 2016-17

### We want your views on what the DNOs aim to achieve in the coming year

5. Are you satisfied that the licensee has a comprehensive and robust strategy for engaging with connection stakeholders and facilitating joint discussions where appropriate?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally
6. Do you agree that the licensee has a comprehensive work plan of activities (with associated delivery dates) that will meet the requirements of its connection stakeholders? If not, has the licensee provided reasonable and well-justified reasons? What other activities should the DNOs do?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally
7. Do you consider that the licensee has set relevant outputs that it will deliver during the regulatory year (eg key performance indicators, targets, etc.)?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally
8. Would you agree that the licensee'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 licensee provided robust evidence that it has pursued this?	Yes we believe that they have from what we can see externally

### We also want your views on how DNO plans will address issues for new connections in constrained areas

9. Where flexible connection offers are available, do you consider that the DNO's work plan for 2016-17 sufficiently addresses concerns about the uncertainty of curtailment levels? For example, do their plans ensure that stakeholders have access to the data they require for an investment decision?	Not Sure.
--	-----------

10. Where consortium connections are available, do you consider that the DNO's work plan for 2016-17 reflect requirements for clear and detailed information about where, how and under what conditions such projects can proceed?	
11. Where consortium connections are available, do you consider that the DNO's work plan for 2016-17 reflect requirements for clear and detailed information about where, how and under what conditions such projects can proceed?	
12. Do you consider that the DNO's work plans include appropriate engagement to ensure that network investment plans are well communicated to stakeholders, including when new capacity will become available?	
13. Do you consider that the DNOs' plans include appropriate activities to improve, where necessary, the provision of information on constrained areas of the network to provide better data about where connections may be viable?	
14. Are there particular additional activities or outputs which you consider should be included in the work plan of activities to better facilitate grid connections?	-

