

## 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.	UKPN All Licence Areas																												
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>Yes and would add that UKPN have gone from a point of poor position to being one of the top performers from an ICP perspective, creating a fantastic engagement process with those ICP's</p> <p><b>Although not asked we would like to comment on the very helpful and positive manner in which UKPN have been working with us on the COP extensions in particular with regard to Design Self Approvals and operation aspects. We believe that these will become the norm for our activities moving forward due to a huge degree to the way in which UKPN staff have engaged with the process and our staff.</b></p> <p><b>We would also comment that UKPN have been very approachable from a perspective of sorting issues as they arise going the extra mile with aspects such sharing of installation works on adjacent non connected projects, provision of materials when issues of delivery experienced by ICP suppliers, in all going the extra mile for the ICP and their customers.</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 they had a plan and reported back on delivery and delays.
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 although like other DNO's some of the KPI's can be a little woolly due to the subject matter but UKPN have strived to make them as clear as they can listening to views from the various customer groups to assist in making the indicators as real as possible.

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 and within the ICE process has targeted the works for each of the different connection stakeholder groups
<b>Section 2: Looking Forward plans 2016-17</b>	
<b>We want your views on what the DNOs aim to achieve in the coming year</b>	
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.
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.
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.)?	<b>Yes we believe that they have and already seeing evidence of elements moving forward being included on a number of the work stream working groups.</b>
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.
<b>We also want your views on how DNO plans will address issues for new connections in constrained areas</b>	
9. Where flexible connection offers are available, do you consider that the DNO's	The subject is very complicated but we would suggest that UKPN are actively moving matters forward in this area but not sure that it is always possible to

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?	provide all information that all parties would require. UKPN have previously and moving forward trying out various trials in an effort to arrive at the best way of dealing with matters moving forward.
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?	Yes we believe they do, although this is very much a moving feast as strategies and interactions with other parties such as Grid develop.
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?	Yes we believe they do.
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?	Yes
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?	-

