

## 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.	SSEPD Southern Region as not active in the Northern Region at this time												
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>Type of connection</th> <th>Total number of connections</th> <th>Total MVA of connections</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Metered Demand Connections</td> <td>Low Voltage (LV) Work High Voltage (HV) Work HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work EHV work and above</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</td> <td>LV work HV and EHV work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unmetered Connections</td> <td>Local Authority (LA) work Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work 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	
<b>Section 1: Looking Back report 2015-16</b>	
<b>We want your views on how well the DNOs have performed over the last year</b>	
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?	Yes we are although we would comment that they were late in starting the ICE process compared to others such as WPD but to be fair the way in which they have dealt with it has been quite comprehensive.  <b>We have very good access to SSE's responsible teams including escalation points and SSE are very supportive in trying to sort matters. There is still we would suggest a variety of attitude responses towards ICP's within the greater SSE workforce which is something SSE are trying to stamp out so ICP interactions are seen as the norm but they certainly not there yet. Whilst we appreciate what has happened with the OFGEM SSE investigations and the change proposals put forward by SSE, the fact that SSE have been putting forward those changes as something coming out of the ICE process is very misleading and also externally to other DNO's sets the wrong tone towards the OFGEM ability / desire to challenge the DNO's effectively.</b>
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 SSE have strived to make them as clear as they can.

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 connection stakeholders? If not, has the DNO provided reasonable justification?	Yes we believe that they have.
---	--------------------------------

## **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.
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.)?	Yes we believe that they have.
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.

**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?	The subject is very complicated but we would suggest that SSE are actively moving matters forward in this area but not sure that it is always possible to provide all information that all parties would require.
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?	As in 10 the work plan does provide detail but as things are moving very quickly in this area SSE are providing direct access to the teams looking at these activities to ensure best fit for individuals requirements
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?	-

