

Response template – Incentive on Connections Engagement July 2016

Question	Response																												
About you and your work																													
1. What is the name of your company?	Unmetered Connections Customer Group (UCCG)																												
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.	SP Energy Networks																												
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> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Low Voltage (LV) Work</td> <td>Some smaller metered installations covered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Voltage (HV) Work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EHV work and above</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table> </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</td> <td> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>LV work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and EHV work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table> </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unmetered Connections</td> <td> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Local Authority (LA) work</td> <td>Applies to all members</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Nos. of connections</td> </tr> </table> </td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of connection	Total number of connections	Total MVA of connections	Metered Demand Connections	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Low Voltage (LV) Work</td> <td>Some smaller metered installations covered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Voltage (HV) Work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EHV work and above</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table>	Low Voltage (LV) Work	Some smaller metered installations covered	High Voltage (HV) Work	n/a	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work	n/a	EHV work and above	n/a		Metered Distributed Generation (DG)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>LV work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and EHV work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table>	LV work	n/a	HV and EHV work	n/a		Unmetered Connections	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Local Authority (LA) work</td> <td>Applies to all members</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Nos. of connections</td> </tr> </table>	Local Authority (LA) work	Applies to all members		Nos. of connections	
Type of connection	Total number of connections	Total MVA of connections																											
Metered Demand Connections	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Low Voltage (LV) Work</td> <td>Some smaller metered installations covered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Voltage (HV) Work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EHV work and above</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table>	Low Voltage (LV) Work	Some smaller metered installations covered	High Voltage (HV) Work	n/a	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work	n/a	EHV work and above	n/a																				
Low Voltage (LV) Work	Some smaller metered installations covered																												
High Voltage (HV) Work	n/a																												
HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work	n/a																												
EHV work and above	n/a																												
Metered Distributed Generation (DG)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>LV work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV and EHV work</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table>	LV work	n/a	HV and EHV work	n/a																								
LV work	n/a																												
HV and EHV work	n/a																												
Unmetered Connections	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Local Authority (LA) work</td> <td>Applies to all members</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Nos. of connections</td> </tr> </table>	Local Authority (LA) work	Applies to all members		Nos. of connections																								
Local Authority (LA) work	Applies to all members																												
	Nos. of connections																												

				in 10's of thousands
	Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work	Applies to some members		
	Other work	Applies to some members		

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?	Yes and Yes
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 and Yes
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?	We would like to see SPEN obtaining explicit feedback from ICPs and incorporating this in their process – otherwise acceptable. It would be much preferred if work activities are S.M.A.R.T in all cases.
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	We would like to see SPEN obtaining explicit feedback from ICPs and incorporating this in their process – otherwise acceptable

stakeholders? If not, has the DNO provided reasonable justification?	
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 – although we would like to see more explicit reporting of feedback from ICPs. For example explaining why no ICPs have taken up the "self inspection" offer.
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?	No. We would like to see more explicit reporting of feedback from ICPs and an explicit action to review other DNOs ICE plans and activities to benchmark and adopt best practice. The recognition of G39/2 training (set out in the CiC CoP) does not appear to be in the action plan – SPEN have confirmed they comply with the CiC CoP – but were insisting on additional training to their OP-3 during 2016. In addition the pilot carried out with ENW which successfully allowed local authority customers to quickly and easily add IDNO assets through the host DNO should be a target. It would be much preferred if work activities are S.M.A.R.T in all cases.
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.)?	No. We would like to see more explicit reporting of feedback from ICPs and an explicit action to review other DNOs ICE plans and activities to benchmark and adopt best practice. The recognition of G39/2 training (set out in the CiC CoP) does not appear to be in the action plan – SPEN have confirmed they comply with the CiC CoP – but were insisting on additional training to their OP-3 during 2016. In addition the pilot carried out with ENW which successfully allowed local authority customers to quickly and easily add IDNO assets through the host DNO should be a target. It would be much preferred if work activities are S.M.A.R.T in all cases.
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?	See above.

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?	n/a
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?	n/a
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?	n/a
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?	n/a
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?	n/a
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?	n/a

