

**Dear Sir or Madam**

***Please see my response to this questionnaire. DNO Consulting have connected 90 33kV 5MW plus PV sites as an ICP in the last three years. My comments are in red and reflect our experience as an ICP in this area of work.***

Looking Back submissions for 2015-16. However, we are particularly interested in your views on the following -

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? **Yes**

If not, are you satisfied that the licensee has provided reasonable and well justified reasons?

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?

**Yes** 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?

3. Do you consider that the licensee's work plan provided relevant outputs (eg key performance indicators, targets etc.)? **Yes** Are you satisfied that the licensee has delivered these outputs? **Yes** If not, do you view the reasons provided to be reasonable and well justified?

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? **Yes in connection with DG.** 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**

In May this year, DNOs also submitted new "Looking Forward" plans for 2016-17. Next year we will assess how well the DNOs delivered these plans. These plans need to address issues that are important to their customers. We want your thoughts on any aspect of the DNOs' Looking Forward submissions and specifically welcome views on the following question areas -

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**

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?

**Yes.** What other activities should the DNOs do?

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.**

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?

**Yes in regard to DG.** If they have not been endorsed, has the licensee provided robust evidence that it has pursued this?

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

- Long term development strategies, heat maps and capacity registers have been developed to varying degrees by DNOs. However, there is need for greater consistency across DNOs and better information to inform how and where customers can connect.

- The level of information included in connections offers is not consistent between DNOs and, in some cases (such as for flexible connections), insufficient for making an investment decision, especially in relation to estimating future levels of curtailment.

In light of these concerns, we would expect the DNOs to have work plans, outputs and key performance indicators for addressing them. We, therefore, also invite you to comment on the extent to which the DNOs' Looking Forward plans for 2016-17 address these issues - 5 of 5

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? **All DNO's (not just SSE) have a few individuals working with in the companies that still express a view which isn't helpful and harks back to the pre-privatisations attitude. However SSE has demonstrated on the few occasions to us that they deal effectively with complaints made against those individuals and then provide the help that we require to delivery our projects.**

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? **Sorry I don't have a view on this question.**

11. Where flexible or alternative connections are not currently available in constrained areas, do you consider that the DNO's work plan for 2016-17 either include steps to provide information about when these types of connection will become available? **Yes** Or that the DNO has justified why these are not available?

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? **Yes**

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? **No**

**Lee Mason**

**Director**

**DNO Consulting Limited**