

Response template – Incentive on Connections Engagement July 2016

Question	Response																												
About you and your work																													
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.	WPD 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">Metered Demand Connections</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">Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</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">Unmetered Connections</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	Metered Demand Connections	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	Metered Distributed Generation (DG)	LV work	None		HV and EHV work	Multiples Varying Year on Year	10MVA +-	Unmetered Connections	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																										
Metered Demand Connections	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																												
Metered Distributed Generation (DG)	LV work	None																											
	HV and EHV work	Multiples Varying Year on Year	10MVA +-																										
Unmetered Connections	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 we are although we would comment that WPD were very early in starting ICE process compared to all the other DNO's and as such are much further forward with most aspects of the process other than those that have developed / become current as the greater process developed. From an OFGEM / end customer perspective they are seen to be the best in field although as an ICP this is not necessarily the case.</p> <p>We have very good access to WPD's management teams, although we would suggest that due to the small geographic team set up of their organisation this makes the ICP interaction quite difficult, if as we do we work across all areas of their organisation.</p> <p>There are small pockets of their licence areas where individuals are less than supportive of the ICP / IDNO processes but it tends to be very isolated and difficult to challenge when set against trying to get the actual job done. We don't believe that the views are shared by the WPD Management team, but disappointingly some aspects of the approach to the new COP contestability extensions could be more encouraging to ICP's</p> <p>We believe that we have started to see a change in the WPD view to competitive works in that perhaps they now see that to stay in their position towards the top of DNO league tables they actually need more competitive works to occur within their areas.</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 and they test these through external organisations which gives more credibility to the process.
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.
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	Yes we believe that they have.

broad and inclusive range of connection stakeholders? 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	
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 WPD 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. They are and have carried out various trials which really start to influence matters going 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?	As in 10 the work plan does provide detail but as things are moving very quickly in this area WPD 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?	-
---	---

