

## **Annex 1 – Open letter consultation on the Incentive of Connections Engagement**

- 1.1. We would like to hear the views of interested parties in relation to any of the issues set out in our open consultation letter.
- 1.2. We would especially welcome responses to the specific questions which we have set out in our consultation and are replicated below.
- 1.3. If you have any questions on this document please contact:

James Veaney  
Head of Connections and Constraint Management  
Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, SW1P 3GE  
020 7901 1861  
[Connections@Ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:Connections@Ofgem.gov.uk)

- 1.4. **Responses should be sent, preferably by e-mail by 17 August 2016 to the address above.**
- 1.5. Unless marked confidential, all responses will be published by placing them in Ofgem's library and on its website [www.ofgem.gov.uk](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk). Respondents may request that their response is kept confidential. Ofgem shall respect this request, subject to any obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.
- 1.6. Respondents who wish to have their responses kept confidential should clearly mark the document/s to that effect and include the reasons for confidentiality. Respondents are asked to put any confidential material in the appendices to their responses.
- 1.7. Next steps: We will consider the responses to this consultation and these will be used alongside other evidence for our assessment of the ICE plans.
- 1.8. Each of the questions asked by this consultation is set out in the template below.
- 1.9. Please ensure that you **indicate the DNO or specific licence area** to which your experiences relate.
- 1.10. When considering your responses to these questions, please consider your experiences, the actions that the DNO has undertaken or committed to undertake, and the actions that you consider it could reasonably undertake.

## 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?	TUV SUD																														
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  SPEN Scotland area																														
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" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>Type of connection</b></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><b>Total number of connections</b></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><b>Total MVA of connections</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Metered Demand Connections</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Low Voltage (LV) Work 30</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">High Voltage (HV) Work 4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">EHV work and above</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">LV work 0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">HV and EHV work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Unmetered Connections</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Local Authority (LA) work 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10 kVA</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Other work 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5 kVA</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Type of connection</b>	<b>Total number of connections</b>	<b>Total MVA of connections</b>	<b>Metered Demand Connections</b>	Low Voltage (LV) Work 30	11		High Voltage (HV) Work 4	6		HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work			EHV work and above		<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work 0			HV and EHV work		<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work 2	10 kVA		Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work			Other work 1	5 kVA
<b>Type of connection</b>	<b>Total number of connections</b>	<b>Total MVA of connections</b>																													
<b>Metered Demand Connections</b>	Low Voltage (LV) Work 30	11																													
	High Voltage (HV) Work 4	6																													
	HV and Extra High Voltage (EHV) Work																														
	EHV work and above																														
<b>Metered Distributed Generation (DG)</b>	LV work 0																														
	HV and EHV work																														
<b>Unmetered Connections</b>	Local Authority (LA) work 2	10 kVA																													
	Private finance initiatives (PFI) Work																														
	Other work 1	5 kVA																													
<b>Consultation questions</b>																															

## **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?	SPEN have regular stakeholder meetings as well as various engagement days.  The level of engagement is very satisfactory. We are satisfied that the licence has implemented its strategy.
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?	We are aware of the target activities and dates identified by Quarter. It is clear that the activities are being delivered.
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?	The activities on the work plan are not all measurable by KPI etc however feedback was provided where practicable.
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?	We agree that the strategy was based on feedback from the stakeholders.


## **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 the engagement process is robust. We are part of the Stakeholder group.
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?	The work plan of activities will meet the issues raised by the Stakeholder group.
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.)?	The licence has relevant targets although some KPIs could be cleaner.
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, the Stakeholder group has a broad spectrum of the industry. The engagement days widen this further.
<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 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?	We would like to see the licensee being permitted to speculate on reinforcement rather than being load driven. Some areas are being constrained in development due to connection capacity.  SPEN are trying to assist to remove some capacity constraints but we understand there are Regulatory issues in doing so.
10. Where consortium connections are available, do you consider that the DNO's work plan for 2016-17 reflect	We are not involved in Consortium Connections.

requirements for clear and detailed information about where, how and under what conditions such projects can proceed?	
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?	We believe this is an area where improvement could be made although it is addressed in the work plans.
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?	The availability of "heat maps" gives a better understanding of network availability.
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.

## Annex 2 - Map showing DNO licensee areas<sup>1</sup>



<sup>1</sup> Image from Electricity Networks Association (ENA)