

Competition in Connections Code of Practice – Consultation Response Form

0002 – Self-Design Approval Processes

Email: code.administrator@energynetworks.org

Response Deadline: 17:00 Wednesday 8 February 2016

Name:	Brian Hoy
Role:	DNO
Organisation:	Electricity North West
Email address:	Brian.hoy@enwl.co.uk
Phone number:	07795447817
Confidential?:	No
If confidential, please specify why¹:	Click here to enter text.

¹ All responses marked as confidential will not be published on the Competition in Connections Code of Practice website. However, all response forms will be made available to all working group members and the Governance Panel to view.

Questions

1. Do you agree with the amendments to the process in Figure Five?

Yes

2. Do you agree with the amendment to paragraph 4.16.3?

No

There is a superfluous “on” in the drafting see below. Otherwise okay

4.16.3 DNOs shall complete and publish ~~on~~ the following standard tables on their website.

3. Do you agree with the use of the Relevant Market Segments in Table One?

Yes. Whilst they are not perfect in that some segments include multiple voltage levels they have the benefit of being commonly and consistently used by DNOs for other reporting

4. Do you agree that Table One will enable DNOs to outline the criteria by which an ICP can approve its own designs? Please give supporting reasons.

Yes

Allows explanations of the criteria

5. Do you agree that Table Two will enable DNOs to outline the criteria that dictate when an ICP can approve its own designs? Please give supporting reasons.

Yes

Allows DNOS to outline the criteria

6. Do you agree that no additional DNO information, other than that provided by DNOs for the self-determination of POC in section 4.6.2 and for 4.16.3 of the Code of Practice, is required for an ICP to do self-design approvals? Please give supporting reasons.

Yes. Design Approval is just checking the design so no further information needed

7. Do you consider that the modification proposal better meets the Relevant Objective 2.3.1 a) iii) of the Code of Practice i.e. “harmonising, to the fullest extent reasonably practicable, the Input Services provided by Distribution Service Providers? Please give supporting reasons.

Yes

A common approach allows easier review by stakeholders

8. Do you consider that the modification proposal better facilitates competition in the market for new electricity distribution connections? Please give supporting reasons.

Yes

A common approach allows easier review by stakeholders

9. Do you agree that, given these proposals are accepted, Section 4.17 in the Code of Practice should be deleted? Please give supporting reasons.

Yes as it removes what would be an out of date and superfluous reference

10. Are there any alternative solutions or matters that should be considered by the Self-Design Approval Working Group?

No