

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:	Neil Magrath
Role:	Regulation Manager – Connections
Organisation:	UK Power Networks
Email address:	Neil.Magrath@ukpowernetworks.co.uk
Phone number:	07875 114825
Confidential?:	No
If confidential, please specify why¹:	N/A

¹ All responses marked as confidential will not be published on the Competition in Connections Code of Practice website.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 we agree

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

Yes, we agree with the amendment.

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

Yes, we agree.

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, we agree that this table will enable DNOs to provide the required criteria, taken in conjunction with Table 2.

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, we agree that this table will enable DNOs to provide the required criteria, taken in conjunction with Table 1.

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, we agree that the DNO information set out in those sections of the Code of Practice is sufficient for an ICP to carry out self-design approval.

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, we consider that this proposal better meets this objective.

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

Yes, we consider that the proposal better facilitates competition in connections.

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, we agree.

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

No