

Question	Name / Organisation	Role	Comments	Additional supporting information	Actions for group
1. Do you agree with the amendments to the process in Figure Five?	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes, the amendment is minor and more accurately reflects the process flow.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, we believe this clarifies the process.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes we agree	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree with the amendments to the process in Figure Five.	N/A	The group noted this response.
2. Do you agree with the amendment to paragraph 4.16.3?	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	No There is a superfluous "on" in the drafting see below. Otherwise okay: "4.16.3 DNOs shall complete and publish <i>on</i> the following standard tables on their website."	N/A	The group agreed to take out 'on'.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes we do.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	No, the amended text should make it clear that the criteria to be set out by which an ICP can carry out its own design approval should be the no more onerous than that employed by the DNO when giving the same authority to its own designers. We suggest the following: 4.16.3 DNOs shall complete and publish the following standard tables on their website which will set out the criteria by which ICPs can carry out their own design approval. Such criteria should account for accreditations and experience already held by the ICP and will be no more onerous than that employed by the DNO in its own connection services.	N/A	The group discussed that, whilst recognising the sentiments expressed by the suggested change, on balance individual DNO design approval criteria should in itself cater for ICPs coming into their licence area and be able to demonstrate capability in another DNO area. The CoP itself should place enough obligation on DNOs to cater for this situation arising, and be able to facilitate ICPs that move around the country.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we agree with the amendment.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree with the amendment to paragraph 4.16.3.	N/A	The group noted this response.
3. Do you agree with the use of the Relevant Market Segments in Table One?	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	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	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes, it makes sense to use the same relevant market segments used elsewhere for competition in connections and to include the three UMS market segments even though the answer from DNOs may well be similar for all three. While this may be the case now, including all three UMS market segments allows scope for them to differ in future.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes. The market segments, as defined by Ofgem, are now well understood and widely used in the industry. Using market segments in this way and template allows other matrices to be lined up against this one.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we agree.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree with the use of the Relevant Market Segments in Table One.	N/A	The group noted this response.
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.	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes Allows explanations of the criteria	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes, we do. A simple 'Yes /No' option on its own would be insufficient but this layout means headline approval can be shown and the comment box allows a DNO to insert any limitations to design approval limits within a given market sector.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	As it's drafted, Table One only serves to specify the market segment where the ICP has the option to approve their own designs. If read in conjunction with Table Two then the criteria by which an ICP can self-approve will be clear.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, the table provides the DNO with the opportunity to detail the requirements by market segment. A blank template would allow some flexibility on the DNO's part to outline the criteria.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree that Table One will enable DNOs to outline the criteria by which an ICP can approve its own designs.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we agree that this table will enable DNOs to provide the required criteria, taken in conjunction with Table 2.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes, ICP's need to understand what options for the different market segments are available within the different DNOs and this will be a good test to benchmark each of the DNOs.	N/A	The group noted this response.
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.	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Where a DNO wants to apply a stepped approval regime then this table will explain it. If full design approval is permitted from the start by a DNO, then the table can be used to show how the ICP can be promoted (or relegated) the inspection regime.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	No, when the ICP qualifies to approve their own design, they should immediately have the right to approve their own designs. The current template gives the impression that there are a number of different levels/stages that the ICP must go through before it can approve its own designs. We know that this is not the case across all DNOs, where SSE and NPG for example allow the ICP to approve their own designs based on their NERs accreditation. We believe that this is industry best practice. It should be the ICP choice to request that the DNO approves the design or instead undertakes an inspections of the ICP approved design. Consideration should be given to using the table as set out below. This table better reflects what we should be trying to capture, i.e. the levels of inspection that apply when the ICP approves their own design. The table in the CoP should be blank however it has been populated by way of example. (please see link in additional information).	Please see suggested table amendment here	The group considered at length the suggestion from Power On Connections, but decided to go with the existing template at this time. They said it was too early to try and make changes at this time when trying to establish best practice, when all DNOs have reported that they have insufficient experience of what that best practice was.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, the DNO can provide a regime that will allow an ICP to attain self-approval of its own designs. This can be achieved by successful submissions leading to Self-approval.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes Allows DNOS to outline the criteria	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes I believe this is flexible enough to allow each DNO to record their own criteria.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we agree that this table will enable DNOs to provide the required criteria, taken in conjunction with Table 1.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes, although this is very high level it gives each DNO the opportunity to show what an ICP needs to do, or not do, to move through the various levels that a DNO may prescribe.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree that Table Two will enable DNOs to outline the criteria that dictate when an ICP can approve its own designs.	N/A	The group noted this response.

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	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes, all the information required to undertake Self-Design Approval work, has already been itemised in section 4.6 to allow an ICP to self-determine the POC and to design the extension assets. Self-Design approval is a process to check that these requirements have been followed and the information has been used correctly.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, we agree that the information provided in 4.6.2 and 4.16.3 contains sufficient information to enable an ICP to undertake the majority of the day to day designs.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes. Design Approval is just checking the design so no further information needed	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes. This represents the full set of information that DNOs themselves use for both the self-determination of POC and the design of extension assets.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	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.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	We agree as long as the DNO publishes all of the relevant data required to produce a design via its web site or other electronic means.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We 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.	N/A	The group noted this response.
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.	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes A common approach allows easier review by stakeholders	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes, the completed table format gives DNOs and ICP stakeholders the ability to compare and highlight differences, which is what is needed as the starting point for any future harmonisation work.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, the information that has been made available by the DNOs will allow an ICP to undertake design work with minimal DNO involvement, thus harmonising the input services.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	Yes we agree the modification proposal better meets the Relevant Objective 2.3.1 a) iii) of the Code of Practice.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes. Recording each DNOs position against a common set of segments and in a standard template format aids both understanding and comparison of different DNOs positions, and therefore promotes harmonisation by identification of differences and emergence of best practice.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we consider that this proposal better meets this objective.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	It could do this if all DNOs take the same view and work together to give all of the relevant information required. We also believe that the DNOs need to ensure that their staff do not take an overzealous view on Design approval and treat the ICP in the same way as they do their own business. We not that a number of DNOs do not peer check their own designers work and do not have a similar process for their own staff. We also believe that an accredited ICP should be considered as competent as the DNOs staff and move down the table and have more designs approved by the DNO, rather than work their way up a table. This would ensure that the DNOs do not provide a higher input service level than is required.	N/A	The working group noted the observation from GTC.
8. Do you consider that the modification proposal better facilitates competition in the market for new electricity distribution connections? Please give supporting reasons.	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes A common approach allows easier review by stakeholders	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	It doesn't overtly facilitate CIC but it does make it clear to ICP's and their customers exactly what they can do without the need for DNO involvement.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	Yes, enabling Self Approval by ICPs will help the DNO meet its obligation to reduce the scope and cost of its input services.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, the modification proposal better facilitates competition by harmonising the input services provided by the Distribution Service Providers.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree the modification proposal better facilitates competition in the market for new electricity distribution connections.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes. This approach aids independent providers by providing clear guidance in the route to self design approval.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we consider that the proposal better facilitates competition in connections.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes, providing the areas mentioned in question 7 are resolved.	N/A	The group noted this response.
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	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	Yes as it removes what would be an out of date and superfluous reference	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	Yes, as this clause will no longer be required upon implementation of this CP.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	Yes, the proposed modification contains the criteria that establish when an ICP can approve its own designs and provides a definitive list of information that the DNO will provide.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	Yes. The requirements under this section are fulfilled, allowing it to be deleted.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	Yes, we agree.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	Yes	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	We agree that, given these proposals are accepted, Section 4.17 in the Code of Practice should be deleted.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	Yes, we believe the proposed modifications cover the requirements of section 4.17 and the paragraph can be deleted.	N/A	The group noted this response.
10. Are there any alternative solutions or matters that should be considered by the Self-Design Approval Working Group?	Brian Hoy / Electricity North West	DNO	No	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Fitzsimmons / Power On Connections	ICP	None at this time	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Tim Hughes / Western Power Distribution	DNO	No.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Catherine Falconer / SSEPD	DNO	No.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Paul McGimpsey / Scottish Power	DNO	None.	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Neil Magrath / UK Power Networks	DNO	No	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Mel Swift / GTC	IDNO	No	N/A	The group noted this response.
	Ian Cobley / Northern Powergrid	DNO	The limited experience we have of ICPs utilising the changes brought about by the introduction of the new Competition in Connections Code of Practice makes it difficult to do more as we don't have a clear idea what 'best practice' looks like. We expect this to change as ICPs make more use of the options presented to them and when this happens we expect more changes to the CiC Code of Practice will be necessary.	N/A	The group noted this response.

Suggested Amendment to question 5 from Power On Connections:

Table Two - Qualifying criteria that determines level of inspection of ICP self-approved contestable designs following commencement of Self-Design Approval by the ICP.

Level	Criteria
1: DNO inspects 80% of ICP Approved Designs	No major N/Cs identified through 10 inspections
2: DNO inspects 40% of ICP Approved Designs	No major N/Cs identified through 10 inspections
3: DNO inspects 20% of ICP Approved Designs	No major N/Cs identified through 10 inspections
etc: DNO inspects 5% of ICP Approved Designs	No major N/Cs identified through 10 inspections