

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: | Tim Hughes |
| Role: | DNO |
| Organisation: | Western Power Distribution |
| Email address: | thughes@westernpower.co.uk |
| Phone number: | 0117 933 2148 |
| 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¹ All responses marked as confidential will not be published on the Competition in Connections Code of Practice website.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, we believe this clarifies the process.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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, 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.

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, 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.

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 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.

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, 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.

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

Yes, the modification proposal better facilitates competition by harmonising the input services provided by the Distribution Service Providers.

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, 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.

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

No.