

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:	Catherine Falconer
Role:	DNO
Organisation:	SSEPD
Email address:	Catherine.falconer@sse.com
Phone number:	01738456229
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¹ All responses marked as confidential will not be published on the Competition in Connections Code of Practice website.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?

Yes

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

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.

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.

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 I believe this is flexible enough to allow each DNO to record their own 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. This represents the full set of information that DNOs themselves use for both the self-determination of POC and the design of extension assets.

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. 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.

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

Yes. This approach aids independent providers by providing clear guidance in the route to self design approval.

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 requirements under this section are fulfilled, allowing it to be deleted.

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

No.