

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:	Paul McGimpsey
Role:	DNO
Organisation:	SP Energy Networks
Email address:	Paul.mcgimpsey@scottishpower.com
Phone number:	0141 614 1951
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¹ All responses marked as confidential will not be published on the Competition in Connections Code of Practice website.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?

We agree with the amendments to the process in Figure Five.

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

We agree with the amendment to paragraph 4.16.3.

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

We agree with the use of the Relevant Market Segments in Table 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.

We agree that Table One will enable DNOs to outline the criteria by which an ICP can approve its own designs.

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.

We agree that Table Two will enable DNOs to outline the criteria that dictate when an ICP can approve its own designs.

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.

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.

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 agree the modification proposal better meets the Relevant Objective 2.3.1 a) iii) of the Code of Practice.

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

We agree the modification proposal better facilitates competition in the market for new electricity distribution 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.

We agree that, given these proposals are accepted, Section 4.17 in the Code of Practice should be deleted.

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

None.