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INTRODUCTION

On 21st February 2018, SSEN hosted a stakeholder workshop to seek feedback on its current performance, its business plan commitments, its social obligations, and the transition to DSO.

The format for the workshops comprised of four short presentations given by SSEN representatives, followed by round table discussions, electronic voting and a Q&A. The broad topics for discussion were: SSEN’s current performance, its business plan commitments, its social obligations, and the transition to DSO.

SSEN instructed EQ Communications, a specialist stakeholder engagement consultancy, to independently facilitate the workshops and to take notes of the comments made by stakeholders. Every effort has been made to faithfully record the feedback given. In order to encourage candour and open debate, comments have not been ascribed to individuals. Instead, notes have been made as to the types of organisations each stakeholder represents.

The full presentation can be found here, with the agenda for the day on slides seven and eight.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After a brief introduction from Colin Nicol, Managing Director, there was an initial discussion session where stakeholders were asked to comment on their experience of working with SSEN.

STAKEHOLDERS’ EXPERIENCE OF WORKING WITH US

- Stakeholders were broadly very complimentary about SSEN and its team. Its staff were praised for being proactive and the company is seen as approachable and easy to work with.
- It was commented that the company should provide more relevant information on its website regarding areas such as Connections and that stakeholders would welcome more transparency, especially with regards to pricing.

OUR BUSINESS PLAN COMMITMENTS

The next session was introduced by Maureen Barrie, Head of Networks Customer Assurance, and Emma Merritt, Customer Assurance Auditor. They explained SSEN’s Business Plan Commitments and how the views of customers and stakeholders had led to the creation of 110 commitments under six output areas: Reliability and Availability, Environment, Connections, Customer Satisfaction, Social Obligations, and Safety.

- Stakeholders viewed Reliability and Availability as SSEN’s most important Business Plan Commitment (BPC), followed by Safety. It was, however, commented that many
of the BPCs are interlinked and that, for example, Customer Satisfaction would be improved by enhanced Reliability.

- In the Reliability and Availability output category, Supply Interruptions were seen as the most important output.
- Information Availability and Connections Service were considered the most important Connections outputs.
- Under Environment, Electrical Losses and Sustainable Working were both ranked highly, whilst Visual Impact was not seen as being of great import.
- In the Customer Satisfaction category, Communication was by far the most important output for stakeholders.
- The Priority Services Register was deemed the most important output in the Social Obligations output category, closely followed by Focus on Vulnerability.
- Network Safety and Safety Training were seen as being the most important Safety outputs according to stakeholders, scoring far more highly than Community Engagement.

SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS

The Social Obligations session was introduced by Lisa Doogan, Director of Customer Relationship Management, and Simon O’Loughlin, Social Obligations Engagement Manager. The first part of the presentation focused on the Priority Services Register (PSR). This was followed by an explanation of the work SSEN has undertaken to help to improve resilience across its communities as part of the Resilient Communities Fund.

- It is clear that more ought to be done to promote the PSR as many stakeholders had not heard of it.
- There was no consensus on whether the introduction of a new PSR category (PSR1+) would be of benefit (43% of stakeholders were of the view that the company should continue with the current three categories), but there was a strong feeling that SSEN should focus on those most in need (PSR1 customers) in the event of a power outage.
- It was felt that SSEN should aim to identify and target those geographic areas of concentrated vulnerability when promoting the PSR.
- Stakeholders were broadly of the view that remote and isolated areas should be targeted for Community Resilience Funding. It was also felt that more should be done to assist those communities who may not know of the funding that is available, regardless of whether they are in rural or urban areas.
TRANSITION TO DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OPERATOR

The final session of the day was presented by Stewart Reid, Head of DSO and Innovation. Stewart explained how the role of SSEN was to change from Distribution Network Operator (DNO) to Distribution System Operator (DSO). He talked stakeholders through the key functions of a DSO and the impact that the growth in low carbon technologies has had on the network.

- Stakeholders felt that it was important that vulnerable customers should not be negatively impacted by the transition to DSO as it was felt that, at present, the more affluent would be most likely to benefit.
- It was commented that SSEN should work with the government at all tiers, as well as relevant organisations, to ensure that the vulnerable are not left behind. This may require working in partnership to educate customers on the potential benefits of this transition.

WRITTEN FEEDBACK

After the workshop, stakeholders were asked to complete a short feedback form. Some of the key findings are shown below:

- 72% of attendees who filled out a feedback form told us that they found the workshop ‘very interesting’ and 28% said they found it ‘interesting’.
- 92% of attendees agreed or strongly agreed that we covered the right topics on the day.
- 74% of attendees thought the venue was ‘very good’, and 97% thought EQ Communications’ facilitation was ‘very good’ or ‘good’.
- 94% wished to receive the post-event report and would be interested in attending similar events in the future.
ATTENDEES

A total of 43 stakeholders representing 32 companies attended the workshop. The companies represented on the day are shown below:

- ABB Ltd
- AES Solar
- Aggreko
- Briggs Marine Contractors
- Citizens Advice
- Energy Action Scotland
- EDF Energy
- Energy Saving Trust
- ENGIE
- Foresee Associates
- Forestry Commission Scotland
- Forsa Energy
- Fossoway Community Council
- Intelligent Land Investments Group Plc
- IQA Operations Group Ltd
- J B Corrie & Co Ltd
- Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd
- Mercure Hotels
- Morrison Utility Services
- National Energy Action
- Natural Power
- Ofgem
- PE Systems Ltd
- Ricardo Energy & Environment
- RJ McLeod (Contractors) Ltd
- The Scottish Government
- Scottish Renewables
- SGN
- SP Energy Networks
- SSE plc
- Warmworks
- Wood Group

What type of stakeholder are you?

- Housing development: 23.1%
- Charity-non profit organisation: 10.3%
- Energy-utility company: 38.5%
- Environmental representative: 2.6%
- Developer-connections representative: 10.3%
- Councillor: 2.6%
- Business customer: 7.7%
- Domestic customer-consumer interest body: 2.6%
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WORKSHOP ONE: YOUR EXPERIENCE OF WORKING WITH SSEN

1. What has your experience of working with SSEN been like?

Summary

In general, stakeholders had a positive impression of working with SSEN. The company is seen as proactive, personable and easy to talk to. Where issues were highlighted, they tended to be local and project-focused.

However, there was a perception amongst some stakeholders that the company is excessively bureaucratic. It was commented that the company does not always provide as much support as it could to smaller companies or individuals wanting to connect to the grid or to initiatives aimed at addressing fuel poverty and other social obligations.

Stakeholders highlighted several key areas for SSEN to improve on. Increased transparency, especially in pricing, would be welcomed. It was also noted that there are lessons to be learned from other DNOs in terms of information that is included on SSEN’s website.

The point was made that members of staff in the North and South are getting better at communicating with each other, but it was added that more should be done to ensure that the high level of knowledge that exists is passed on to more junior members of staff.

Verbatim comments

“They are one of the better DNOs for taking feedback on board. They are always willing to speak to us and have open minds.” Voluntary sector representative

“Easy company to work with; we’ve got key account managers, and we just have that direct contact, I don’t have any issues. Being able to pick up the phone is vital.” Business representative

“I think generally the relationship is very positive, very professional.” Developer/connections representative

“It’s been an overall positive experience, in comparison to other DNOs. It’s always been a very straightforward logical and positive interaction.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“SSEN has actively involved us in activities, which has made our experience with SSEN very positive.” Voluntary sector representative
“SSEN has prioritised engaging stakeholders, especially within price control, which is an example of best practice, but there is still more to be done.” Government/government body representative

“Our experience was always good, always positive. SSEN is definitely better than Scottish Power, they were always good to deal with.” Business representative

“There’s a confusion amongst customers as to the difference between DSO and DNO, people don’t know who to call when there is a problem.” Parish councillor

“The difficulties with securing training dates has negatively impacted our ability to train employees.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“It can be quite a bureaucratic process reaching people at the top. They are very forward-thinking, but the knowledge and skills are trickling down too slowly.” Developer/connections representative

2. Are there any examples of good practice from other companies that SSEN ought to emulate?

Verbatim comments

“This is my first stakeholder panel, which means they’re not on everyone’s radar.” Environmental representative

“There is a dramatic difference between the price according to which a DNO is supplying the energy, and because of the DSO barrier, SSEN don’t get a chance to explain themselves.” Parish councillor

“You could give people more information about why their energy costs are different in different areas.” Charity/voluntary sector representative

“Scottish Power’s website was always easy to use and interactive, better than what SSE had available. The online offerings such as heat maps and generator maps were very easy to use.” Business representative

“In terms of DNOs I deal with – Northern Power Grid, SSEN, UKPN – the one thing that SSE is getting better at is that the colleagues South and North are now starting to talk, so we are getting more aligned specifications.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
“Social obligations of the competition – some of the other DNOs are putting more funding into that and that would put them higher in the ranking.” Voluntary sector representative

“Private clients and communities are treated very differently. If you’re off the street you might need more support and that support isn’t necessarily given.” Energy/utility company
WORKSHOP TWO: BUSINESS PLAN COMMITMENTS

PART ONE: OUTPUT AREAS

In this session, stakeholders were asked as a group to rank each of SSEN's output areas by priority on a scale of 1-100. The results from each of the six tables were averaged, with their positions shown on the image below. As can be seen, Safety was the top priority for stakeholders, with Reliability and Availability ranked second.

OUR OUTPUT AREAS

[Diagram showing priority levels for Safety, Reliability and Availability, Environment, Connections, Social obligations, and Customer satisfaction.]
PART TWO: BUSINESS PLAN OUTPUTS

Stakeholders were then asked as a group to rank the outputs which fall under each of the above output categories. The results of this were then aggregated. As can be seen in the table below, New Technology, Visual Impact, Connections Engagement, Partnerships and Assurance, Training and Education, and Community Engagement were, on average, placed at the highest position of each of their respective categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR BUSINESS PLAN OUTPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability and availability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Readiness &amp; Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Interruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social obligations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships and Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Service Register (PSR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RELIABILITY AND AVAILABILITY

Summary

Reliability and Availability was seen as a very important area by stakeholders, who made the point that without Reliability many of the other areas of focus would be largely redundant. When asked to vote electronically, Reliability gained the highest score with 43% of stakeholders seeing it as the most important priority.

As with all the output categories, Reliability and Availability was not seen by stakeholders in isolation. For example, stakeholders commented that improved Reliability would result in fewer Customer Satisfaction issues.

Within the output category of Reliability and Availability, stakeholders’ views were often led by their own backgrounds and roles. The most generally prioritised output in this category was Supply Interruptions (receiving nearly 40% of votes when stakeholders were asked to vote electronically).

Representatives of voluntary groups were disproportionately concerned about how issues relating to Reliability and Availability affected vulnerable customers. Unlike the majority of other stakeholders, they saw looking after those in vulnerable situations as being central to Reliability, highlighting that these people were more dependent on electricity than other customers.

Utilities representatives, however, commented that reducing Supply Interruptions was unachievable without Investment and Innovation. These stakeholders believed that Innovation and New Technologies should be at the heart of SSEN’s approach in the future.

Verbatim comments

“Safety and Reliability and Availability have to be the top priorities. I doubt you could put anything above those in terms of importance.” Government/government body representative
“All of the other categories are worthless unless you have Reliability.”
Developer/connections representative

“Many of these are interconnected. It would be hard to achieve any without achieving the others.” Voluntary sector representative

“Reliability and Safety are pretty high up for me. They’re part and parcel of the same output.” Business representative

“I think Reliability and Availability is a very high priority, because it impacts everything, especially Customer Satisfaction.” Business representative

“If there weren’t any Supply Interruptions in the network you would have no reason to get in touch with SSEN.” Business representative

“Investment should be prioritised over Supply Interruptions in the Reliability category.” Voluntary sector representative

“I would have thought Investment is going to drive the reliability of the network, and then the Supply Interruptions. These are enablers to the rest.” Energy/utility company

“You can’t achieve the other three areas without putting Investment at the top.”
Government/government body representative

“I think the balance between Supply Interruptions and Innovation is about whether you are prepared to suffer in the short-term for long-term benefit. I would suggest that Innovation should be ranked higher than the others.” Developer/connections representative

“My interest is in vulnerability, so Reliability is key. Vulnerable customers are particularly vulnerable when there is an outage, so they need a reliable network.” Voluntary sector representative

“We need to ensure those vulnerable households are protected, so we need to have a reliable network.” Voluntary sector representative

“Investment, Network Readiness and Innovation, and New Technology are all related. I can’t really prioritise one over the others.” Energy/utility company
ENVIRONMENT

Summary

Many stakeholders (unsurprisingly, disproportionately those representing environmental groups) felt strongly that SSEN should put Environment at the heart of everything it does.

In terms of prioritisation of outputs within the Environment category, there was almost no consensus, in part as a result of a lack of understanding of how certain areas, for example Electrical Losses, relate to the environment.

Visual Impact was the most contentious area discussed, with parish council representatives in particular calling on SSEN to prioritise visual amenity in AONBs. Other stakeholders disagreed, arguing that climate change would prove far more destructive to the countryside in the long term. This split was reflected in the voting. Visual Impact received 17% of votes overall, with 50% of parish councillors voting it the most important output area of focus. Interestingly, no environmental representatives voted for it at all.

Reducing Electrical Losses and Sustainable Working were seen as being far more important than Visual Impact by the majority of stakeholders. This became evident when they were asked to vote electronically where these outputs scored 43% and 40%, respectively. The point was made that Electrical Losses had an impact on customers' bills, making it a high priority issue.

Whilst some stakeholders saw Sustainable Working as being of vital importance, others saw it as the by-product of success in other areas, so placed it last when prioritising it. In general, stakeholders found it hard to reach a consensus when asked to rank the three outputs in the Environment category, meaning that their scores across the group as a whole were very similar (ranging from 1.8-2.2). What they could agree on, however, was the inherent interconnectivity of all environmental outputs and the need for SSEN to work together with other organisations and the government to achieve success.
### Verbatim comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“After the basic expectations, Environment is the most important factor. We should appreciate the environment, as stakeholders.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Environmental considerations are driving a lot of the changes.”</td>
<td>Government/government body representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You should try to consider the environmental impact of what you do across all your output categories. For example, you should be asking yourselves; how can we make our Connections processes more environmentally considered?”</td>
<td>Environmental representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Looking after the environment should be non-negotiable really.”</td>
<td>Environmental representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SSEN should make more of an effort to better define what they actually mean by environmental issues.”</td>
<td>Environmental representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think people would be interested in the Environment if they saw reductions in their bills.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Electrical Losses should be prioritised as it impacts on the price of energy.”</td>
<td>Voluntary sector representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Visual Impact is more important than Sustainability as it is one of the last concerns of the customer.”</td>
<td>Voluntary sector representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The one that affects the public the most is Visual Impact.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m from the hospitality industry so the Visual Impact is key for us. People come for the scenery and they come for the parks. It’s the biggest generator of income in Scotland.”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“To me smog and polluted rivers, from not achieving the other areas, is going to have a much worse long-term Visual Impact than simply undergrounding your cables.”</td>
<td>Developer/connections representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Visual Impact is a completely unnecessary issue. In talking about the environment you’re extremely concerned with this trivial issue, but it’s not an environmental issue.”</td>
<td>Environmental representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONNECTIONS

Summary

Connections were not seen as a particularly high priority. Just 3% of stakeholders who attended the workshop viewed it as being the most important output area. Even those stakeholders who work in the sector saw other output areas, such as Reliability and Availability, and Safety, as being more important. One of the reasons for this was because a limited number of people had contact with the company on this issue, and those that did received a high level of service.

In the discussions, Connections Engagement was deemed the most important output in this category. However, when stakeholders were asked to vote electronically, Connections Service and Information Availability scored far more highly. It was commented that these outputs had a greater impact on the quality, cost and timeliness of a new connection.

Stakeholders particularly prioritised Information Availability in terms of transparency. It was felt that there should be a focus on providing all the relevant information to connections customers on SSEN's website.

Verbatim comments

“Their existing connections are at a good standard. Establishing new connections should not be a priority for SSEN.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Connections are the most important to my business, but I recognise that in the bigger picture Reliability is more important.” Energy/utility company

“If the Connections are good, then the Reliability and Availability would be improved. The two are related.” Energy/utility company
“Connections is strongly linked to Customer Satisfaction in terms of developing and improving the network. Having a good connections service is the enabler.” Energy/utility company

“I’m not sure Connections is even an issue. Once in a blue moon customers care about it, then they won’t think about it for years.” Parish councillor

“Connections Service is at the top, because that’s the bread and butter. You need to make the connections to make the network reliable and available to everyone.” Government/government body representative

“Connections Service is more important than Engagement.” Business representative

“Service should be the priority for the Connections, then Information, then Engagement.” Energy/utility company

“Most important is the transparency. People need to have access to all the information they need, when they need it.” Energy/utility company

“I would have thought cost and timescale are the most important part of Service.” Developer/connections representative
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Summary

It was generally felt that SSEN’s Customer Satisfaction is very good, as it currently stands. Because of this, it was consistently seen as the least important output area by stakeholders.

Although stakeholders acknowledged that Customer Satisfaction is important for any business, it was felt that SSEN should maintain its current position, rather than place an increasing focus on it.

As noted earlier, stakeholders felt that high scores in Customer Satisfaction were a by-product of providing a good level of service elsewhere, for example in Reliability. The point was made that most customers will only contact SSEN when there is an interruption, so reducing outages would inevitably have a positive impact on Customer Satisfaction scores. It was also noted that in the North of Scotland power outages are seen as more understandable during the winter than in England, so when there is a supply interruption it receives fewer complaints.

Within the category of Customer Satisfaction, Communication was the most highly prioritised output when stakeholders were asked to vote electronically. This wasn’t the case, however, when they were asked to rank each output in the round table discussions.

When viewing how attendees voted by stakeholder type, Communication was clearly the most important output for those representing consumer bodies and charities. When discussing this topic in the context of Customer Satisfaction, the changing preferences of young people in terms of modes of communication was seen as something which SSEN should be mindful of.

It was commented that both Customer Service Training and Communication are vitally important to Customer Satisfaction. Customers understandably want their issues dealt with promptly and, if this isn’t the case, they expect to be told why.

Verbatim comments

“I think SSEN have a particular good ethos around their customers and there are other things that are more important to focus on. In my experience it’s good as it is.”

Energy/utility company
“Customer Satisfaction is simply a by-product of Safety, and Reliability and Availability, if you get those right, Customer Satisfaction will naturally follow.” Energy/utility company

“If you don’t interrupt, you don’t interact, so your Customer Satisfaction data is only from when there are interruptions.” Business representative

“Your expectation depends on what kind of customer you are. North of Scotland, you understand why there are outages during winter. In England you expect more, and therefore when you are off, you’re concerned after half an hour.” Voluntary sector representative

“As a consumer, it’s all about Customer Satisfaction. If I have a problem I want it dealt with straight away in a timely manner and to a satisfactory standard.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I think it’s probably right to have Communication at the top. People need to know who to contact in an emergency, and when there is a problem they want to know it’s being dealt with.” Charity/voluntary sector representative

“The new generation would want the ease of Communication using the internet in lieu of calling customer service.” Energy/utility company

“Communication is important; keeping people up to date in case of a power cut and in advance of that explaining what they can do if there is going to be a power outage.” Voluntary sector representative

“I would put Customer Service Training at the top with Communication. They’re linked; without the Training, the Communication is pointless.” Government/government body representative

“I suppose we start with the Training because if we get that right, that’s the base for everything to start.” Business representative

“Training and Communication are at the top. There is an awful lot of Customer Service Training that is needed for engineering people. They tend to see the engineering task and not the consequence of that.” Energy/utility company

“Doing things like stakeholder workshops are really important.” Voluntary sector representative
“Stakeholder Engagement should be a priority, as we are benefitting from this right now.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS

Summary

Whilst some stakeholders commented that certain Social Obligations initiatives lay outside the remit of SSEN, the majority were of the view that the company should be socially responsible and should always work to support the more vulnerable in society. In general, stakeholders ranked the Social Obligations output category at the lower end of SSEN’s priorities. However, it should be noted that this is unsurprising as other categories such as Safety and Reliability are seen by most as being central to the core function of an energy network. As a result, when asked to prioritise these categories by voting electronically, only 8% rated Social Obligations as the most important.

Within the Social Obligations output category, almost 40% of stakeholders voted for the Priority Services Register (PSR) as being the most important output, although this wasn’t the case when they were asked to rank each one in the round table discussions. It was commented that maintaining and updating PSR data was crucial and it was added that the numbers of eligible people would only increase due to the UK’s ageing population.

It was commented that Training and Education should be a priority, as this would result in other outputs being efficiently executed. Interestingly, when discussing the outputs in the round table workshops with stakeholders aiming to reach a consensus, Training and Education, and Partnerships and Resilience were ranked the highest priority areas, but when stakeholders voted on these individually, they came out bottom.

Verbatim comments

“Social Obligations should be prioritised over Environment. We largely have clean energy in Scotland, therefore we should protect society.” Voluntary sector representative

“Social Obligations matter more to SSEN than other DNOs because of their isolated island customers.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
“SSEN have a responsibility to help vulnerable customers, especially in outages.”
Voluntary sector representative

“I think any large company has a social responsibility. If the government isn’t taking responsibility, then the large companies should do.” Business representative

“It’s below the core business in importance and below things like safety of employees.”
Business representative

“I’d put Vulnerability at the top. That’s the prime action within Social Obligations: making sure vulnerable customers have the best levels of support they can get.”
Government/government body representative

“If I had to choose one, I’d put the PSR at the top because that’s the key element that allows us to engage with vulnerable customers.” Voluntary sector representative

“Gathering data from the PSR is essential; must come first.” Energy/utility company

“I suppose the challenge is that there are more and more customers that are eligible for the PSR and this is only going to rise.” Developer/connections representative

“Partnerships and Resilience shouldn’t be prioritised over the PSR. SSEN should focus on Vulnerability, and Training and Education.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I wouldn’t belittle any of the priorities. However, I think that Partnerships and Resilience is not as important as the others, as it is used much less and depended on less than the others.” Voluntary sector representative
SAFETY

Summary

Safety was generally seen by stakeholders as being an important priority for SSEN. The point was made a number of times that the company works with contractors and other companies where staff safety was dependent on the Safety precautions taken by SSEN.

In the round table discussions, when asked to rank all of the company’s output categories the stakeholders ranked Safety most highly. However, when they voted electronically, it was rated second behind Reliability and Availability, with just under one third of attendees stating that it was SSEN’s most important priority area. Those stakeholders representing infrastructure companies and utilities representatives were particularly keen that SSEN view Safety as the most important priority area, with almost 90% saying that it was the most important. Very few people ranked Safety lower than second.

Within the Safety category, there was a broad consensus that Network Safety and Safety Training were equally important areas on which to focus (with 46% and 43% of the vote respectively). Community Engagement was deemed of high importance in terms of output when stakeholders discussed this at their tables. However, only 11% rated it more highly than Network Safety and Safety training, when they were asked to vote electronically.

One issue that was very topical at the time of the workshop was cyber security. It was commented that SSEN needs to have a plan in place for dealing with any cyber-attacks.

Verbatim comments

“Safety has got to be the highest priority for the networks: lowering the risk to those who operate on it and the risk to customers.” Energy/utility company

“I think you’ve got to have Reliability and Safety at the top. Those two should be a given.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I think we would always put Safety right at the top. That’s non-negotiable”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety should always be the priority; our employees depend on it.”</td>
<td>Developer connections representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It depends from what position you’re looking at it. From where I sit Safety is up there, but as a consumer, I don’t know.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The consumer doesn’t care about Safety as it’s not something that is visible to them, because it’s a given.”</td>
<td>Parish councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Network Safety is my priority. The other things are important, but less so.”</td>
<td>Developer/connections representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Safety Training should be below the Network’s Safety, as it would ensure the safety of the workers whilst completing projects.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Priority should be for Safety Training.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Community Engagement is an important aspect. However, Network Safety and Safety Training are more of a priority.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The staff and contractors are exposed to the risk every day, and all energy companies need to get out the message about how much money and time is spent to ensure this kind of safety.”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Another issue is cyber security; the network is an extremely vulnerable target. This might be an issue of new technologies.”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cyber security needs to be considered here, especially in collaboration with essential institutions such as the NHS.”</td>
<td>Environmental representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKSHOP THREE: SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS

PART ONE: THE PRIORITY SERVICES REGISTER (PSR)

Summary

Almost half of the stakeholders who attended the workshops had little or no knowledge of the PSR, including almost all who came from an infrastructure/engineering background. Almost a quarter stated that they didn’t know anyone who would be eligible. This indicates that more needs to be done to publicise and promote the PSR to customers.

There was much disagreement amongst stakeholders over the need to add an additional (PSR1+) category, both for those with critical needs and for those with multiple needs.

Some stakeholders argued that the extra category would enable SSEN to focus more specifically on targeting people’s needs. However, others believed that the PSR1+ would undermine the care given for those who have only one eligibility or to those who have less obvious vulnerabilities.

In general, PSR1+ faced less opposition for its inclusion as a category for critical vulnerabilities than as a category for multiple vulnerabilities (7% disagreed with the former, 29% with the latter). Many people questioned whether the addition of an extra category of care would simply reduce the level of assistance received by those not defined as critical. Indeed, some stakeholders felt that the PSR is already too broad, especially given the UK’s ageing population. It was also felt that adding more categories might make the PSR less meaningful in terms of quality of care and assistance.
More basically, there was a concern as to where these additional resources for PSR1+ would come from. In the end, there was little consensus on this matter with a third of stakeholders taking a neutral view on this when voting electronically.

In terms of the roll out of the PSR, 81% of stakeholders agreed that certain geographic areas of concentrated vulnerability should be targeted. Although there was agreement that the company should target promoting the PSR in areas where the need is greatest, there was some question over whether SSEN was adequately considering its financial capability to take on all of those who are eligible.

Where flaws were highlighted in the method of targeting areas of vulnerability, they focused on the idea of the PSR becoming a ‘postcode lottery’ and on the fairness of one group of vulnerable customers ‘subsidising’ another simply because of where they lived. Dissent especially came from government and government body representatives, who highlighted that a holistic approach, regardless of location, would be more appropriate.

The area of greatest controversy surrounded who would qualify as PSR1+. Some members of the group called for other medical needs to be added to the PSR1+ list, highlighting those who need hoists and nebulisers, and there was acknowledgement of the difficulty of taking a nuanced approach towards mental health issues. Moreover, several stakeholders agreed that a better solution than creating another category was to put greater emphasis on local management of situations (storms, floods or faults) when outages occur and ensuring that everyone on the PSR is contacted as soon as possible, including by designated partners.
1. Do you think we should promote the PSR to areas we know most eligible customers live – even if they aren’t PSR1? Or do you think we should carry on promoting the PSR equally to all customers, regardless of location or priority?

Verbatim comments

“Whether they’re PSR1 or PSR1+, they should be contacted as soon as possible in the event of a power cut.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“If there was an immediate need for electricity then yes, these identified groups should be the first to be helped.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I think it’s very well categorised as it is.” Business representative

“It seems sensible to prioritise certain areas really, as long as the data is accurate.” Charity/voluntary sector representative

“I think the most efficient way to address this is to work with partners.” Energy/utility company

“I’m not sure I agree with that approach [to target certain areas]. It could be more efficient, but I think you have an obligation to deal with everyone irrespective of where they live. If that needs more money, then that money should be spent.” Government/government body representative

“If you prioritise people in this way you’re in danger of creating a new emergency service. This might give people too high expectations of SSEN’s capabilities.” Business representative

“If you look at the areas that are geographically known to be deprived or vulnerable, you could isolate those who are in desperate need of help.” Voluntary sector representative
“It will become a postcode lottery.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Direct resources to the neediest. Able-bodied customers shouldn’t be prioritised.” Energy/utility company

“If everyone signed up for the register who is eligible, could you really supply that enormous demand? Do you actually have the capabilities to put more people on the register?” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I think if you make these things too big and broad they become meaningless. If you want to provide meaningful assistance, then I think you should engage with the councils.” Business representative

2. Do you think we should focus more on promoting the PSR to PSR1 customers?

We should focus more on promoting the Priority Services Register to PSR1 customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim comments

“I think that all customers on the PSR should be contacted in the event of an emergency. At least half of frontline workers we speak to are unaware of PSR. This should be promoted generally and nationwide. SSEN should empower frontline workers who can help reach out to those who would not otherwise be contacted.” Voluntary sector representative

“It’s all about knowledge and context. For example, some people may rely heavily on their next door neighbour.” Business representative

“I think you should target people where there’s the highest need. The difficulty is vulnerability and the characteristics that make people eligible are not tangible, especially from a fuel poverty side.” Voluntary sector representative
“I had a relative who was category one, and I told my in-laws about it. Not one person in the health service told him about the PSR. It was lucky I was in the industry.” Voluntary sector representative

3. Do you believe SSEN should create an additional PSR category of PSR1+ for customers thought to be at highest risk when without electricity? (Or should we leave things as they are?)

We should create an additional PSR category of PSR1+ for customers thought to be at highest risk

- Strongly agree: 32%
- Agree: 39%
- Neutral: 22%
- Disagree: 7%
- Strongly disagree: 0%

Verbatim comments

“PSR1+ is a great idea. It identifies those who would be in immediate danger.” Voluntary sector representative

“It’s a big demand, because it’s all labour focused. To support people you have to go straight to their premises, which can be lengthy and time consuming.” Developer/connections representative

“I suppose the question is: is there a better way of doing a disaster recovery plan? For example, do you employ key points of contact in more remote areas to ensure the information is disseminated quicker and more effectively there?” Energy/utility company

“PSR1+ should be created as it would identify those who need help the most.” Developer/connections representative

“PSR1+ should be extended to those who require a hoist and a nebuliser as well, as they will also need immediate help.” Developer/connections representative

“Short interruptions can have a big effect. SSEN shouldn’t just focus on longer electrical interruptions, but investigate how short, frequent electrical interruptions can affect the vulnerable customers.” Government/government body representative
“If you’re in PSR1+, I can’t see that it would be any different than the response for other categories.” Developer/connections representative
“I don’t know if there’s something that is so critical that you need a separate category for it.” Developer/connections representative

“One of the challenges you have is that it is getting too broad. This is going to cost a lot of money, especially as the population ages.” Energy/utility company

“It’s a case of what different resources do you put into PSR1+ and PSR1, and how you dedicate those different resources.” Government/government body representative

4. Do you think we should create an additional PSR category of PSR1+ for customers with more than one PSR1 eligibility? (Or should we leave things as they are?)

Verbatim comments

“What benefit would there be to the PSR1+? Would it just mean that others wouldn’t get as good a level of service – because that is unacceptable. You have a duty of service. If you can’t keep promises, why make them at all?” Energy/utility company

“There has to be promises, but you shouldn’t over-promise or over-stretch yourselves.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“If you’re already meeting demand with PSR1, why do you need to add the PSR1+? If you haven’t already been in a situation where the current system of categorisation has failed, why do you need to expand that?” Environmental representative
“I think having a PSR1+ category is simple, and easy to present. It would give you a system of priority. A temporal solution.” Government/government body representative

“Mental health is so broad – it’s important to include it [in your categorisation], but where, I don’t know. There are so many different issues to consider.” Voluntary sector representative

“You’re doing the right thing, but who you prioritise isn’t your job, it’s healthcare’s.” Developer/connections representative
PART TWO: COMMUNITY RESILIENCE FUNDING

Summary

In general, stakeholders agreed that it was a good idea to prioritise community funding to more geographically isolated areas, as rural customers are less accessible to emergency services.

Stakeholders were also in agreement that SSEN should utilise the knowledge base of local authorities to ensure that isolated communities members are not left out when funding is allocated. It was, however, commented that remote communities are not necessarily the poorest. The point was made that urban communities can often be more socially, rather than geographically, isolated. Notwithstanding, when resilience projects in towns and cities were specifically suggested, they proved significantly less popular than those in more isolated, rural areas. This was reflected in the voting where 57% of stakeholders supported prioritising isolated areas, but only 23% supported approaching urban areas this way. Stakeholders seemed suspicious of prioritising town and city-based projects and emphasised using new techniques and sophisticated mapping to categorise communities more accurately. There was a definite emphasis on strategic funding being used to make vulnerable communities more self-sufficient and resilient. The group agreed that SSEN should prioritise these projects, but encouraged the company to collaborate with other networks and associations to provide this help, suggesting that SSEN engage with community councils and residents’ associations to find out the best way to help vulnerable communities. In fact, local authorities, NGOs and environmental representatives were most positive towards the policy, none of whom voted against using funding in this way.

More than three quarters of stakeholders agreed that funding should be prioritised for vulnerable groups in areas that might not be as accessible for emergency services. It was, however, noted that remote and isolated areas are actually the most resilient, as they expect to experience power cuts. Therefore, funding should be used in a different way for these communities: to strategically reinforce this self-reliance and reduce power outages, rather than improve the response time to loss of power.

The least prioritised areas were those local to transmission development works. Only 7% agreed that these should be an area of focus. It was seen by some that this is more of a PR exercise to keep neighbours on board, rather than indicating a true need for funding.

There was a strong belief among stakeholders (71%, when voting electronically) that those who have not yet received funding should be prioritised. Stakeholders also agreed that it is important for SSEN to recognise that not all vulnerable communities have strong community...
groups that know of the existence of this funding. It was added that SSEN needs to identify communities without this access and actively reach out to them.

After these long discussions as to which communities were the most vulnerable, around the tables there was a strong negative response to a generalised programme of increased resilience across the network. Yet, when it came to voting, 46% of stakeholders voted in agreement with the idea.

Few stakeholders got around to discussing seed funding for communities, so whilst some negative responses were recorded, this was by no means the opinion of all stakeholders. Indeed, 39% voted neutrally on the policy.

1. Should SSEN prioritise projects which support communities who are particularly remote or isolated and have experienced emergency events due to poor weather?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of stakeholders who strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree with prioritising projects for remote or isolated communities affected by poor weather.]

Verbatim comments

“You need to be able to reach those people really in need within those short timescales.” Voluntary sector representative

“We should be prioritising communities that you have identified as being more likely to be eligible to be on the PSR.” Environmental representative

“People who live remotely are actually less impacted. Actually, rural communities tend to be more resilient. If they’ve chosen that life for themselves, they’re usually fine.” Developer/connections representative
“Community councils are a great way of reaching out into communities. No one understands the local community more than the community council.” Business representative

“I think community councils are even more important in rural areas, especially with elderly people and vulnerable customers. The councils will know about them and know how to reach and connect with them.” Government/government body representative

2. Should SSEN prioritise town and city-based projects which show innovative approaches to building resilience?

![Pie chart showing opinion on town and city-based projects]

Verbatim comments

“Urban communities can be very isolated. In the rural area where I live we rely on our neighbours, that’s where the PSR comes in.” Voluntary sector representative

“I’d have thought that those in remote areas would be the most resilient.” Housing representative

“Funding should be directed to, and allocated to, those who will benefit most, irrespective of where they live.” Government/government body representative

“There are two factors: resilience in the network and resilience in the communities. Both of these are important.” Energy/utility company
3. Should SSEN prioritise projects which demonstrate innovative approaches to improving the resilience of vulnerable community members?

Verbatim comments

“As long as SSEN concentrates their resources to ensure the protection of the most vulnerable, then I’m in favour. I don’t think it’s down to whether these are innovative or not.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Protection for those on the PSR should not be the sole responsibility of SSEN, but should be a collaboration between services.” Voluntary sector representative

4. Should SSEN prioritise projects which support areas where it can be difficult for emergency services to respond to?

Verbatim comments
“If you live on an island, you will be resilient by nature. These people are more alive to the risks.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“People living in these areas are much more at risk, and you can’t get services to them immediately, so some resource needs to be put there, especially for vulnerable or disabled customers.” Government/government body representative

“Yes, SSEN should support projects that are the most threatened by power cuts.” Government/government body representative

“If you’re responding to the needs of your customers, going above and beyond should be a priority.” Government/government body representative

“There are remote areas that are wealthy and those that aren’t. They aren’t all the same, so you should consider it by wealth.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
5. Should SSEN prioritise communities which are local to our transmission development works?

![Community Priority Pie Chart]

Verbatim comments

“Prioritising communities affected by transmission development work would be a PR job, not necessarily benefitting those who are vulnerable.” Energy/utility company

6. Should SSEN prioritise projects from areas which have not applied before and have been identified as having especially low resilience?

![Project Prioritisation Pie Chart]

Verbatim comments

“SSEN needs to look into who has less access to applications.” Charity/voluntary sector representative
“SSEN needs to try to communicate with any community groups that aren’t reaching out themselves. The company needs to be doing more active outreach to these less engaged community groups.” Charity/voluntary sector representative

“You should advertise more to those who haven’t yet received funding and haven’t yet increased the resilience within their communities.” Government/government body representative

“Those who receive more funding are likely to be more adept at filling out the forms and applying for funds. Therefore, we should prioritise those who don’t have the same resources within their communities which may have impaired their ability to successfully receive assistance from the community fund.” Energy/utility company

7. Should SSEN prioritise projects which improve resilience across the whole distribution area?

![Pie chart showing responses to the question.]

Verbatim comments

“Resources are not unlimited. You should concentrate the funding on areas deemed more vulnerable.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
8. Should SSEN prioritise projects which require seed funding for community energy projects?

Projects which require seed funding for community energy projects should be prioritised for community funding

- Strongly agree 10%
- Agree 17%
- Neutral 39%
- Disagree 19%
- Strongly disagree 15%

Verbatim comments

“We spend a lot of time in remote communities. When their power goes down they’re not that fussed by it. They’ve grown their own resilience, their own emergency sources of power.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
WORKSHOP FOUR: THE TRANSITION TO DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OPERATOR

Summary

The point was made that, inevitably, those people who would be most interested in the transition to DSO would be the most well-informed and potentially the most affluent. However, stakeholders firmly believed that vulnerable customers should not be disproportionately impacted and it was suggested that increased engagement with groups representing those customers would be vital.

More tangibly, the idea of social tariffs was raised, to help support the vulnerable in the future. Stakeholders were particularly in favour of smart meters, but made the point that simplicity is needed when introducing new technology to the public, especially the vulnerable. Educating customers on how to use these technologies was also seen as a way to increase the take-up of smart meters. Similarly, teaching the public about the wider transition to DSO was cited as a method of bringing more people on board.

There was consensus from stakeholders that SSEN should be drawing on external expertise in order to make the DSO transition more accessible for customers. It was recommended that SSEN engage with the government to ensure that the appropriate regulation is in place and that it is supportive and inclusive. It was also noted that there should be increased engagement with local authorities and representatives of consumer groups. In addition, stakeholders commented that reaching out to housing associations would be vital, as they have knowledge of vulnerable customers.

When it came to the distributed network, stakeholders were largely aware of the opportunities that smart grids offer, highlighting that they would reduce costs by reducing energy loss. There was a particularly positive attitude to their impact on increasing sustainability and reducing the visual impact of the grid. There were a couple of concerns raised, as well, including the need for transparency in their costs.
1. How do we ensure vulnerable customers aren’t left behind in the transition to DSO?

**Verbatim comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The people who would be interested in the transition to DSO are the well-informed. But, those in social housing, with no EV, how you would bring those people along?”</td>
<td>Government/government body representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“People who suffer from fuel poverty tend to be on pay per unit meters where the cost of electricity tends to be more, and that’s even before you’ve got to energy efficient housing. Socially conscious suppliers should be offering socially conscious tariffs to get better prices.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There’s an opportunity for energy suppliers to have a much deeper relationship with customers.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They should be focusing on getting information to the vulnerable first. Benefitting rural customers and following that first.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Smart metering needs to be being rolled out as standard across boards.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You need smart meters to be as simple as possible; it needs to be accessible to older audiences, ones you’ve probably identified as vulnerable.”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“People aren’t switching to alternative potentially cheaper suppliers because it’s too much hassle.”</td>
<td>Parish councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“DSO equipment should be transferable across companies to make the system more accessible and easier to use.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It leads back to educational and generational issues. The kids are being educated, but the adults are the ones who decide how the house is run and they aren’t even installing LED lights.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s cheaper to educate the customers to reduce their consumption then it is to install the infrastructure yourselves.”</td>
<td>Charity/voluntary sector representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“SSEN should ensure that everyone understands the benefits of network investments.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Suppliers and smart meters could be more accessible and transparent, they might make it easier for vulnerable customers to transition to and understand DSO.”

Government/government body representative

2. Who should we work with to ensure this isn’t the case?

Verbatim comments

“I’d imagine there would be a lot of vulnerable groups and it’s important to get their input. I think it’s about engaging with local groups and lobbying the government to find where the money will come from. Why should they be paying for charging stations when they can’t afford a car?” Developer/connections representative

“You have to have organisations that have a big reach, like housing associations.” Government/government body representative

“It’s very difficult for energy companies to self-regulate on this level, and there’s a role for the government to be part of this.” Business representative

“There’s a political will for tighter regulation, which has to be supportive rather than restrictive. It’s not often highlighted or promoted how to keep costs low and be efficient with money.” Developer/connections representative

“The government should target subsidies and make them more accessible to allow vulnerable groups to use the systems in place.” Voluntary sector representative
3. Are you aware of the opportunities that smart grids may offer?

**Verbatim comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Smart grids will be able to reduce costs to stakeholders and consumers.”</td>
<td>Government/government body representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Smart solutions reduce the loss of electricity, reducing costs to customers.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Smart grids can reduce the visual impact and increase the sustainability of the electricity network, which is beneficial to the customer.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Smart grids cannot be enacted without transparency across stakeholders.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Opportunities for local generation, opportunities for storage tracking pricing so you can buy electricity at a lower price; these would benefit our customer base.”</td>
<td>Voluntary sector representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What does that mean for vulnerable people? They can’t afford to invest in renewables. How can they access new technologies?”</td>
<td>Voluntary sector representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Peer to peer demand is interesting.”</td>
<td>Energy/utility company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELECTRONIC VOTING:

Following today's presentation, Q&A, and roundtable discussion, on a scale of 1 - 10, my knowledge of the transition to DSO has improved:

- Nine: 3%
- Ten: 8%
- One: 3%
- Two: 3%
- Three: 6%
- Four: 11%
- Five: 28%
- Six: 8%
- Seven: 11%
- Eight: 19%
WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

Q1: Overall, how interesting did you find the workshop to be?

- Not interesting: 0%
- Interesting: 28%
- Very Interesting: 72%

Q2: Did you feel that you had the opportunity to make your points and ask questions?

- Disagree, 0%
- Agree, 58%
- Strongly Agree, 42%
- Strongly Disagree, 0%

Comments:

- “The electronic voting was a useful tool, to estimate other peoples' views.”
- “Could have taken longer to discuss certain subjects – bit rushed. Possibility extend length of sessions.”
- “Very helpful to have a dedicated facilitator.”
- “The session was really well structured. Great discussion.”
Q3: Did we cover the right topics for you on the day?

Comments:
- “Social Obligations topic was really interesting and found information most informative. DSO transition really interesting.”
- “I feel the topics were relevant, but the questions asked were not key, i.e. not for a stakeholder to decide on the individual needs of the vulnerable.”
- “Content very good, and more on DSO would be useful.”
- “I think I was expecting more on DSO in particular – this had the most discussion in the round table.”

Q4: Which of the following topics do you think we should be focusing on in the future?

Other suggestions:
- “DSO Transition” – mentioned three times.
- “Fuel poverty”
- “Emergency security”
Q5: What did you think of the venue?

Comments:

- “Convenient and comfortable.”
- “Central and good transport links.”
- “Queue for toilets.”

Q6: What did you think of the way the workshop was chaired by your facilitator?

Comments:

- “Excellent facilitation, interactive feedback was great.”
- “Kept going – but pace a little fast at times. Maybe slightly longer. Overall, it was well calculated.”
- “Encouraged discussion, kept things moving and listened to what everyone wants to say.”
- “Workshops flowed very well.”
Q7: Any other comments?

- “I would be keen to hear more about the electric vehicle charging.”
- “Value the effort of SSEN to engage with stakeholders. Agenda at the time when the invitation was sent out would have been useful.”
- “Slightly more time for DSO discussion.”

Q8: Would you like to receive our post-event report and invites to similar events in the future?

Yes 94%
No 6%