INTRODUCTION

On 20th March 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 Distribution.

STAKEHOLDERS’ EXPERIENCE OF WORKING WITH US

- Stakeholders are broadly complimentary of SSEN. There was praise for the company’s knowledge base and for the way it engages with its stakeholders.
- Where issues were highlighted, these tended to focus on communications. The point was made that it is not always as easy as it could be to contact the right member of staff. It was also noted that there is a perceived lack of standardisation in processes.

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 have led to the creation of 110 commitments under six output areas: Reliability and Availability, Environment, Connections, Customer Satisfaction, Social Obligations and Safety.

![Pie chart showing the prioritization of SSEN's Business Plan Commitments]

- Stakeholders overwhelmingly cited Reliability and Availability as the most important of all SSEN’s Business Plan Commitments, followed by Safety. Whilst other categories...
such as Social Obligations they were not deemed to be central to the company’s core activities. It was also noted that levels of satisfaction would be improved if other areas, such as reliability were addressed.

- In the Reliability and Availability category, Supply Interruptions was seen as the most important output, when stakeholders were asked to vote electronically.
- Under Environment, Sustainable Working was seen as the most important output, followed closely by Electrical Losses.
- The most important Connections output voted by stakeholders was Information Availability. The point was made that accurate information that is easy to find is essential for Connections customers to help them plan.
- Stakeholders valued Communication as the most important output in the Customer Satisfaction category, by some margin.
- In the Social Obligations output category, Focus on Vulnerability was seen by stakeholders as being the most important output, followed by the Priority Services Register.
- Network Safety was seen as being the most important output in the safety category, although some commented that Safety ought to be a given, rather than a specific area of focus.

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.

- Half of those who attended the workshop felt that SSEN should promote the PSR to areas where they know most eligible customers live. However, the same number also felt that the company should promote the PSR equally to all customers irrespective of the location or priority.
- There was little consensus on the idea of creating a new PSR1+ category when the idea was discussed. It was felt that this may actually made the system more complex. However, when asked to vote on this almost two thirds said they would be in favour of this.
• Over two thirds of stakeholders were of the view that communities in remote and isolated areas should be prioritised for Community Resilience Funding.
• It was noted that people living in urban areas, as well as less affluent communities should be prioritised for Community Resilience Funding. It was commented that often these people do not have well established community networks and may not even know of the funding that is available. Stakeholders felt that these people should not be left out.

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 Distribution will change from that of a 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 more should be done to ensure that the vulnerable and less affluent are not left behind by the transition to DSO. It was commented that Government and regulatory intervention would be needed to ensure that this is the case.
• Stakeholders felt that working in partnership was essential in order to promote and educate customers on the transition and to DSO. It was also noted that working collaboratively with planners, developers and housing associations would be needed to ensure that new technologies are incorporated into new housing developments from the outset.

WRITTEN FEEDBACK

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

• 39% of attendees who filled out a feedback form told us that they found the workshop ‘very interesting’ and 61% said they found it ‘interesting’.
• 91% of attendees agreed or strongly agreed that we covered the right topics on the day.
• 97% thought EQ Communications’ facilitation was ‘very good’ or ‘good’.
• 88% wished to receive the post-event report and would be interested in attending similar events in the future.
ATTENDEES

A total of 35 stakeholders attended the workshop, representing 34 companies. The companies represented on the day are shown below:

- Aggreko UK Ltd
- AMCO
- Arun District Council
- Cadent Ltd
- Community Council for Berkshire (CCB)
- DistGen
- Distributed Generation Ltd
- Dummer Parish Council
- EDF Energy
- EFACEC Energia
- Engage Consulting
- Gloucestershire County Council
- Grayshott Parish Council
- Groundwork South
- Holme Infrastructure Projects Ltd
- Lucy Electric
- Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Europe Ltd
- National Energy Action
- NRSWA Ltd
- PA Consulting
- Reading Borough Council
- Schneider Electric
- Skanska
- Southern Water
- T H WHITE
- TE Connectivity
- TH White Installation Ltd
- Thames Water
- The Schools Energy Project
- Thames Valley Police
- Upton Grey Parish Council
- Warm Zones
- Welsh Power
- WSP
What type of stakeholder are you?

- Housing development: 22%
- Charity-non profit organisation: 19%
- Energy-utility company: 38%
- Local authority officer-elected representative: 16%
- Business customer: 6%
WORKSHOP ONE: YOUR EXPERIENCE OF WORKING WITH SSEN

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

Summary

There was a largely positive feeling towards SSEN from stakeholders, especially in regard to the quality of technical assistance the company gives. Broadly speaking, stakeholders felt that SSEN is one of the better DNOs to work with and their staff are seen as approachable and knowledgeable.

There was also praise for some of SSEN’s innovation, especially their online application grid and mapping programmes, which were seen as very accessible and useful. Moreover, several stakeholders shared positive feelings towards SSEN’s dedication to social obligations.

Where problems were highlighted, these tended to focus on communications. It was commented that the advice the company gives is good, but that it is not always easy to get in touch with the right person. This was repeated across every table with domestic customers explaining that they had problems getting through to call centres during outages, and utility customers needing improved communication from control centres.

There was complaint about the lack of a standardised process (both within the company and across all DNOs), suggesting that the experience of working with SSEN greatly varied with regards to speed and quality according to who they were talking to.

There were some specific areas for improvement cited by stakeholders who had worked with other DNOs. UKPN was highlighted as having a more efficient process for submitting tenders. Stakeholders also welcomed the company’s communications and use of key account managers for larger customers. It was felt that this is something SSEN should look to emulate.

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

Verbatim comments

“No problems at all really.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I’ve always had a positive relationship with SSEN, I’ve sat on the panel for the community fund and I think they’re fantastic at engaging stakeholders and taking feedback.” Voluntary sector representative
“There's a mapping tool which SSEN has, it's fantastic.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“SSE have introduced a grid online application platform which is better for tracking in real time, compared to previously. You can now see if it’s with the contracts manager, which is quite good, you can see where it is on the timescale.” Developer/connections representative

“They are one of the more progressive DNOs, in terms of innovation.” Business representative

“They deal with people who are in debt and talk to them. I was very impressed with them, given that they are an electricity supplier.” Council officer

“Our power supply is like that of the Outer Hebrides. We have had several significant breaks in the last few years. A couple of times, our village has been out for the week. It’s disastrous. We've had people on dialysis impacted. We need fail-safes for when GSM doesn't work.” Parish/community council representative

“It took about 12 months at SSE for me to find the right person.” Local authority representative

“It’s getting hold of people that’s a problem. You are stretched thin with staff with certain technologies. In fact, you are more stretched than you should be.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Communications are key. We are also a big service supplier and we have a big customer portal. You can find the status of a project or book services. It would be an idea for SSEN to have a system like that. It’s a way to find out simple updates and deadlines.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“We have been trying to get in touch with the connections expert, but it is a real issue. You should have a designated contact; even if they aren’t an expert, they can be a designated conduit to an expert.” Developer/connections representative

“We haven’t had any problems with this cold weather, but at Christmas you had power outages that affected our assets and we had problems contacting you.” Energy/utilities company

“We wanted to know how to upgrade our network supply on a particular line and it was just misery, trying to get the right response.” Development/connections representative
“Communication is not as good as it has been pre-RIIO – five years ago we might have had better visibility, now we have to submit a tender within two weeks of receiving it for a job that may be starting in a month.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“It makes it challenging that you don’t follow a set path in coming to a project execution. Depending on who you work with within the company it can be a completely different process and experience.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“My only interaction is really when things go wrong. Smart meters are a big thing, but there are some areas of my villages where there isn’t any phone signal. They came to try to fit it and they can’t.” Parish/community council representative
3. Are there any examples of good practice from other companies that SSEN ought to emulate?

Verbatim comments

“I hold quarterly meetings with UK Power Networks and I have an account manager and that proves really useful; we tend to engage with the DNO in a period of crisis. To be able to have one point of contact is really, really useful to me and to be able to have those quarterly meetings and have an agenda is useful. That’s what I’m getting from UKPN, but not SSE.” Energy/utilities company

“All DNOs were isolated and didn’t understand each other’s processes, but I’ve found in the last four years everyone has upped their game. Across the board the industry is much more on top of things than they were.” Energy/utilities company

“Out of the DNOs, they are still the best. It’s from an ICP perspective.” Developer/connections representative

“We work with all of the DNOs in the UK, but SSEN’s service is special, they have provided a very warm relationship.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Have a project manager or a salesman to deal with a specific enquiry.” Development/connections representative

“I’ve found them generally very good, on the connections side, but I agree that across the board the whole DNO industry has massively improved.” Housing representative

“WPD explained ICPs and DNOs, they made it seem very simple getting that information.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I’ve been dealing with yourselves for new connections, you’re one of the three DNOs we deal with in our Council, and we have a lot of trouble communicating with you.” Local authority representative
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, Reliability and Availability was the top priority for stakeholders, while Safety ranked second.
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, Investment, Visual Impact, Connections Engagement, Partnerships and Assurance, Partnerships and Resilience, and Community Engagement were, on average, placed at the highest position of each of their respective categories.
RELIABILITY AND AVAILABILITY

Summary

There was a consensus that Reliability and Availability was the most important output category for SSEN to focus on, largely because of the many ways in which it relates to other areas. When asked to vote on the six output categories, more than half stated that it was the most important. It was commented that if Reliability improved, this would improve Customer Satisfaction.

Similarly, interconnectivity with the Environment category was noted due to the fact that climate change will inevitably result in more bad weather, making Reliability essential. It was also felt that the perceived unreliability of new, greener technologies would need to be addressed by a more stable and resilient grid. In addition, it was noted that the move to electric vehicles would put significant strain on the network. There were a few stakeholders, however, who did highlight that there may come a point where making small gains in Reliability would cost too significant an amount of money to be worthwhile.

Almost 40% of stakeholders who voted electronically saw Supply Interruptions as being the most important output. This was not the case, however, when stakeholders were asked to rank each output in the discussion sessions where Investment was deemed the most important output.

Stakeholders believed that Supply Interruptions were simply unacceptable to consumers and, as the heart of SSEN’s purpose, should be the first to be addressed. New Technologies, Investment and Network Readiness were seen as similarly important when stakeholders voted electronically, all hovering at around 20% of the vote. This was reflected in discussions, where the emphasis again rested on the interconnected nature of the areas and the need to tackle them all to improve availability. The long-term integration of new technologies was highlighted as particularly important to address, but their vulnerability to hacking was seen as a significant disadvantage.
## Verbatim comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Organization/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Reliability and Availability feeds into everything.”</td>
<td>Housing representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If you get Reliability right, Customer Satisfaction will follow on.”</td>
<td>Energy/utilities company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“As a consumer, Reliability and Availability has to be top, you need electricity as and when you need it, always.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No DNO has 100% reliability; if you set that as the target you’re never going to achieve it.”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The nearer you get to 100% reliability the more you have to spend, and it might not be worth the money for small gains.”</td>
<td>Development/connections representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s all about value for money, if it’s going to cost several million pounds to make the network more reliable, that money might be better spent on a campaign to help people use the networks at different times.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Green technologies are unreliable in themselves, so the greener you are, the more difficult it becomes, hence Reliability needs to be right at the top to understand how you’re going to manage it.”</td>
<td>Energy/utilities company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The climate is the biggest existential threat that the whole of civilisation has got. In the context of the company, I would still say that Reliability is very important, you have to make a stable grid to support the move to low carbon.”</td>
<td>Infrastructure/engineering representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We will need a ridiculous amount of power for electric cars.”</td>
<td>Local authority representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You need as much reliability as possible; we are only going to get more Beasts from the East.”</td>
<td>Business representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“People shouldn’t get cut off, people shouldn’t be left on their own. You should use your network to reduce Supply Interruptions.”</td>
<td>Voluntary group representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You need to make sure Supply Interruptions don’t happen in the first place.”</td>
<td>Local authority representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Supply Interruptions should be top, but New Technology would help with that. And you can’t divorce that from Investment because that’s the means to deliver technology.” Energy/utilities company

“Without Investment you can’t prepare Network Readiness for the future.” Local authority representative

“They’re all in a circle, they’re connected. You can’t put one above the other.” Council officer
ENVIRONMENT

Summary

Stakeholders saw the Environment as integral to future planning and reliability, arguing that climate change will have to be addressed at some point, whether now or in the future. It was not seen as quite so central to SSEN’s purpose as Reliability and Safety, but was still placed as the third most important area, with 12% of the vote. Where it was criticised, stakeholders highlighted that there is an element of futility to environmental policy, where no matter how hard SSEN tries, it cannot wholly solve any environmental problems.

Sustainable Working was the forerunner in terms of outputs in this category, followed closely by Electrical Losses. Both were supported by stakeholders for their impact on long-term sustainability, especially concerning new technologies and their potential effect on lowering bills.

Visual Impact was the most contentious area overall. It was not deemed a high priority when stakeholders were asked to vote electronically, although 40% of those representing the business community saw it as one of the top two most important outputs in this category. It was, however, commented that undergrounding cables for purely aesthetic reasons (rather than to improve reliability) should not be a high priority for the company, especially as people have become more accepting of wind turbines and solar parks.

Verbatim comments

“Environment has to go with Reliability and Availability because if we don’t deal with it now there’s going to come a point where it’s even harder to fix.” Emergency services representative

“The difference between some of these things is that even if the DNO improves, they can’t fix the Environment, but they can improve Reliability.” Business representative

“Environment is there, but not as big as keeping the lights on which is what they’re there for.” Business representative
“So, this output is the company itself running its buildings and offices and transport, rather than making an environmental policy as a DSO? That’s just cosmetic, it’s not enough.” Voluntary sector representative

“I would go for Electrical Losses at number one; it can save money and save environmental impact.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Visual Impact should be down the bottom.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“There are so many more things that are so important, Visual Impact just isn’t an environmental issue, why is it in this category?” Voluntary sector representative

“For me and the area I represent, it’s all about overhead cables. It would look a lot better if we didn’t have that and it would make it easier for farmers. We’re quite rural so power outages are often caused by trees coming down and knocking cables.” Parish/community council representative

“Undergrounding cables does make the cables more resilient, but in general if it’s purely aesthetic then I agree, it’s not an issue.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“When you do undergrounding of lines in one place, the losses go up and the cost of energy goes up for everyone, even in areas without undergrounding.” Business representative

“Most people are accepting of wind turbines and solar parks as part of the landscape. So, the Visual Impact of generations has been more widely accepted.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“If Visual Impact is a by-product of resilience then great, that’s a bonus, but that’s the extent to which we should consider it.” Voluntary sector representative
CONNECTIONS

Summary

With the exception of business and utilities representatives, stakeholders did not particularly prioritise Connections. Only 8% of those voting electronically saw it as the most important output category. However, it was acknowledged that improvements needed to be made in the area.

Domestic customers had less to input on this discussion than business representatives. Overall, Information Availability was deemed the most important output in this category. Stakeholders believed it was essential that information about the connections process is transparent and factually correct, as incorrect information inevitably costs connections customers time and money.

It was commented that more information on equipment specifications would be welcomed.

There was some suggestion that SSEN should be involved in development planning from an earlier stage in order to prevent the need to retrofit technology, especially with more people installing solar panels. It was also felt that the company should be more proactive in its planning for the potential uptake of electric vehicles.

Verbatim comments

“From my point of view Connections relates to Customer Satisfaction and Social Obligations. People will feel vulnerable if a street light on a dark street is out and if they’re told it’s going to take weeks to fix they’ll feel unhappy.” Local authority representative

“I would say that certain connections are very important, but some aren’t. It’s difficult to bracket all connection issues into one category.” Local authority representative

“Connections Service should be at the top. Everything flows from there.” Voluntary sector representative
“I think Services should be at the top, if you get that right then you don’t need the Information.” Local authority representative

“With a good, functional CRM model, you can see what’s going on.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“You should have a system where complaints get tracked and responses get red flagged, so the organisation is aware of it.” Business representative

“With electric vehicle connections, SSEN’s problem is not enough proactive engagement. If you’re looking at a local authority putting in new houses, it’s about understanding how the development is targeted and understanding what the demand for electric vehicles will be in the long term. You’re not very good at looking at things in advance so you retrofit things. It’s a partnership, working and future-proofing stuff, which you don’t do enough of at the moment.” Energy/utilities company

“Lots of people are getting solar panels on their houses now, and they generate power when they don’t need to use it, when everyone’s at work, so it’s about storing it and moving it both ways.” Energy/utilities company

“I’d prioritise Information Availability. I think it’s important that SSE are getting all the information needed up on their website. The bit we tend to struggle with is specifying equipment. It would be nice for the G81 list to be clearer in terms of which equipment is approved and not approved.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I’d put Information Availability at the same level as Connections Service. If the information is wrong, it costs us a lot of time and money. If the Information is right, then you can focus on the correct direction and not waste any time.” Developer/connections representative

“Information Availability is important for generators who want to connect to the network.” Business representative

“Connection Engagement is the bottom of our concerns.” Voluntary sector representative

“I’d probably put Engagement over Information.” Local authority representative
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Summary

Customer Satisfaction was universally seen as the least important output category, gaining only 1% of the vote when stakeholders voted electronically. This was not because Customer Satisfaction was seen as unimportant in itself, but because stakeholders believed it would improve in direct correlation to improvements in other output categories, without its own specific investment.

More than half the stakeholders (53%) thought Communication was the most important output in this category, followed by Stakeholder Engagement and Customer Service Training. Partnerships and Assurance was seen as the least important output with 9% of the vote.

Increasing customer agency, by giving them more understanding of their situation when problems occur, was thought to be a key form of Communication that could improve Customer Satisfaction. More practically, stakeholders encouraged more comprehensive web communications and improvements in Training in order to make improvements to Satisfaction.

Verbatim comments

“Communication is a key one with customers and stakeholders. A lot of it is empowerment, allowing people to understand what’s going on and make decisions.” Energy/utilities company

“If you just do your job well then people will be happy.” Parish/community council representative

“Obviously putting on events like this really helps to ensure you’re getting Stakeholder Engagement, so you don’t just do what you think is the right thing, you’re listening to the customers instead.” Parish/community council representative
“I would say Partnerships are probably more important than Stakeholder Engagement. Both have value, but Partnerships makes for a deeper more practical relationship.” Voluntary sector representative

“For me it’s about understanding the impact, helping people help themselves. If you can tell customers the power’s going to be out for four hours, they can go and do something else for that time.” Energy / utility company

“Communication is important because people want information from the web, if you can improve information available on the web, then you have less people contacting you.” Local authority representative

“Training should be the priority.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Training should come second because it’s supporting the existing Communications process.” Voluntary sector representative

“I think Communications should be the priority, but Training is part of that obviously.” Voluntary sector representative
SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS

Summary

In the discussion, stakeholders generally agreed that Social Obligations should not be isolated as a problem and that the solutions to social problems are deeply entrenched with the other areas, like Security. It was also noted that companies like SSEN have a moral responsibility to support vulnerable customers.

Voluntary sector representatives in particular highlighted that in recent years they had noted increasing reliance on SSEN’s Social Obligations initiatives due to cuts in council funding and universal credit. There were several business representatives, however, who argued that Social Obligations should not be a DNO’s responsibility and that too much emphasis on this area would both increase bills and detract from the sustainability of the business. Nevertheless, in round table discussion many stakeholders highlighted the importance of SSEN’s Social Obligations. When it came to voting, Social Obligations was rated in the bottom three categories, with only 8% of the vote.

In terms of outputs, there was an overwhelmingly strong preference for prioritising Focus on Vulnerability and then the PSR, as can be seen above. Seventy-one percent of NGO representatives favoured the former and 80% of business representatives the latter. Stakeholders agreed that there is more work to be done in ensuring that those who are eligible are made aware of the PSR. The importance of Training and Partnerships was not totally disregarded, however, as the success of current training was noted as being important in enabling frontline staff to identify customers in vulnerable situations. In addition, stakeholders encouraged SSEN to make greater use of Partnerships to increase the speed and accuracy of PSR help.

It was also proposed that SSEN should not just solve the symptoms of vulnerability in crises, but should work to improve reliability and prevent problems happening in the first place.
Verbatim comments

“It is a moral obligation, and any group has that obligation.” Parish/community council representative

“There is a real link between Reliability and Social Obligations and an intrinsic link to the Environment. Like how health and safety is not just an afterthought, neither should Social Obligations be. They should be central in planning.” Voluntary sector representative

“The reason why it’s so important is that each of us has Social Obligations. We do not want to ghettoise the vulnerable, we need to make links to deal with the vulnerability.” Business representative

“Social Obligations and the PSR are important; with council cuts and universal credit coming out, more and more people are going to be on that list.” Voluntary sector representative

“It’s not necessarily a DNO responsibility.” Development/connections representative

“It’s fantastic that you do this, but will it not blow into billing? It’s far beyond what you need to do. Here you’ve moved into social services. Is that sustainable for the business that you are in?” Business representative

“The Register is the most important thing.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“The PSR is the first point of call, then work on Resilience and its preventative measures, building for the future. There are so many technologies and systems that SSEN could be using.” Voluntary sector representative

“Focusing on Vulnerability should be number one.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I think Vulnerability needs to be more systematically built into how we think about everything, as opposed to it being an isolated issue. The way you currently have it, you’re at risk of leaving a huge section of vulnerable customers behind.” Voluntary sector representative

“Training should be higher because if you don’t train your staff in what to look for, they’re not looking for the right things.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
“I think the customer team are exemplary, so Training is important, it doesn’t just happen by accident. When you’re dealing with vulnerable people, it’s a special type of communication.” Voluntary sector representative

“I don’t think Training needs to be higher because if you have good Partnerships, you’ve got that through other routes.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Surely Partnerships is important; you know you need to work with local groups, to help guide the other things. By tapping into local groups, you can find the issues that need resolving.” Parish/community council representative

“If projects are community operated by local people, it’s great for community resilience.” Business representative

“Partnerships are more important because three phone calls to the council, health service, etc. will identify people quicker.” Local authority representative

“SSEN should be improving reliance and innovation. They should be asking how they can be preventing outages in first place and what mechanisms could be put in place to stop them for the most vulnerable. They should be exploring battery storage backups for the elderly.” Voluntary sector representative
SAFETY

Summary

All the stakeholders agreed that Safety should be highly prioritised. It was ranked the second most important output category for SSEN, with 18% of the vote. However, many disagreed that it should be an output category at all; they argued that this left a margin for error and interpretation, whereas Safety should be a given, not down for discussion.

In terms of the action points, very few were discussed in detail, with more of the emphasis of discussion on the wider importance of Safety. Within the area of Training, stakeholders wanted proof that the current training system was successful. There were also concerns raised over cyber security and the need for SSEN to completely proof their IT control systems against attack. When these areas were voted on, Safety Training and Network Safety were clear forerunners in terms of priority, with Communications Engagement receiving just 21% of the vote.

Verbatim comments

“It’s paramount. Electricity is a dangerous thing.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“If it’s not there, there is a tendency to cut corners. You must not cut corners to achieve Reliability.” Parish/community council representative

“It’s the baseline.” Emergency services representative

“Safety is more of an expectation. It should be an absolute given, not something that should be an output category.” Voluntary sector representative

“It would be the highest one. If you do everything in a safe manner, everything else falls in line.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
“Safety would incorporate Reliability, because the safer you are, the more reliable you’re going to be.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Safety is a simple by-product of having a Reliable and Available service.” Energy/utilities company

“It depends which side of the fence you’re on. If you’re an employee, it’s very important.” Local authority representative

“Safety is overlooked. You can do all the Training in the world, but how do you ensure that the Training is being activated in the real world?” Parish/community council representative

“The subject of concern should be IT systems. How certain are we about the IT systems and their security?” Parish/community council representative
When asked whether the stakeholders in attendance knew anyone who was eligible for the PSR, one-fifth stated that they did not. This was reflected when they were asked to vote on their level of knowledge of the PSR: over 40% rated their knowledge as either ‘1’ or ‘2’ out of ‘5’.

Regarding the question of whether SSEN should target the PSR in areas of greatest concentration of eligibility, stakeholders were in favour. It was felt that if this data existed and could be accessed, it made sense to use it.

Specific urban social issues were highlighted, especially alienation and anonymity, with one stakeholder proposing that SSEN could identify particularly isolated people by distinguishing between social and private tenants. There was a generally positive feeling towards targeting these pockets of greatest need, yet several stakeholders highlighted issues with this system. They emphasised the complexity of changing levels of vulnerability and argued that rural and low-density areas should not be allowed to slip through the net, as often these are areas of great deprivation. Moreover, they highlighted that different geographic areas have different needs, and that these need to be addressed with bespoke solutions. In contrast, though many stakeholders agreed that contacting everyone is beneficial, they commented that many of those who are eligible are likely to be the ones least likely to self-nominate.
Indeed, as a solution to this, a large number of stakeholders emphasised the importance of partnerships; of working with third parties to promote the PSR. It was suggested that, rather than contacting the vulnerable themselves, SSEN could work through GPs, health professionals, community hubs and with local authorities, who already have the relationships.

In particular, stakeholders believed that this would reduce problems inherent with self-identification and would ensure that customers only have to contact one company about the PSR, rather than several. The issue of data protection was also raised as a hindrance to this sharing of data between agencies. Stakeholders agreed that a greater focus needs to be on lobbying the government to help SSEN create a universal database in collaboration with other DNOs and relevant organisations.

When it came to discussing the greater promotion of the PSR to potential PSR1 customers, the consensus was largely positive. In fact, only 3% of the group disagreed with the initiative and the suggestion of automatic enrolment for PSR1 customers proved very popular. The greatest hindrance to PSR1 enrolment currently was seen as a combination of a lack of awareness of the PSR itself and the stigma that might exist in association with the word ‘vulnerable’. The solutions to this focused again on partnerships, but particularly at the point of medical care.

Nearly 60% were in favour of adding a PSR1+ category for customers at higher risk, yet most of these had commented about the changes that would need to be made to the initiative to make it more efficient. Though the principle of a ‘life and death’ category seemed valid, some stakeholders were of the view that there didn’t seem to be much of a benefit to this extra level. Instead, they thought that SSEN should work to improve the proportion of calls that actually make it through to customers in need in the event of a power outage, by collecting secondary numbers for them.

It was commented that it was difficult to answer the overall question without understanding how standards of care would differ between the categories. Again, the point was raised that customers should just have one point of contact for the PSR, rather than all their different utilities.

There was stakeholder consensus that PSR1+ for those with more than one eligibility seemed to be generating excessive complexity. It was felt that even among voluntary groups, this would confuse customers, partners and even SSEN itself. Fewer than half of the stakeholders voted in favour of the policy.
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?

We should promote the PSR to areas we know most eligible customers live, even if they aren’t PSR1?

- Strongly agree: 11%
- Agree: 39%
- Neutral: 36%
- Disagree: 8%
- Strongly disagree: 6%

We should carry on promoting the PSR equally to all customers regardless of location or priority

- Strongly agree: 22%
- Agree: 28%
- Neutral: 22%
- Disagree: 22%
- Strongly disagree: 6%

Verbatim comments

“If you have heat maps that help you target people more effectively, why wouldn’t you use them? It seems logical to me. You’ve commissioned the information, just apply the data, it’s simple.” Voluntary sector representative

“If you’ve got the data to support it, it just makes for simple business sense.” Voluntary sector representative

“I think they probably need to do both. They need to target and identify areas, but it’s important to remember that vulnerability and situations change. There should be an overlap; there’s data to suggest what type of people live in certain areas, this should be cross-referenced against the areas with dense low uptake populations.” Voluntary sector representative

“There’s not a one size fits all fix. You have to look at all the categories.” Voluntary sector representative

“They all have different types of need, rural vs. city areas. This different makeup means you can target people’s problems better.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“SSEN shouldn’t make the assumption that if you live in a town you know your neighbours.” Local authority representative
“I think there’s an interesting challenge in terms of tenure. If you have people in commercial instead of social rented accommodation, then they don’t know their neighbours, they don’t know where to find each other. They need the service more.” Parish/community council representative

“If you could try and work in partnership with local authorities and local groups, that would be great. We only have patchy information, but the heat maps would be very useful. SSEN are able to fund these social diagnostics, so if they are not going to use the information, they should at least let us know it.” Voluntary sector representative

“There are usually community centres or hubs, so you can get them to do the work for you and they already have the trust and the relationships, so you’ve already broken down the main barriers.” Voluntary sector representative

“If you get customers to volunteer the information, SSE might end up with the wrong information.” Local authority representative

“People don’t often identify themselves as being vulnerable, so SSE should be working with various charities, linking with them and getting recommendations from them, because people don’t often self-identity.” Local authority representative

“There needs to be an emphasis on targeting and partnering, when care home teams go out and speak to these elderly people. They should get them to register.” Local authority representative

“There are different registers and lists; there must be a way we can share that information. The sharing of vulnerable peoples’ data has the barrier of data protection.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“The focus needs to be on lobbying policymakers and government bodies to help all these companies combine data and lists and overcome data protection laws that prevent all the DNOs and charities from making a universal functioning database.” Voluntary sector representative

“I’ve never heard of it, but there are people in terms of friends and family who would be eligible.” Infrastructure/engineering representative
2. Do you think we should focus more on promoting the Priority Services Register to PSR1 customers?

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

- Strongly disagree: 0%
- Disagree: 3%
- Neutral: 20%
- Strongly agree: 37%
- Agree: 40%

Verbatim comments

“We should have automatic enrolment if you have a landline. It would be good for vulnerable people. It needs a national steer.” Local authority representative

“There’s always something more you can do until you’ve got everyone accounted for. It’s about understanding what resources you’ve got and how to contact partner organisations. For example, we’re using Groundwork as a trusted third party to go out and talk to people and using your mapping to identify vulnerable areas.” Energy/utilities company

“I think there are a lot of people who don’t know about it, who don’t know what the benefits are for them. Some people are very suspicious.” Voluntary sector representative

“The parish councillors, they can deliver the message. I hadn't heard of the PSR until this morning. It's another way of raising awareness.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“For a lot of people, phone calls or texts might not be the way they like to work, so the work with local councils is a great point of contact.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I don’t think it’s just the parish council’s job, it needs to be collaborative.” Developer/connections representative
“I work with helping people to reduce their energy costs and I always cover the PSR as an add-on to the advice I give, so tapping into organisations that do that.” Council officer

“All families with young children go to GPs for their shots and sick people as well; that’s where you need to be most.” Emergency services representative

“One of the priorities is awareness, a more national approach to talking about the PSR. So GP surgeries, local authorities, SSE are doing a great job, but it’s not just for them to do so, it’s about working with people who have a trusted connection, so we need to start talking about the PSR.” Energy/utilities company

“I think there’s going to be a gap. I train workers who support vulnerable families, but for this PSR, there are people in the NHS who support people who need that medical equipment. If you could provide training I think they’d appreciate it. Lots of the frontline workers I work with say they’ve never heard of the PSR.” Council officer

“It’s a joint effort and it’s surprising how many frontline NHS staff haven’t heard of it. There needs to be education, which involves initiative and funding.” Council officer
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?)

**Verbatim comments**

"So, you’re just creating four categories, really." Voluntary group

"We already prioritise people in terms of priorities in the PSR anyway.” Energy/utilities company

"It certainly makes sense to have a life or death situation category." Energy/utilities company

"It depends on what you would do additionally. Or do you just leave PSR1 and have a priority group? There must already be an order in which you contact people, even within PSR1.” Parish/community council representative

"If it’s just 2000 people in PSR1, you don’t need to subdivide it, but as it grows, you will just have to.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

"It would make it more complicated." Voluntary sector representative

"It’s about your logistics as well. For example, if you drive into a village, you don’t say, ‘Well I’m not stopping here because it’s PRR1 not PSR1+.’” Emergency services representative
“There’s life and death ones, but there are other ones that are such a high priority, I don’t understand why things like stairlifts aren’t in PSR1, because that supports someone’s life.” Energy/utilities company

“Mental health is such a huge blanket of people, you need to be cautious, you could split that into 10 groups of more and the variety of vulnerability within that would be huge. In general, you need to be more cautious about the way you categorise people.” Voluntary sector representative

“You need to dive deeper into the specifics of these categories, especially if you’re looking at life or death situations, you need to evaluate the hidden ways in which seemingly lesser ailments can become life or death.” Voluntary sector representative

“I wonder what the purpose of PSR1+ is. Will it make a five-minute difference? What difference will it make to the end user? You could also downgrade people with children under five.” Voluntary sector representative

“It’s difficult to answer the question in any informed way when we don’t know what the difference in services are that you provide between the different groups.” Voluntary sector representative

“Make sure that there is secondary contact too. Some of these people probably can’t answer the phone.” Parish/community council representative

“Having two points of contact is very confusing – especially if you’re vulnerable, they’re not going to have the skills!” Council officer

“Our issue is we put people on a PSR then don’t take them off, for example, we rush into estates where we think people need it and it turns out it’s a young couple!” Emergency services representative

“If you’re over 75 you’re more likely to be vulnerable just because of older age, so potentially there could be an age-related sub category, because its targeted.” Local authority representative

“In terms of critical cases, battery backup should be automatic. You should not leave it to a carer to try and change the power source to a generator.” Parish/community council representative

“I think it’s more about the enhanced support, there’s not an endless supply of backup batteries.” Voluntary sector 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?)

**We should create an additional PSR category of PSR1+ for customers with more than one PSR1 eligibility**

- Strongly agree: 17%
- Agree: 25%
- Neutral: 28%
- Disagree: 16%
- Strongly disagree: 14%

**We should continue with the current three categories**

- Strongly agree: 11%
- Agree: 28%
- Neutral: 25%
- Disagree: 25%
- Strongly disagree: 11%

**Verbatim comments**

“It’s too broad. You have to include everyone, you have to have it as a blanket policy.”

Voluntary sector representative

“We are the sort of organisation that would benefit from this, but even for us there is a risk of the classifications becoming increasingly niche. I wouldn’t know what sub category to put people into and people would get missed. It’s better for SSEN to invest in smarter, more strategic solutions. You should be supporting the vulnerable that way.”

Voluntary sector representative

“The issue is that you don’t want this PSR to balloon into a huge side business you are trying to run. You need to be working hand in hand to solve this at the initial point.”

Business representative
PART TWO: COMMUNITY RESILIENCE FUNDING

Summary

Sixty-eight percent of stakeholders were of the opinion that communities in remote and isolated areas, known for having emergency events, should be prioritised for community resilience funding. They believed that these areas, where there is more likelihood of disruption and more difficulty in fixing it, would provide more ‘bang for your buck’. There was agreement that remoter places often need more targeted infrastructure support, not just to address emergencies. More broadly, stakeholders were generally not aware of community resilience funding. It was commented that the initiative should be better communicated, otherwise those communities who have not heard of it will be disadvantaged. Stakeholders suggested that SSEN should work with partners on this as well, with the National Flood Forum and Clinical Commissioning Groups being suggested in particular.

The discussion was less clear-cut on the proposal to prioritise town and city-based innovation projects. There was a consensus that built up, urban areas often have poorer community links than small rural areas. Because of this, it was commented that vulnerable people on housing estates would need more help than those in rural villages. Again, the point was highlighted that those areas most in need might not have the resources to find out about or apply for this funding. Several stakeholders argued that it is not possible to prioritise urban over rural, as they both have different needs. Moreover, the relatively small size of the budget for the projects meant that funding should be more targeted. In the end, there was little consensus on this and 37% of stakeholders voted neutrally on the issue.

Eighty-four percent of stakeholders agreed that innovative approaches to vulnerability should receive targeted funding. It was a hugely popular suggestion. Indeed, no one at all disagreed with the initiative. In fact, several representatives believed that SSEN should be applying the same innovative logic to their own social policy: aiming to prevent outage and increase resilience, rather than resolve the problems outages cause. Suggestions for addressing this included looking at the smart network and storage solutions to combat outage issues.

Due to time constraints, stakeholders did not have the time to discuss the last five questions. However, the outcomes of the electronic voting on this are shown below.
1. Should SSEN prioritise projects which support communities who are particularly remote or isolated and have experienced emergency events due to poor weather?

Verbatim comments

“It’s where you get the most bang for your buck.” Parish/community council representative

“Living in a remote community, it’s very important.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“I’ve spoken with SSE about mapping and targeting areas where there’s a higher chance of disruption. Using mapping that way, you’ll know where those failures are and where the higher risk is.” Parish/community council representative

“Personally, I think it’s a really good initiative, I’m actually surprised on how progressive DNOs have become, that you’re not just reactionary, but identifying these potential situations. From what I’ve seen so far you’ve come a long way.” Energy/utilities company

“Shouldn’t we be promoting the funding to people within the PSR1 register? If you have so many small projects, you could put that money together and fund an area densely populated with people on the PSR1.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Community funding should certainly work directly with local authorities and parish councils, it’s on a very individual level.” Parish/community council representative
“At our village hall, we need a pretty comprehensive system of how you make their environment safe and useable. It shouldn’t just be putting in a generator, it should be ensuring we have enough power to drive a pump for heating.” Parish/community council representative

“We have information that we can show to the council. It’s really helpful, it works rather well.” Emergency services representative

“There’s a risk that those communities who find out about them will be the ones who use them.” Local authority representative

“There’s a lot of health Clinical Commissioning Groups that are transitioning to be much more voluntary and working with the local authority. Working out what the community needs from a health perspective that’s new, how they’re organising themselves is based on specific needs.” Local authority representative

“The National Flood Forum will know isolated communities: that will be doubly effective. They can do the legwork.” Local authority representative
2. Should SSEN prioritise town and city-based projects which show innovative approaches to building resilience?

Verbatim comments

“You can’t assume that they would be better off in the cities. To be honest, villages often have better community networks than urban built up areas. Cities have networks of CCTV, but that’s for crime, not for looking after each other. Loss of communication causes panic in an emergency; you need different things for different communities.”

Infrastructure/engineering representative

“They have different needs, you can’t prioritise one over the other.”

Voluntary sector representative

“The amount of money isn’t that much, so it’s got to be tailored to really localised projects and localised organisations.”

Infrastructure/engineering representative

“Prioritise based on impact and disruption.”

Infrastructure/engineering representative

“The greatest need should be prioritised wherever it is.”

Parish/community council representative

“A community might not apply because they are not aware. Hence, the beauty of an event like this.”

Parish/community council representative
3. Should SSEN prioritise projects which demonstrate innovative approaches to improving the resilience of vulnerable community members?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents: Agree 53%, Strongly agree 30%, Neutral 17%, Disagree 0%, Strongly disagree 0%]

Verbatim comments

“Solar and battery storage when the network goes down might be a cheaper solution. You can be using the smart network to solve it.” Developer/connections representative

“It’s fantastic that you guys are doing the PSR as part of any response, but its complexity does cause more problems. You need to be part of the solution. Just make sure vulnerable people don’t go off supply with a single generation point and meshed networking. Make the most vulnerable households 10% more resilient. These kinds of interventions are less costly and more strategic, when you consider the future of bad weather.” Business representative
4. Should SSEN prioritise projects which support areas where it can be difficult for emergency services to respond to?

![Projects which support areas where it can be difficult for emergency services to respond to should be prioritised for community funding](image)

- Strongly disagree: 0%
- Disagree: 0%
- Neutral: 8%
- Strongly agree: 36%
- Agree: 56%

5. Should SSEN prioritise communities which are local to our transmission development works?

![Communities which are local to our transmission development works should be prioritised for community funding](image)

- Strongly disagree: 6%
- Disagree: 24%
- Agree: 12%
- Strongly agree: 3%
- Neutral: 55%
6. Should SSEN prioritise projects from areas which have not applied before and have been identified as having especially low resilience?

![Pie chart for communities which are local to our transmission development works should be prioritised for community funding](image)

Communities which are local to our transmission development works should be prioritised for community funding:

- Strongly agree: 14%
- Agree: 57%
- Neutral: 26%
- Disagree: 3%
- Strongly disagree: 0%

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

![Pie chart for projects which improve resilience across the whole distribution area should be prioritised for community funding](image)

Projects which improve resilience across the whole distribution area should be prioritised for community funding:

- Strongly agree: 18%
- Agree: 41%
- Neutral: 26%
- Disagree: 12%
- Strongly disagree: 3%
8. Should SSEN prioritise projects which require seed funding for community energy projects?
WORKSHOP FOUR: THE TRANSITION TO DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OPERATOR

Summary

Stakeholders were largely in agreement that poorer customers without access to the smart grid should not have to bear the economic costs of it, and that the benefits of the DSO transition should be made more available to them.

It was commented that existing solar panel subsidies were seen as proof that such inequality is already a feature of the energy network, and there was a definite emphasis on making sure that this should not be exacerbated in the future. There was some dissent, however, with fears that if SSEN takes too much of a role in poverty alleviation, this will hit bills across the board. There was also debate over the definition of the vulnerable and who would qualify for such help.

Practical suggestions for combating this inequality were given. Ideas put forward included: rent-a-battery schemes, improvements in reliability, smart meters and micro grid controllers tailored to social landlords, and greater localisation of generation and storage. Stakeholders encouraged the take-up of solar panels on social housing, in particular on shared garages, in order to start preparing the grid for electric vehicles. In particular, education projects were highlighted to address the problem of technical complexity with more diversified types of generation. There was a consensus that the process would need to be simplified, or education projects would be needed in order to ensure that people with a lesser understanding of the energy network are not left behind.

Stakeholders also approached solutions from the angle of tax and policy. They encouraged SSEN to pressure the government into centralising a policy for upgrading the system and to inspiring more regulatory intervention. It was also commented that building regulations should be enforced to make it easier for battery storage to be included in new-build housing.

Stakeholders suggested a variety of different groups for SSEN to work with on the transition to becoming a DSO. This included planners and developers, housing associations and micro grid representatives, in order to incorporate new technologies from inception.

Stakeholders seemed pessimistic about the government, companies and landlords’ willingness and ability to implement socially conscious policies, but reinforced the need for Ofgem and the government to actively engage in this area. Local authorities, community groups and voluntary organisations such as Citizens Advice were seen as good intermediary
partners for local support and community knowledge. The issue of data protection was also raised again as a hindrance to SSEN’s work in this area.

Several stakeholders were key champions of the breadth of opportunities that smart and micro grids could bring, especially within social housing. They did not think that SSEN was going far enough to embrace this and encouraged the company to be more broadminded about the benefits of so-called ‘disruptive’ technologies. There was a suggestion, for example, that large companies who use high amounts of energy should utilise demand side response, using energy when it is cheaper (e.g. in the middle of the night) to allow cheaper energy for those who have to use it in the day. It was seen that awareness of the smart grid amongst household customers is dependent on the smart meter rollout, and it was thought that SSEN should ensure that the rollout is adequately publicised.

1. **How do we ensure vulnerable customers aren’t left behind in the transition to DSO?**

**Verbatim comments**

“It’s a poverty premium and it goes across the board. The least paid are being charged the most, they can’t access the cheaper market.” Local authority representative

“How can lower income households not be excluded from innovation, how can they access battery storage, without the upfront cost?” Local authority representative

“Keep vulnerable people in focus, in the infrastructure that you build; make it resilient.” Voluntary sector representative

“People with solar panels are receiving subsidies, poorer people are paying for these subsidies already, it’s already happening.” Energy/utilities company

“There is a danger, like the PSR system, if responsibility for poverty alleviation falls more on energy networks that it will hit customers’ bills. There will be long-term problems; unless there is central government body funding, there will be energy imbalance and a false economy.” Business representative

“We need to be cautious about distinctions as well. The truth is that you can be affluent and still vulnerable. Definitions and groupings like this are dangerous. Fuel poor and low income are different groups.” Voluntary sector representative

“What about a rent-a-battery scheme to make it affordable for people to innovate?” Local authority representative
| “You should have local generation for local use and storage, then everyone gets the benefits.” Developer/connections representative |
| “Education and training will play a massive part.” Developer/connections representative |
| “Simplifying all this for certain users will be important.” Voluntary sector representative |
| “If you start making the grid more complex to engage with – solar cells and heat pumps and batteries, etc. – it’s going to confuse a lot of people. There is a risk that you are disengaging from people who can’t use complex technology, but they have equal right to the power.” Voluntary sector representative |
| “People will need a smart micro grid controller that is cheap and easy to use, to control the system.” Developer/connections representative |
| “It would be crazy if there are areas of garages on housing estates with no solar cells or facilities for charging, but this will happen in low income housing. People are not going to make that investment, so the government needs to.” Parish/community council representative |
| “You should have to bid on projects. The way it is currently set up is totally decentralised and we have to come to stakeholder workshops to know about things like this. It’s a political problem.” Voluntary group representative |
| “What about tariffs, a guaranteed reduced social tariff?” Energy/utilities company |
2. Who should we work with to ensure this isn’t the case?

Verbatim comments

“People are going to need infrastructure in their houses for these grids. They need huge cables and a generator room in their house. You need to involve planners and developers.” Parish/community council representative

“It is about simplification of what we do or at least how it is presented to people. SSEN should be using some form of trusted intermediaries; it could be a community association, local authority or social housing providers.” Voluntary sector representative

“I always think of CAB. They are a great source for supporting people.” Business representative

“With National Energy Action and Citizens Advice you can be ensuring no one gets left behind and remains vulnerable.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“It’s all part of what Ofgem needs to decide. You can’t rely on shareholders to act in a socially responsible way, shareholders want revenue.” Local authority representative

“Why aren’t builders putting energy storage into place for new builds? It’s not enforced; it needs to be government.” Infrastructure/engineering representative

“It’s dangerous to bring it up to the government; the political angle in an energy company is a risky and volatile way to go. The government is far too disengaged on the energy sector.” Business representative

“It comes down to data protection too, we’re not just concerned about the vulnerable, here.” Energy/utilities company
3. Are you aware of the opportunities that smart grids may offer?

Verbatim comments

“Massively, but I think with the grids there is a lot of work that needs to be done to understand the benefits.” Developer/connections representative

“You need to see what’s happening in the market, taking into account disruptive technologies in the grid. We don’t know what will take off and when. SSEN should be looking at broader scales.” Voluntary sector representative

“Large businesses can help balance the network. For example, if a major energy user was able to use their energy at a time that’s cheaper and play the market, other people could benefit during the day.” Energy/utilities company

“Huge companies are getting reduced payments for reducing their energy costs, why isn’t this replicated for smaller households?” Local authority representative

“I mean there are innovation tools – smart meters – tailored to social landlords. That’s one of those tools they should be investing in.” Local authority representative

“A lot of this also hinges on whether the smart grid rollout is effective, which it definitely isn’t.” Voluntary sector representative
Following today's presentation, Q&A, and round table discussion, on a scale of 1 - 10, my knowledge of the transition to DSO has improved:

- Five: 29%
- Six: 16%
- Seven: 10%
- Eight: 10%
- Nine: 3%
- Ten: 8%
- One: 8%
- Two: 5%
- Three: 8%
- Four: 3%
WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

1: OVERALL, HOW INTERESTING DID YOU FIND THE WORKSHOP TO BE?

- Interesting, 61%
- Very Interesting, 39%
- Not Interesting, 0%

2: DID YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE YOUR POINTS AND ASK QUESTIONS?

- Strongly Agree, 32%
- Agree, 65%
- Disagree, 3%
- Strongly Disagree, 0%

Comments:
- “A very well-structured morning. Liked the mix of information giving and short round table (chaired) discussions. Use of technology excellent to give instant feedback results.”
- “Perhaps a little broad for all stakeholders present, although appreciate that this is difficult without multiple events.”
- “Perhaps more time for Q&A would have been useful.”
Q3: DID WE COVER THE RIGHT TOPICS FOR YOU ON THE DAY?

Comments:
- “More details on how DSO affects SSEN’s subcontractors and framework partners?”
- “Extremely useful and interesting from a user perspective. In particular DSO transition and the vision and challenges for the future.”
- “Topics too focused on social obligations and SSE N behind other DNOs on transition to DSO and stakeholder engagement.”

Q4: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING TOPICS DO YOU THINK WE SHOULD BE FOCUSING ON IN THE FUTURE?

Comments:
- “Climate change resilience.”
- “Demand side responses, transition, future developments and markets.”
- “Micro grids.”
Q5: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE VENUE?

Comments:
- “Good location.”
- “Useful.”

Q6: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE WAY THE WORKSHOP WAS CHALED BY YOUR FACILITATOR?

Comments:
- “Engaging and relaxed. No pressure on those of us who are customers and not industry experts.”
- “Facilitator very good, round table discussions too rigid.”
- “Steered this well, kept things flowing.”
Q7: ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

- “First class and informative event. My output will be to share key points from the presentation with parish councillors/community – in particular the Priority Services Register.”
- “Make attendees prioritise options to get a more meaningful response.”
- “Valued meeting people from other areas of the energy industry.”

Q8: WOULD YOU LIKE TO RECEIVE OUR POST-EVENT REPORT AND INVITES TO SIMILAR EVENTS IN THE FUTURE?

![Pie chart showing 88% Yes and 12% No]

Yes, 88%
No, 12%