

# Stakeholder feedback: Our First Consultation – November 2012

## October – November 2012

[www.ssepd.co.uk/HaveYourSay/ED1/](http://www.ssepd.co.uk/HaveYourSay/ED1/)

Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSEPD) is the owner of two electricity distribution networks:

- Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution (SHEPD) in the north of Scotland,
- Southern Electric Power Distribution (SEPD) in the south of England.

Electricity distribution networks transport electricity to customers' homes or business premises. We do not sell electricity to customers - that is the role of energy suppliers. Our duties and obligations include ensuring we are able to provide an economic and efficient service to users, including generators, who wish to connect to our network.

**Our First Consultation** sought the views of our customers and wider stakeholders around our business activities over the period to 2023 and beyond. We have placed the needs of our customers and wider stakeholders at the centre of our planning to ensure that our distribution networks are fit for purpose. The results and key themes from this consultation have already been used to help inform our business plan and are quoted in **Our Second Consultation**: Innovating for a greener, more efficient future.

This survey was distributed to over 2000 stakeholders. It was made available on our website; promoted on social media; and within both local and industry press to encourage responses from the widest possible audience. One hundred and sixteen customers responded to our consultation.

Details of the responses for Questions 1 to 11 are covered in the following pages. These tables set out the questions we asked, stakeholders feedback and our response.

## Question 1: Do you like the structure and presentation of this consultation?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			What is good and bad, and how could we do better in the future?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 1 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	6			a) broadly speaking the structure and presentation are clear. Given the importance of renewable energy generation throughout the SHEPD area, and against the background of the Government targets for increasing renewable energy in the UK's energy mix, OREF would like to see more attention devoted to this issue, perhaps through a separate section of the plan. b) Clear and concise	Eight connection customers responded to this question. The majority of those respondents liked the structure and presentation of the consultation paper. However, they are keen to see more detail so that they can make informed comment. We note that one respondent would like to see a more interactive approach to engagement rather than consultation papers.	Key theme: The majority of respondents who answered this question liked the content and presentation of the consultation paper.  Our response: In addition to Our First Consultation Paper we have been holding a series of focus groups, one to one in-depth interviews and an on-line survey with stakeholders on themes specifically related to RIIO-ED1. We will publish the output from these groups with Our Second Consultation Paper.
		2		a) Too impersonal. Not interactive - See WPD's method. b) Would like to see more clearly how this practically relates to RIIO-ED1, as set out by Ofgem. Nonetheless, I welcome a section entitled 'listening'.		
			4	a) It is clear but oversimplified		
Consumer Representatives	1				Only one consumer representative organisation responded to this question. They liked the structure and presentation of this consultation.	
		0				
			0			
Customer	20			a) Have no opinion either way, but would like to see more cables going underground out of sight b) Clearly written with good use of visual aids c) Every effort is being made to involve the affected in the fix - this is fantastic d) Nicely presented, but it's a lot of paper, printing and postage. Can it not be done by email/ internet?	Twenty-five customers responded to this question. Our customers liked the structure and presentation of the consultation. We have made Our First Consultation Paper available online as well as in hard copy. We note that one respondent is unhappy that they had to provide their personal details.	Some of our stakeholders were looking for further detail; and for the content to more closely match the primary outputs identified by Ofgem under RIIO-ED1. We will ensure these points are addressed in Our Second Consultation Paper.
		5		a) I haven't seen the letter through my door, and nor do I like the first question being my personal details. It looks more like you're trying to find out about me rather than my views. b) Once more a "Government driven" waste of money exercise.		
			11	a) I have been on a holiday down the Nile in Egypt and was told that they generate approx 29% of there country's electricity from the Aswan Dam. Green energy and does not rely on the wind. As we have as big rivers and 40 foot high tides whats wrong with water power. The French generate from damming the tide. Wind power went out with the sailing ships, its not always there. Neither would you have to pay huge ground rents. It would be green.		
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1			a) If, anything more detail would be preferable in future documentation.	Only one Emergency Service/NHS Body responded to this question. We note that they like the structure and content of the consultation but keen to see more detail so that they can make more informed comment.	We will produce and regularly update our stakeholder engagement and communication plan which will provide stakeholders with enough information, and in a format they want, to enable them to participate in key debates.
		0				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	2				Two Energy Supply Companies responded and both liked the structure and presentation of this consultation.	
		0				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	5			a) Easy to read but some jargon still exists. b) Good presentation, pitched at the right level, i.e. not too technical & not too basic.	Five Government and Public Sector Organisations responded to this question. All these respondents liked the structure and presentation of the consultation but noted that some jargon still existed.	
		0				
			4			

## Question 1: Do you like the structure and presentation of this consultation? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			What is good and bad, and how could we do better in the future?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 1 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	0				One member of the Innovation Community responded to this question. No preference was expressed around the content and presentation of the consultation. They felt that our document was accessible to various areas of the energy sector. We note the need to consider how our proposals will offer value for money to customers and on the Fuel Poor.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			1	a) The document was well structured so that a broad audience could understand the various areas of the energy sector. I believe with a lot of publicity relating to increases in domestic energy costs and media references to subsidies in the renewable energy market more emphasis should be made of the ways in which SSE are working with customers to give them the best value for money. Urban and rural fuel poverty are major issues in the UK, especially in Scotland.		
Landowners and Estates	0				Two Landowners and Estates expressed views on this question. They did not like the content and presentation of this consultation. One commented that the paper was too long.	
		2		a) 44 pages is too many to read		
			2			
Local Authority	5			a) Simple to understand b) Good, just about right. c) Good - clear and easy to follow	Five local authorities responded to this question. They liked the content and structure of this consultation.	
		0				
			1			
Regulators	0				This group did not express a view around the content and presentation of the consultation.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	13			a) Very interesting approach reflected in the structure of the presentation. b) In principal it is good and agree approach, more consultation with our company for improvements c) Good: - clear identification of the purpose of the document; - important commitments on safety and environment issues; - detailed analysis of actual performance and future goals. d) Clear and concise but a bit repetitive in some places e) Good: Easily understood Bad: Some links for customers/competition needed f) No particular comment to make	Thirteen supply chain respondents liked the structure and presentation of the consultation.	
		0				
			2			
Utilities	6			a) The structure of the consultation appears fit for purpose. b) Keep to plain English without too much industry terminology. c) Very good presentation and detail but found document a bit wordy. d) Very clear	Seven utility companies responded to this consultation. The majority of people liked the content and presentation of the consultation. One respondent commented that we need to ensure that the spirit of the consultation is adopted through our day-to-day business practices.	
		1		a) Good: Looks like a lot of effort, time and money has been spent on it. Bad: Most of the issues arise and persist at grass root/lower levels which this document doesn't address. Having an organisational philosophy is one thing and making sure it percolates to operations level is another.		
			0			
Other	9				Twenty-one respondents did not categorise themselves or selected the "other" category when responding to this questionnaire. Nine members of this grouping liked the content and presentation of the consultation. One did not like the content and felt that the purpose of the document was unclear and would have liked the option to complete the form on-line. Eleven respondents in this grouping did not answer the question.	
		1		a) The purpose of the document is not very clear from the outset. There is a lot of information up front but the details about how to respond to the consultation were not provided until page 5. Also, a form that is possible to complete online would be helpful.		
			11			

## Question 2: Do you agree with our approach to listen to your views?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) Is there any specific activity not currently being considered which you believe we should incorporate into this?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 2 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	7			a) Additional stakeholder events and feedback on actions. b) Whilst I believe the approach is good, it does not (in my view) reflect what happens at an operational level where in my experience, Customers do not received good service.	Nine connections customers responded to this question. Seven agreed with our approach to listening but wanted to see other engagement methods being used in addition to the consultation paper. Two respondents did not like our approach to listening and wanted us to further segment our audience when we listen.	Key theme: The majority of stakeholders responding to this consultation like our approach to listening.  Our response: We are offering a range of ways to engage with us during our consultation on RIIO-ED. These include: interviewer administered surveys, written consultation documents; audio recorded focus groups with electronic audience response system; on-line surveys; one-to-one in-depth interviews with stakeholders; stakeholder meetings, events and customer voice groups.
		2		a) It is not clear to me whether you mean "listening" purely through this specific consultation or in terms of general business practice. I think it is necessary to separate out large generator customers from other customers, in terms of identifying priorities and in recording broad measures of customer satisfaction.		
			3			
Consumer Representatives	1				Only one consumer representative organisation responded to this question. They liked our approach to listening.	With our stakeholders in mind, we will continually monitor and evaluate our mechanisms of engagement to ensure they sustain constructive engagement.
		0				
			0			
Customer	17			a) Not aware of any yet b) I am happy with the process - I trust that it is just as easy for those with no network connections or PC c) Allow people to support nuclear power, new grid lines, wind generation, wave power. Rather than just self appointed 'Action Groups' who oppose anything, everything.	Seventeen customers were happy with our approach to listening with one asking that we ensure that our consultations are made available to those without internet access and another asking us to ensure that we are balanced in our approach to listening. Four customers do not like our approach to listening.	We will publish key themes arising from our stakeholder consultation processes alongside our responses. We want to be transparent in our approach and to ensure that our stakeholders know what action we will be taking both to improve our internal processes and how it has informed our business plan. We are committed to being open and easy to talk to.
		4		a) Waste of tax and consumer money b) Your approach shouldn't be influenced by customers who have little knowledge of your business.		
			15			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1				Only one Emergency Service/NHS Body responded to this question. We note that they like the structure and content of the consultation but keen to see more detail so that they can make more informed comment.	
		0				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	2				Two energy supply companies responded to this question. They like our approach to listening.	
		0				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	4			a) Your industry has become far too disjointed, as a customer I want to deal with one body as we used to prior to Ofgem changing the rules, when ordering new or ceasing existing supplies the current procedures do not work effectively. When there is a problem it is left to the customer to ring round & liaise with meter operator; electrical supplier & network operator wasting valuable time & resources in getting jobs done. We want to be able to deal with one body who can then talk & liaise internally with all the other parties to deliver the required services.	Four Government and Public Sector Organisations responded to this question. We note that they like our approach to listening. We also note that one respondent finds it difficult to communicate with us.	
		0				
			5			

## Question 2: Do you agree with our approach to listen to your views? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) Is there any specific activity not currently being considered which you believe we should incorporate into this?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 2 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	1			a) The provision of a simulator that demonstrates energy savings when homes are adapted and when they use greener energy. This may help translate the benefits of smarter grids and homes to the general public.	One Innovation Stakeholder responded to this question. They have indicated that we should consider creating a simulator which demonstrates the benefits of smarter grids to a domestic setting.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	1				Two Landowners and Estates responded to this question. One liked our approach to listening and one did not.	
		1				
			2			
Local Authority	4				Four Local Authorities responded to this question. They all liked our approach to listening.	
		0				
			2			
Regulators	0				This group did not express a view upon our approach to listening.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	12			a) It was understood that listening step is oriented to whom SSE provides services, and not to supply chain and service providers sector. b) For our operations more consultation on design and environmental challenges c) You have all areas covered d) Definition for contestable, non contestable % in area of project in both areas e) No particular comment to make	Twelve Supply Chain and Service providers responded to this question. They all liked our approach to listening.	
		0				
			3			
Utilities	7			a) We agree with the approach on the assumption that all views will be considered. b) We provided detailed feed back to your research company on various operations and daily business issues which have not been referenced to in this document.	Seven Utilities responded to this question and agreed with our approach to listening. We note that one company felt that their feedback had not been adequately referenced in the document.	
		0				
			0			
Other	9			a) We are happy with the proposed approach for listening to stakeholders. b) Yes. Better engagement with environmental conservation interests in Scotland. c) Think that it is good that you are asking customers and stakeholders for their views.	Twenty-one respondents did not categorise themselves or selected the "other" category when responding to this questionnaire. Nine respondents who were in this grouping responded to this question and liked our approach to listening.	
		0				
			12			

**Question 3: Do you agree with these priorities: a reliable supply of electricity; a safe supply of electricity; value for money; good customer service; and that our activities are not carried out at the expense of the environment?**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) Are there any priorities that you would like to see included / removed? c) If yes, please tell us why.	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 3 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	7			a) There is widespread interest in Orkney and throughout the Hydroelectric area generally in taking up the opportunities for micro-generation provided by the area's abundant renewable resources of wind, wave, and tidal stream. In OREF's view SHEPD should be doing everything it can to enable residents and landowners to develop this potential. This should be one of SHEPD's priorities The delivery and collection of distributed sustainable energy from renewable sources is also a key priority. The distribution grid has an important role to play here for smaller scale generation between ~50MW and 50kW. Planning the grid for this role is also very important. Adaptable to changing supply and demand patterns. The revolution in energy supply and changes required in energy use will alter the supply and demand dynamics, shift excesses and shortfalls to different time periods and due to different scenarios. System flexibility to be able to cope with such changes well also be important. This priority will help to meet Government targets on renewable energy, as well as assisting consumers in the Hydroelectric area to maximize distributed generation of renewable. b) Land power relations need to improve. c) They are accurate but perhaps window dressing? d) Reliable supply is most important as everyone relies on electric. No one can do without electric and it has to be value for money.	Nine connection customers responded to this question. Seven agreed with our priorities. Two did not agree with our priorities. Two respondents stated that we should be prioritising the connection of renewable/low carbon energy to our network. One respondent indicated that they would like more information around our priority of not carrying out activities at the expense of the environment to ensure that customers receive value for money.	Key theme: Our stakeholders agree with the priorities that we have identified. We note that some of our stakeholders would like to see these priorities ranked in order of importance.  Our response: Our top priority is for our business to "think safety"; to think of the safety of ourselves, our colleagues, our contractors and the public. We want everyone our business touches to go home to their families safely and free from injury at the end of the day. Working to achieve that is the most important thing we will do.
		2		a) The views and interests of generators should be better represented. The priorities should include - connect new low carbon generation in a timely and efficient manner b) "That activities not carried out at the expense of Environment" is far to big an area and needs to be more defined. It seem like anything could be put in that pot and then costs just added to the cost to customers without any need to evaluate cost benefit.		
			3			
Consumer Representatives	0				One consumer representative organisation responded to this question. Whilst they agreed with our priorities they would like us to add care for vulnerable people. We will incorporate this into our day-to-day stakeholder engagement implementation plan.	Our second priority is to provide a good service to our customers. Our Second Consultation will propose a range of measures that, taken together, will improve the services that we provide to our customers. These proposals include: actions to improve the reliability of supply of electricity; how we will be more responsive to customers' enquiries; and the minimum environmental standards we propose to adopt. Therefore these targets for providing a good service to our customers are not ranked; rather each is of equal priority to SSEPD.
		1		a) We agree but would also add care for vulnerable people		
Customer			0		Twenty customers responded to this question. Nineteen of our customers agreed with our priorities. However, some stakeholders would like to see the priorities ranked in order of importance. One customer disagreed with our priorities as they felt that we should be focussed on safety and reliability.	Some stakeholders offered feedback around the ways in which we communicate processes. We have incorporated this within our day-to-day stakeholder engagement plan and incorporated this into our existing business processes and procedures where appropriate.  We have also considered your feedback around the importance of the environment within Question 10; the way we assess value for money within Question 11 and how we consider vulnerable consumers within Question 11.
		1		a) Safety must be the no1 priority. I'd rather have no power than a risk of electrocution, but reliability is a very close 2nd.		
			16			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1				Only one Emergency Service/NHS Body responded to this question. They agreed with these priorities.	
		0				
Energy Supply Companies			0		Two Energy Supply Companies responded to this question. However, one felt that safe supply of electricity should be the highest priority.	
	2			a) But a safe supply of electricity should be at the top of that list!		
Government and Public Sector Organisations			0		Four Government and Public Sector Organisations responded to this question and they all agreed with our priorities.	
	4					
			5			

## Question 3: Do you agree with these priorities: a reliable supply of electricity; a safe supply of electricity; value for money; good customer service; and that our activities are not carried out at the expense of the environment? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) Are there any priorities that you would like to see included / removed? c) If yes, please tell us why.	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 3 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	1				One member of the Innovation Community responded to this question and agreed with our priorities.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	2			a) Our Economic wellbeing relies on an uninterrupted supply.	Four Landowners and Estates responded to this question. Two agreed with our priorities, with one noting that an uninterrupted supply is crucial to economic wellbeing. Two disagreed with our priorities with one suggesting that our wording around our environmental priority needs to change.	
		0				
		2		a) You identify five priorities that a group of customers have identified and this AONB is of the opinion that you should give equal weight to these five priorities in your future plans. We would also go a little further and strongly suggest that your priority 'That our activities are not carried out at the expense of the environment' is made more positive, along the lines of, 'our activities will conserve and, wherever possible, enhance the environment'.		
Local Authority	4			a) Add: Cooperation and information sharing with the civil resilience community. As a Category 2 responder, SSE has a duty to cooperate and share information and on this basis is a key partner with responders in resilience work.	Four local authorities responded to this question. We note that one respondent would like us to include co-operating and sharing information with the resilience community. We are committed to doing this and are picking this up through our day-to-day stakeholder engagement implementation plan.	
		0				
			2			
Regulators	0				No Regulators responded to this question.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	12			a) The above are also our priorities in the services we provide to SSE. We believe that reliable, safe and good value for money transformers, with good customer service, will support SSE achieving these priorities. b) Only 1 or 2 simple tariffs to choose from c) More competition awareness. Clients need to see visibility or SSE could be seen to be monopoly. d) No particular comment to make e) I believe that these are the right priorities. f) Meet modern expectations, environmental impact must be considered g) More stakeholder interface, we believe we can contribute to this goal SSE has, we believe that more discussion on our service could be of benefit to SSE	Twelve supply chain and service providers responded to this question and agreed with our priorities. Two respondents asked that the flow of information from us to this stakeholder group improves with another stating that we need to pay more consideration to the environment.	
		0				
			3			
Utilities	5			a) We agree with the stated priorities, although I have set below some of the matters that we think should be considered as the consultation process continues. This focuses around "Value for Money" being a balance of service against cost, not just lowest cost. It must be borne in mind that distribution and transmission costs are typically 19% of a customer's electricity "bill", so give a proportionately small opportunity for cost saving, but a commensurately high opportunity for service disruption and the associated economic costs which customers might suffer as a result. b) Publish a clear escalation procedure or a hierarchy in area such as design and project delivery so that ICP's/IDNO's know which route to take when there is a need to escalate c) Support for all IDNOs in the SSE area so that the end customer gets the best service possible.	We received six responses from utilities. Five agreed with our priorities with one stating that value for money is a complex measure and needs not only to consider financial cost but service too. Additionally, there two comments relating to business process and IDNO/ICP in our areas - this will be picked up through our day-to-day stakeholder engagement implementation plan.	
		1		a) The safety of personnel and other services. General personnel and environmental safety. See HSG47 for guidance.		
			1			
Other	8			a) We wish to highlight 'That our activities are not carried out at the expense of the environment' is the key priority for RSPB and our members. b) Innovative cost solutions - win win for supplier & SSE. Look at total supply chain costs to benefit all. c) Better coordination with other utility service providers. Delivery of a more sustainable service with less impact on the environment and disruption to transportation	Eight respondents who classified themselves as falling into the "other category" responded to this question and agreed with our priorities. One respondent stated that their members prioritise the environment most highly.	
		0				
			13	a) The environmental element could be expanded upon. I would anticipate this would include both SSE's contribution to climate mitigation and to how SSE's own activities affect landscapes, public amenity and species and habitats - along with measures to mitigate these impacts.		

**Question 4a: Is our focus on managing change to minimise cost and customer disruption the right approach for the challenges ahead? If not, please explain why.**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If not, please explain why.	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 4 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	5			a) Yes, but it is important to consider medium and long term cost and disruption, not just short term. Grid upgrade and strengthening costs are dwarfed by raw fuel cost fluctuations, yet there is micro scrutiny of grid costs, whilst there is little control over raw fuel prices.	Seven connections customers responded to this question, with five agreeing with our focus on managing change minimising cost and disruption. One customer emphasised the need to focus on medium-to-long term costs as well as short term costs. Two connections customers did not agree with our approach, believing that there are "revolutionary changes required to the energy system", and suggesting that we should be pushing faster and further with innovation to make better use of existing assets and effectively deal with distributed generation.	Key theme: Over 92% of respondents agreed with our approach to managing change, with some respondents noting a need to ensure environmental concerns were not compromised. A small number of respondents disagreed with our approach, with many of these suggesting that change should be further and faster.  Our response: We agree that there is a need for innovation to be sustainable. There is a natural correlation between much of our innovation strategy and our desire not to carry out our activities at the expense of the environment. For instance, Active Network Management has reduced the need to build new overhead lines across the country and the materials required to enable this; losses reduction initiative, creosote and SF6 alternatives. We are committed to bringing innovative solutions into use as part of our day-to-day activities as soon as practically and safely possible.
		2		a) Cost and customer disruption are both inevitable for the revolutionary changes required to the energy system, of which electricity distribution networks are a key component. Indeed, the name 'distribution' is now redundant, with so many distributed generators connecting onto this network as well as consumers. It is how those costs are shared and socialised that will determine the effective transition to low carbon electricity system. b) Never mind "planning" for Smarter Grids - they should already be implemented! There is considerably more that could be done to make better utilisation of the existing assets, such projects have already been demonstrated elsewhere and really should already be part of your business. For example, is there any good reason why "dynamic line ratings" are not applied universally across your network? In essence, you have the generally right direction, but should be pushing much further and faster with innovation.		
			5			
Consumer Representatives	1				One consumer representative responded to this question, and agreed with our approach to managing change.	
		0				
Customer			0		Twenty customers responded to this question, with eighteen agreeing with our approach to managing change. Two did not agree with our approach.	
	18			a) As I have explained before with water there no fumes and if a country like Egypt can do it why o why not us.		
		2				
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies			16		Only one Emergency service/NHS body responded to this question, agreeing with our approach.	
	1					
		0				
Energy Supply Companies			0		Two energy supply companies responded to this question, agreeing with our approach to managing change.	
	2					
		0				
Government and Public Sector Organisations			5		Four governmental and public sector organisations responded, all agreeing with our approach in this area.	
	4					
		0				
Innovation Community	1				One member of the innovation community responded to this question, agreeing with our approach.	
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	1				One landowner responded to this question agreeing with our approach. One responded, whilst neither agreeing or disagreeing, noted that they do not believe our focus on minimising cost should compromise our commitment to the environment.	
		0				
			3	a) The AONB encourages you to take an innovative approach, however we would strongly encourage you to ensure that the focus on minimising cost does not reduce your commitment to conserve the environment.		
Local Authority	4				Four local authorities responded, with all four being in agreement with our focus on managing change to minimise cost.	
		0				
			2			
Regulators	0				There were no responses from Regulators to this question.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	12				Twelve supply chain and service providers responded to this question, all of whom agreed with our approach in this area.	
		0				
			3			
Utilities	5			a) Need to consider whole costs including the mobilisation of two emergency response providers and give the customer the best service that they have paid their duos for.	Six utility companies responded to this question, and six were in agreement with our approach to managing change. One disagreed, and noted that simply reducing costs and interruptions does not address future challenges - foundations should be laid now to design intelligent, smart grids.	
		1		a) Simply reducing cost and CI / CMLs does not meet the challenges ahead. I have set out below in paragraphs "a" to "d" how preparation should start now to lay the foundations of active and intelligent distribution networks and "smart grids" in terms of network design, connection criteria and staff training and recruitment profiles.		
			1			
Other	5				Five uncategorised members responded to this question and all agreed with our approach to managing change. However, one respondent noted that any approach should have appropriate regard for the environment.	
		0				
			16	a) Perhaps need to include "with appropriate regard for the environment"		

**Question 4c: Can you tell us about any local schemes and initiatives which will affect the smart grid we are creating?**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder Feedback Detail of local schemes and initiatives which will affect the smart grid we are creating	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 4c and our response
Connections	a) OREF is already working with SHEPD on the assessment of a number of initiatives aimed at removing the present capacity constraint which has made it necessary for SHEPD to introduce restrictions on micro-generation connections to the distribution network in Orkney. OREF has proposed a number of options which are now under detailed examination in joint OREF/SSE/Orkney Islands Council groups. OREF believes that the current problem provides an opportunity to identify and implement a number of innovative projects, which would have potential for wider application in the SSEPD area. These solutions encompass technical solutions, and demand enhancement and management solutions, as well as organisational solutions. OREF is keen to co-operate with SSE in implementing some of the solutions identified through the joint working outlined above. A list and brief description of the projects suggested by OREF is attached. b) Skye reinforcements	Any collaborative working is welcome, a large proportion of solutions for deconstraining Distributed Generation sit with the communities in which the energy is created so collaborative initiatives are where the real benefits can be accrued. We are working to ensure that communities like Orkney appreciate the full benefits that an Active Network Management system can bring when combined with local demand and energy storage owned and operated by customers.	<p>Key Theme: Our stakeholders are supportive of our collaborative approach to working on innovation and recognised the benefits.</p> <p>Our response: We have worked hard to bring forward a balance portfolio of innovation that addresses both the opportunities presented by smart metering and non-smart meter solutions. We have noted the local schemes and initiatives being undertaken that will affect the smart grid we are creating. We are already working closely with Orkney Renewable Energy Forum and Eco-Island. We will contact the respondent with regard to Zeropex.</p>
Consumer Representatives	a) Important to work with the Footprint Trust on the Isle of Wight - as we are the main sustainability charity, that works with the community.	One consumer representative responded to this question. We note that they have flagged up the work of the Footprint Trust on the Isle of Wight.	
Customer	a) No, the Planners where we live will stop anything. b) None yet, this depends on the interconnection of appliances to smart metering switchable loads	No local schemes or initiatives were identified.	
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies			
Energy Supply Companies			
Government and Public Sector Organisations			
Innovation Community			
Landowners and Estates			
Local Authority			
Regulators			
Supply chain and service providers	a) Zeropex schemes in water networks	One supply chain or service provider responded to this question. We note that they have flagged up Zeropex schemes.	
Utilities			
Other	a) Potential to connect to private pave. Farms b) Smart metering programme will no doubt provide good info re usage etc once complete and this may ultimately impact on Distribution business	No local schemes or initiatives were identified.	

## Question 4d: Do you think our approach to innovation is right?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 4d and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	3			a) Yes, but need to build in greater forecasting potential and less reactivity b) Moving forward is very important	Five connection customers responded to this question. The majority of this group agree with our approach to innovation and reflect our desire to see our innovative solutions quickly integrated into our day-to-day activities.	Key theme: Our stakeholders agree with our approach of making taking our innovative solutions and integrating them into our day-to-day activities as quickly as possible.  Our response: We have worked hard to bring forward a balanced portfolio of innovation that addresses both the opportunities presented by smart metering and non-smart meter solutions. The primarily focus of our innovation team is to balance the need to robustly test new innovations both commercially and technically to avoid premature deployment which could result in loss of supply for our customers. We continue to be committed to integrating our innovative solutions into our day-to-day activities as demonstrated by our recent announcement relating to the roll out of active network management to key zones within the north of Scotland.
		1		a) Never mind "planning" for Smarter Grids - they should already be implemented! There is considerably more that could be done to make better utilisation of the existing assets, such projects have already been demonstrated elsewhere and really should already be part of your business. For example, is there any good reason why "dynamic line ratings" are not applied universally across your network? In essence, you have the generally right direction, but should be pushing much further and faster with innovation.		
				8		
Consumer Representatives	1				One consumer representative responded to this question and agreed with our approach to innovation.	
		0				
			0			
Customer	14			a) Be good to see it working b) Getting the ideas is fine - identifying the golden nuggets that come from it is usually where it all falls down. Furthermore for those that get through, the actioning of a fix is usually constrained by resource typically money but more commonly a champion to make it happen. c) More innovation, more price variation through the day, smart electric goods that switch off when there is high demand/ expensive electricity.	Agree with the comment on Smart metering, that is why only a small percentage of our innovation programme directly relates to Smart Metering (only the NTVV project). That said, Smart Metering when in place will make some of our non smart meter dependent innovations more widely available.	
		3		a) Too much emphasis being put on smart metering technologies. Reducing the customer facing interfaces which I believe are important.		
			19			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1				Only one Emergency Service/NHS Body responded to this question and agreed with our approach to innovation.	
		0				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	2				Two Energy Supply Companies responded to this question and they agree with our approach to innovation.	
		0				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	3				Four Government and Public Sector Organisations responded to this question. Three agreed with our approach to innovation but one disagreed.	
		1				
			5			

Question 4d: Do you think our approach to innovation is right? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 4d and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	1			a) More work on prognostics and architectures such as open reference from the field of computer science. The grid is complex and aging infrastructure can be optimised with respect to asset remaining life by developing a better understanding of network interdependencies from generation to end user.	Optimisation of asset use is key to a number of projects we have underway, this has to be balanced with the fact that no amount of smart will prevent us from having to replace a rotten pole. There is a balance to be struck however between pushing assets and maintaining resilience of the network both in normal operation but also in exceptional events like storms and black starts <sup>1</sup> .	(see page above for details)
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	0					
		0				
			4			
Local Authority	4				Four Local Authorities responded to this question. They agree with our approach to innovation.	
		0				
			2			
Regulators	0					
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	11			a) And company A is available to cooperate with innovation in our products, aiming your focus above and smarter grids. b) But more should be used by other SSE businesses not just Distribution c) Well overdue - other parts of the world have had smart networks for years. Can you learn from them?	We are working with a number of other organisations to ensure that solutions are joined up, e.g. Our relationship with Dimplex and Honeywell are ensuring the Demand Side Management is designed to achieve benefits for both system balancing and the network.	
		0				
			4	a) A challenge to adopt best available technology not entailing excessive cost is needed		
Utilities	4				Four Utilities responded to this question. They agree with our approach to innovation.	
		0				
			3			
Other	5			a) Company B are looking at developing new design cables to benefit all involved in the supply chain. b) Seeking the views of customers etc is new and innovative. First time I have been asked for my opinion	Five innovation companies responded to this question and agreed with our approach to innovation. Any new designs or innovations are of interest to our programme, would be happy to discuss further what Copper Cable Company are proposing. The majority of our innovation programme is focussed on these very challenges, ANM, Energy Storage, DC and dynamic line rating just but a sample of what we are doing in this field. The point is well made as in reality electric vehicles and heat pumps are not yet providing anything like the challenge that embedded generation is giving. With regard to Offshore this is usually the area in which the transmission network is involved not Distribution although there are exceptions.	
		0				
			16	a) I would have expected to see more coverage of the challenges in connecting remote generation sites, including onshore and offshore wind, as well as the potential for wave and tidal generation.		

<sup>1</sup> Black start: The series of actions necessary to restore electricity supplies to customers following a total or widespread partial shutdown of the GB Transmission System. Black Start requires distribution substations to be re-energised and reconnected to each other in a controlled way to re-establish a fully interconnected system.

**Question 5: Have you experienced an interruption in your power supply caused by a fault on our network? What did we do well and how could we improve?**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 5 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	1			a) Fault was rectified in reasonable time.	Five Connections customers responded to this question. Of these, only one had experienced a fault on their power supply. They felt that we responded in a reasonable time.	Key Theme: Customers appear to be reasonably satisfied with how long it takes to respond to network faults and in restoring their power supplies. Some customers wanted to see a more resilient network that is less affected by severe weather events - particularly in remote rural areas. Some customers also felt that customers who experienced repeated interruptions should be given additional consideration. Whereas our physical response to faults was received well by customers they felt that we should look at further improving our handling of customer calls, including the provision of accurate information regarding fault duration.
		4				
			7			
Consumer Representatives	0				One consumer representative responded They had not experienced any fault on their power supply.	
		1				
			0			
Customer	12			a) When the power went off I called the Engineering Line and was told of a fault that was being repaired on the next road to mine. True enough, as I looked out the window I saw the repair team working. Little could be done to improve as there will always be a single point of failure if you go down the distribution chain far enough. b) We have had power cuts but cannot complain about efficiency of workers reconnecting us c) Typically there is no warning of power cut. If power cut there is no advice of how long it will take to repair. d) Its not that it went well SSEPD and Contracting 1 do not talk to each other and they certainly were not talking to the regeneration firm of Company C who are carrying out the redevelopment of the housing estate where I live. e) Not your area but 11k network is mainly overhead which creates problems in storms/bad weather. Making a profit for bonuses and shareholders handouts is priority to costs of upgrading - answer - nationalise. f) OK disruption to a minimum g) Kept us informed - the estimated time of return turned out to be very accurate - well done. There's nothing worse than not knowing so communication is key h) Recovered situation swiftly. Well prepared for storms in advance and provided adequate updates on helpline. i) This was only a brief outage	Nineteen customers responded to this question, of which twelve had experienced an interruption in their electricity supply. The majority of respondents felt that we handled the fault well, but there were some others that felt it could have been handled better. These customers felt that having accurate and timely information on how long they would be affected was important to them and needed to be improved.	Our response: We are pleased that customers recognise our efforts and good performance in dealing with network faults. We recognise the relatively worse performance of the most remote parts of our network in terms of the number of times these customers are off supply and will be including proposals in our Business Plan to improve this. We also recognise that we need to continue to improve our customer call handling and associated fault information. Much work has been done on improving this between field staff and the Emergency Service Centres which will improve this in the short term, but we acknowledge that this is most important to our customers, to allow them to consider appropriate alternative arrangements during power outages.
		7		a) You provide a good supply of power all the time and can be relied on. But its a pity that its not green. (water power would be) b) I like the recorded message when we ring regarding a power cut. It is clear.		
			17			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1			a) Local support was very positive. Unfortunately the local infrastructure is not very resilient and therefore lack any robustness during adverse weather events leaving the system vulnerable to power interruptions. Development of a more robust network of power distribution would be very welcome in the islands.	We received one response from Emergency Services and NHS Bodies. They had experienced power outages. They wanted to see a more resilient network that would be less affected by severe weather events.	
		0				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	0				Two Energy Supply Companies responded They had not experienced any fault on their power supply.	
		2				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	0				Three Government and Public Sector stakeholders responded They had not experienced any fault on their power supply.	
		3		a) Work more closely with land owners, e.g. Forestry commission on timing of line closures to so both parties can plan ahead		
			6			

## Question 5: Have you experienced an interruption in your power supply caused by a fault on our network? What did we do well and how could we improve? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 5 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	1			a) Response times are relatively quick but due to frequency of faults and power fluctuations a local assessment should be done and mitigation put in place.	We received one response from the Innovation Community and they had experienced faults on their electricity supply. They felt that we responded well but that the frequency of these events was still a concern and needed further investigation.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	2			a) The supply goes off regularly, everything has to be reset.	We received two responses from Landowners and Estates who had experienced power supply interruptions. They recognised the inconvenience that this causes them in resetting electrical appliances.	
		0				
			2			
Local Authority	2			a) Improve the timeliness of information to partner organisations so that we can consider the impact upon organisational business continuity and community impact/vulnerable people. b) Provided reasonable information on length of time before fault could be repaired. For many businesses proactive advice of a power failure, cause and length of time to reinstate would be helpful, possibly setting up a database of customers who need to be told immediately a failure is identified.	Four Local Authorities responded to this question, of which two had experienced an interruption in their electricity supply. They recognised the importance to them of having good quality information available about the likely duration of the fault, and wanted to see further improvements in this area. They were also concerned about vulnerable customers who may be particularly affected by electricity supply interruptions.	
		2				
			2			
Regulators	0				There were no responses from Regulators to this question	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	1			a) On a couple of occasions. SSE did very well: after 2nd time a follow up letter would be good.	We received eight responses from Supply chain and service providers, of which only one had experienced power interruptions. One stakeholder felt that our response was very good, but they felt that they expected improved communications for repeated failures of their electricity supply	
		7		a) Fed via UKPN network, not SEPD network		
			7	a) This question is not applicable to our company b) Not applicable for us		
Utilities	2			a) We operate many sites across the SSE (South) region, so invariably have experience both planned and unplanned interruptions. There have been recent cases of us not being notified of planned supply interruptions that have resulted in ESG/4 failures. Automation of the notification process would improve matters, but this would mean an investment in IT systems such as ENMAC Troublecall or similar, which other DNOs such as Western Power Distribution and UK Power Networks have already made. Apart from providing better customer service by electronically linking customer information to network topology, this might also increase transparency by providing stronger audit trails in the reporting of CIs and CMLs. b) Not very well, had no information on the fault that had occurred and received rude letter suggesting it was our fault that SSE did not know they had a fault affecting our network.	Six Utilities responded to this question, of which two had experienced power interruptions. One stakeholder felt they would like to see improved IT systems to better inform customers on unplanned outages. The other customer felt we had not handled their case very well.	
		4				
			1			
Other	4			a) 1 local fault cleared quickly. 1 major fault cleared quickly. Answered the phone quickly, gave accurate information. b) Power restored very quickly. You did well.	Five "other" stakeholders responded to this question, of which four had experienced electricity supply interruptions. Of these two stakeholders felt that we had responded well in restoring supplies and in dealing with the faults.	
		1				
			16			

**Question 6: Do you think a Guaranteed Standards payment of around two-thirds of the distribution element of the average bill is fair? What, if anything, could be done to improve the Guaranteed Standards scheme?**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 6 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	3				Three Connections customers responded to this question. They all agreed that this level of payment was fair.	Key Theme: The majority of stakeholders agree that the current level of payment for GS standards is fair. Some customers wanted to see higher levels of compensation that reflected the consequential loss to the individual customer caused by the loss of supply.
		0				
			9			
Consumer Representatives	1				One Consumer Representative responded to this question. They agreed that this level of payment was fair.	Our response: We also believe that the current level of Guaranteed Standard payment is fair and are pleased that stakeholders support this. We believe that it is necessary for customers to consider options for mitigating loss of supply in each individual case, and it would not be appropriate or practicable for DNOs to take on this increased level of liability which would only be passed on through customer bills. We recognise that customers do not want to see further increases in their bills which supports this position.
		0				
			0			
Customer	12			a) Expand the criteria for multiple interruption compensation to take better account of customers bothered by frequent but short duration interruptions. b) Again open it up to the public more through focus groups - listen to what is being said and action accordingly	Fourteen customers responded to this question. Of these, twelve agreed that the level of payment was fair. Two customers disagreed that the level of payment was fair. These customers were concerned that the compensation levels did not adequately reflect customers who suffered multiple short interruptions. They also indicated that DNOs should initiate focus groups with customers, and that they were concerned that increased payments would increase costs through their bills.	
		2				
			22	a) How much more is this going to cost us customers? .		
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1				One Emergency Services representative responded to this question. They agreed that this level of payment was fair.	
		0				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	2				One Energy Supply Company responded to this question. They agreed that this level of payment was fair.	
		0				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	2				Two Government and Public Sector Organisations representative responded to this question. They agreed that this level of payment was fair.	
		0				
			7			

## Question 6: Do you think a Guaranteed Standards payment of around two-thirds of the distribution element of the average bill is fair? What, if anything, could be done to improve the Guaranteed Standards scheme? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 6 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	0				There was no response from the Innovation Community to this question.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			1			
Landowners and Estates	1				Two Land Owners and Estates responded to this question. One agreed and one disagreed that the level of payment was adequate. One stakeholder felt that, as other forms of fuel were not available in many rural areas that the reliance of these customers to the electricity supply was greater, and DNOs needed to recognise this in their operations.	
		1				
			2	a) Attention should be given to those considerable numbers of customers in rural areas that have no alternative fuel supply. I note that in your paragraph on essential service (page22) you note that mains gas is not available in many rural locations and this AONB is one where this is the case.		
Local Authority	3				Four Local Authority representatives responded. Of these three agreed that the level of payment was fair. One representative felt it was not fair and should more reflect the consequential loss to the customer of losing his electricity supply.	
		1		a) It does not fairly reflect the cost to the organisation of a loss of power		
			2			
Regulators	0				There was no response from Regulators to this question.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	9			a) We do not know enough to comment	Nine Supply Chain and Service Providers responded to this question. They agreed that this level of payment was fair.	
		0				
			6	a) This question is not applicable to our company.		
Utilities	3			a) GS should be split across all distributors so that there is an incentive to work together. At present we only receive a percentage of the DUOS yet would have to pay the whole of the GS.	Four utilities answered this question. Of these, three agreed, and one disagreed that the level of payment was fair. One respondent wanted to see DNOs working together more. One respondent was concerned that the level of payment may provide a perverse incentive to DNOs where the cost of avoiding a GS payment may be significantly less than the cost of avoiding it, such as when it may require significant overtime working.	
		1		a) This does not reflect the economic loss that such failures can cause commercial and industrial customers. Whilst we recognise that DNOs need to have their liabilities capped for the losses suffered by customers, a payment of typically only £54 could incentivise DNOs to make decisions to save its own costs in the operation of its networks which might result in customers in the industrial and commercial sectors to suffer much higher losses. E.g. delaying repairs to a cable fault to avoid overtime costs might save a DNO in excess of the £54 they might have to pay a customer as an EGS payment, but cost a commercial or industrial customer several £1,000s in lost production. This would therefore not encourage DNOs to make a holistic decision with regards to its own and customers' costs.		
			3			
Other	3				Three other stakeholders responded to this question. They agreed that this level of payment was fair.	
		0				
			18			

## Question 7: Have you had experience of being contacted by, or contacting, us?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If so, what were the circumstances? c) What did we do well and how could we improve?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 7 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	5			a) Regarding new connections a2) Good service b) Connection enquiries c) New connections, diversions, wayleaves c2) Varied d) Connection of wind turbine on farm d2) Connection went well and was impressed with staff involved. e) New connections and disconnections e2) I had to chase for a response during the construction phase of the new connection and even now, the site is finished an dwellings sold but still the SSE works are outstanding. With regard disconnection, no commitment to assist the Customer what so ever.	Five connection customers responded to this questions. In terms of what we did well the responses vary from impressive through to unsatisfactory	Key Themes: Inconsistency in service levels from initial call/enquiry through to site information.  Our response: With a stronger focus on customer service, we are working across our customer facing teams, to ensure a consistency in delivering first class service. This includes the monitoring of contacts through customer satisfaction surveys, telephone call monitoring for training and ongoing training and coaching for all employees.
		0				
			7			
Consumer Representatives	1			a) Running free white goods scheme for your company. Calling your helpline on behalf of clients. a2) Very good - better than all the other help lines we call.	One Consumer Representative responded to this question. Positive comment regarding our appliance testing and repair service	
		0				
			0			
Customer	9			a) As a local electrician, I regularly call the Engineering 0800 number. I often need Supplier fuse upgrades or PME checks. I always get a job reference number and an expected call back time from the local team. It's easy to keep SSE informed of fuses pulled. a2) A particular customer was very impressed as I called the engineering line for a fuse upgrade and the next day a team was out to do the job. This made us both look very professional. To improve, I'd like to be given something better than a sticky label to re-seal the cut-out after an isolation task. Being given only 5 sticky labels at a time from the local SSE depot seems a bit cheap. b) Power cuts when we were hotel owners b2) always found staff helpful & able to update us efficiently c) Supply failure d) New supplies to many developments d2) I must admit that SSE are one of the better supply authorities. e) Trying to find out why power was lost e2) Told the truth about the issue and gave an anticipated return to service which was almost spot on f) During disruptions f2) Did OK g) [Job number removed]. You cashed the £50,000 cheque, then lost the paperwork. It took ages to actually get someone onto site to discuss what we were going to do. g2) Your guys are like Doctors, when you get to see them they are great. However, you work in 'silo's' rather than one contact for the customer. We have to deal with three separate experts. h) Bill queries with your contact centre, power cuts... h2) Staff are verging on being 'over friendly' I am unsure if this is some sort of SSE Policy, but I would much rather call and receive an efficient, professional service, than try and make friends with your representatives. i) PV applications as a customer and installer i2) I think you done well due to the pending FIT Deadlines	Seventeen customers replied to this questions. Roughly half of had contacted us and comments were largely positive; with one suggesting we are too friendly. Sadly some paperwork lost internally which has let us down	
		8				
			19			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	0				Only one Emergency service/NHS body responded to this question and they had no experience of contacting us.	
		1				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	1			a) Grid fault with a pave install a2) everything went well	Two energy supply companies responded to this question. One had experience of contacting us and made positive comments.	
		1				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	1			a) Ordering new services into public buildings & cancelling services into public buildings a2) Your industry has become far too disjointed, as a customer I want to deal with one body as we used to prior to Ofgem changing the rules, when ordering new or ceasing existing supplies the current procedures do not work effectively, when there is a problem it is left to the customer to ring round & liaise with meter operator, electrical supplier & network operator wasting valuable time & resources in getting jobs done. We want to be able to deal with one body who can then talk & liaise internally with all the other parties to deliver the required services.	Two Government and Public Sector Organisations responded to this question. One respondent had contacted us and experienced inconsistent service levels and various points of contact.	
		1				
			7			

## Question 7: Have you had experience of being contacted by, or contacting, us? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If so, what were the circumstances? c) What did we do well and how could we improve?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 7 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	0	0	1			(see page above for details)
Landowners and Estates	2	0	2	a) Our main linkage is in connection with the undergrounding schemes responding to the Ofgem programme for protected landscapes. Whilst we have found the local teams responsive and helpful I have to say that we were quite disappointed at the end of the last round that the schemes that had been identified for progress had not been achieved. We were even more disappointed when SSE did not pick up this significant environmental baton at the start of the next round in 2010. Whilst welcoming the push to make up the lost ground this summer, together with the completion of the scheme that was outstanding from the last round, it would be unfair to say that we are not disappointed that this activity has come online two years late. We would, therefore, sincerely hope that in the business plan for the future there will be an unequivocal undertaking to give high priority to landscape enhancement schemes both in the protected landscapes and Conservation Areas.	Four Landowners and Estates responded to this question, with two contacting us. They are very keen to see us giving high priority to landscape enhancement schemes in both protected landscapes and conservation areas.	
Local Authority	2	2	2	a) Power outage in the city centre, knocking out power to County Hall and our IT services. a2) Need to improve the timeliness of information to critical partners so that a community impact can be made. b) Agree dates for planned maintenance b2) Altered dates to suit the council operation. Better recognition of the impact of loss of power on IT systems and the time required to power down and up safely	Four Local Authorities responded to this question. There is a need to improve communications with local authorities.	
Regulators	0	0	1		No regulators responded to this question.	
Supply chain and service providers	7	2	6	a) We are contractors so we are in contact daily a2) Your invoice processing could be quicker, simpler and not so complicated. Especially regarding retentions b) As a supplier of transformers to SSE. c) discussions regarding incidents d) Supply contract execution d2) Communication was exactly as required e) Always for contracts of work e2) Sometimes have trouble getting return calls f) Business to business relationship f2) Yes - Open and honest g) We are a supplier of electric fuses	Nine supply chain and service providers responded to this questions and had experience of contacting us. Comments reflect our need to improve internal processes need improvement and a negative comment regarding return of calls.	
Utilities	6	0	1	a) The most notable was a requirement to increase supply capacity. I found the back office estimating staff to be helpful, but found the supervisory staff arranging the work to have inadequate technical and regulatory knowledge. I have covered this in more detail under Q4, but would be pleased to expand on this particular experience if you require. b) To discuss the safety of other services and utilities due to work undertaken by SSE. b2) Maintain the procedure for utility "searches" as a procedure for ALL ground penetrating works by use of www.linsearchbeforeudig.co.uk c) Numerous occasions - Generally the experience is very good. d) We had to contact you to raise concerns on project delivery as no one from SSEPD responded or returned our calls for energisation. We also had to contact you and spend significant amount of time to get you to understand that you as a DNO can not dictate you policies on us, an IDNO, where we are the majority asset owner. d2) With no clear published escalation procedure we had to approach your commercial manager who has always been very helpful. e) Awaiting a large refund, it did take 6 months to get back to Virgin Media e2) This incident would have been dealt with better if someone hadn't taken end to end ownership of the issue f) Faults - very poor and unhelpful Connections - very friendly and helpful f2) Deal with all customers in way that gives us confidence that you listen and care.	Six Utilities responded to this question. Six had experience of contacting us. Comments around our performance vary.	
Other	3	1	17	a2) Only when power outage - good as new message saying aware of fault and were acting on it b) I work for companies who require new or build up electricity supplies, also tariffs mop etc b2) I do work for people who do not find it easy to do their own enquiries. I worked for SSE for 40+ years so I know the ropes. c) Power cut c2) No	Four people who categorise themselves as "Other" responded to this question. Three had experience of contacting us - generally in a power cut and were happy with the response.	

**Question 8: Do you agree that in the future the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate? If not, please explain why.**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 8 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	4				Five Connection customers responded to this question. Four agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate. One disagreed because they think that the low carbon revolution will lead to an increase in the number of connections.	Key theme: The majority of respondents who answered this question agree that the number of new domestic and commercial connections is linked to the overall economic climate. Some believe that this will be influenced by factors which are separate from economy; and that connections going forward may have less of an effect on the network as people will "generate their own electricity".
		1		a) as per NGET FES and similar DECC articles - rapid expansion in use of electricity for heat, storage, cars and microgen - will lead to a proliferation of new small-scale connections only marginally affected by overall economy. Continued upward trend in utility-scale renewable connections - industry growth far in excess of overall economy.		
			7			
Consumer Representatives	1				One consumer representative responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	Our response: We are seeing continued growth in connections of all types as the low carbon economy emerges. We expect this to continue (we don't see it as "hype") as planning applications and the economics of energy usage (petrol price rise) encourage greater use of connections. We are ensuring we deliver on this through exploring innovative connections solutions (as demonstrated in <b>Orkney RPZ</b> <sup>2</sup> and <b>New Thames Valley Vision</b> ) and reinforcing early where we see need.
		0				
			0			
Customer	14			a) to me it appears to be a correlation with the economy as a whole - so you would see disconnections align in the negative sense in a tough economic environment	Sixteen Customers responded to this question and agree that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	
		2		a) It will reduce after probably a two year "hype" from next spring.		
			20			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	1				One Emergency Services and NHS bodies responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	
		0				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	2				Two Energy Supply Companies responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	
		0				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	2				Two Government and Public Organisations responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	
		0				
			7			

<sup>2</sup> RPZs are focused specifically on the connection of generation to distribution systems. RPZs are intended to encourage DNOs to develop and demonstrate new, more cost effective ways of connecting and operating generation that will deliver specific benefits to new distributed generators and broader benefits to consumers generally. The RPZ mechanism is an extension of the Distributed Generation (DG) Incentive that is also being introduced as part of the DPCR. If a DNO employs genuine innovation in the way that it connects generation it can seek to register the connection scheme with Ofgem as an RPZ. Ofgem will decide, using published criteria (See Ofgem publication "Further Details of the RPZ Scheme – Guidance Document", published 14 April 2005), whether the scheme qualifies as an RPZ. If it does, the incentive element of the DG Incentive is increased for the first five years of operation by £3/kW

**Question 8: Do you agree that in the future the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate? If not, please explain why. (continued)**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 8 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	1				One member of the innovation community responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	1				One Landowner and Estate responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate. One respondent felt that this question is oversimplified as it combines both input and output connections.	
		0				
			3	a) This is, I would hazard to suggest, oversimplified in that it combines both input connections and output connections. Whilst there is considerable debate on the effectiveness of various renewable technologies, making matters easy when it comes to connections for individual customers linking solar panels or domestic scale wind turbines seems to be crucial. This is particularly so if the community as a whole is to take advantage of the opportunities to capture and utilise renewable energy and gain the benefits of making any surplus available to the National Grid. From the position of somebody outside your business I find Question 8 rather strange in that the question is either self evident if the number of connections is linked to the economic climate or is there something more complicated that has not come to light in the discussions in the document? Nevertheless the following paragraph makes the valid point that customers are looking for connections 'at the right time and for a reasonable price'. May I say that you should regard rural areas as special cases as by the nature of such rural areas connections involve considerable distances, particularly when compared to urban situations. Perhaps an element of innovation in rural areas could involve partnership supply and more elements of self help with land owners and land managers.		
Local Authority	3				Three local authorities responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	
		0				
			3			
Regulators	0				No regulators responded to this question.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	9				Ten supply chain and service providers responded to this question. Nine agree that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate. However, one respondent makes the point that connections could increase dramatically if there is a move towards electric vehicles.	
		1		a) If we move on electric cars etc, connections could outstrip economic climate		
			5			
Utilities	5				Five Connection customers responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the over all economic climate. One made the point that connections might be more likely to follow demographic patterns rather than economic.	
		0				
			2	a) This is beyond the scope of Wessex Water as a commercial customer of SSE Power Distribution. However, I would add that domestic connections would surely follow demographic more than economic patterns.		
Other	3				Three people, classing themselves in the "Other" category, responded to this question and agreed that the number of new domestic and commercial connections will continue to follow the overall economic climate.	
		0				
			18	a) Similar. But there will be more self powered, self generating dwellings which may or may not connect to the grid.		

## Question 9: Have you had experience of making a connection to our network?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If so, what did we do well and how could we improve?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 8 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	6			<p>a) Generally we have a good relationship with contacts at SSEPD, although service standards for new connections need to be reviewed to ensure service standards are included for delivery and quality of grid feasibility studies with early network information provision, as well as service standards for formal applications. Better breakdown of costs for connection offers is required, the current system is opaque and unaccountable. It should be noted that developers of renewable systems are paying for extensions to the distribution network which are added to the Regulated asset value. This increase in RAV allows SSE to increase its regulated earnings.</p> <p>b) Helpful and pleasant to deal with.</p> <p>c) Quicker response times in early stages</p> <p>d) Multiple utility-scale wind farm connections: 1 Positives: Dedicated project delivery managers, knowledgeable and generally communicative. Responsive individuals in the commercial team with suitable Legal resource behind them to be able to amend "standard" legal agreements in the most appropriate fashion. Reasonable approach to interpretation and application of relevant technical requirements (e.g. regarding reactive power flows) 2 Negatives: Under-resourced commercial and planning teams - e.g. 7 months to re-assess the cost of one scheme is not acceptable Unbearable slowness to uptake innovation proved elsewhere - why so many years to roll out the active network management scheme as proven in Orkney? Little drive to sort out the shambles of paperwork needed for distribution connections "affecting" the transmission system. Historically, less than pro-active in obtaining necessary land rights until these agreements become programme-critical.</p> <p>e) Wind turbine connection to grid. Went well.</p> <p>f) See previous answer - whilst staff may be OK the management is very poor.</p>	Seven Connection Customers responded to this question and the majority had experience of making a connection to out network. They think that we should have more standards for feasibility studies and connection timescales. They would also like to see a more detailed breakdown of costs. They like working with our dedicated teams for large Distributed Generation Customers. Specific Orkney issues were raised. We would like to clarify that connections assets do not add on to the RAV <sup>3</sup> , they have no value if wholly paid for by the connector and so we do not earn income through Use of System charges from them. They do add to the RAV as a liability)	Key theme: Stakeholders who had experience of connecting to our network generally report that our internal procedures for connection could be improved so that connections are more timely.  Our response: We are aware that our customers would like their connections to be processed in a timely manner. To enable this we have appointed a Head of Customer Services (with route-and-branch review of our Connection and Engineering Team); improvements have been made to our Quotation Letter around clarity and options; the Web Site has been improved to allow electronic application forms to be used, and from August 2013 it will be possible to apply, accept, pay and track your application on-line. We are also trialing on-site quotations. A dedicated Major Projects team with contract managers have been in set up in SHEPD with plans to roll out in SEPD.
	0					
			6	<p>a) Currently no connections above 3.7 kW are possible in Orkney. Orkney has probably the best renewable resources in the UK, and it also has a resident population interested in sustainability and quick to take up opportunities presented by the schemes to encourage renewable energy production. The restrictions on connections is therefore particularly frustrating – especially for those who had commenced the processes for developing projects, including making application for planning consent and/or for a connection. People in this position will have already committed time and money to their projects. In this situation, as well as looking for solutions to the restriction, there is a particular importance on information availability. Restrictions on connection are more acute in some zones in Orkney than in others. Potential developers need to know where constraints are particularly acute, and likewise where there may be opportunity for limited new connections. SHEPD should look at ways of making this information available, and OREF is prepared to co-operate with SHEPD in this task.</p>		
Consumer Representatives	0				One customer representative responded to this question but had no experience of making a connection.	
		1				
Customer			0		There is a clear demand for us to make more information available on the web around loading on systems which will allow connection customers to make a judgement on the areas in which they would apply for Distributed Generation connections. There are now heat maps available on our website and we are continually improving this information.	
	4			<p>a) I make numerous G83/G59 requests for PV inverter connections to the network. It would be really useful if there was a system that would allow me to see capacity/capability in the system without having to submit the forms and wait 10 days for a response. But understand that this is a massive task for very little financial return.</p> <p>b) Many. You are fairly good in your response time and accuracy.</p> <p>c) House move - all went as planned - the arrival time on site was within the agreed timeframe - made the move quite seamless</p> <p>d) job number DVY383. You cashed the £50,000 cheque, then lost the paperwork. It took ages to actually get someone onto site to discuss what we were going to do.</p>		
		11				
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies			21		One Emergency Service or NHS Body responded to this question but had no experience of making a connection to our network.	
	0					
Energy Supply Companies		1			One Energy Supply Company responded to this question and had experience of making a connection to our network and would have liked a faster response time to G59 application.	
	1			<p>a) quicker response time on a G59 application</p>		
Government and Public Sector Organisations			0		Three Government or Public Sector Organisations responded to this question. Only one had experience of making a connection to our network and would like us to liaise with all the other parties on their behalf.	
	1			<p>a) your industry has become far too disjointed, as a customer I want to deal with one body as we used to prior to Ofgem changing the rules, when ordering new or ceasing existing supplies the current procedures do not work effectively, when there is a problem it is left to the customer to ring round &amp; liaise with meter operator, electrical supplier &amp; network operator wasting valuable time &amp; resources in getting jobs done. We want to be able to deal with one body who can then talk &amp; liaise internally with all the other parties to deliver the required services.</p>		
		2				
			6			

<sup>3</sup> RAV: The value ascribed by Ofgem to the capital employed in the licensee's regulated distribution or (as the case may be) transmission business (the 'regulated asset base'). The RAV is calculated by summing an estimate of the initial market value of each licensee's regulated asset base at privatisation and all subsequent allowed additions to it at historical cost, and deducting annual depreciation amounts calculated in accordance with established regulatory methods. These vary between classes of licensee. A deduction is also made in certain cases to reflect the value realised from the disposal of assets comprised in the regulatory asset base. The RAV is indexed to RPI in order to allow for the effects of inflation on the licensee's capital stock. The revenues licensees are allowed to earn under their price controls include allowances for the regulatory depreciation and also for the return investors are estimated to require to provide the capital.

## Question 9: Have you had experience of making a connection to our network? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If so, what did we do well and how could we improve?	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 8 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	0				There were no responses from the Innovation Community to this question.	(see page above for details)
		0				
			1			
Landowners and Estates	1			a) Connection was timely	There were two respondents from Landowners and Estates who answered this question. One had experience of the connecting to our network and felt that the connection was timely. One respondent indicated that anecdotally connections were expensive and that we should be doing more to reduce the costs.	
		0				
			3	a) The AONB has received a number of second hand comments that achieving a supply connection is a very costly business. We would, therefore, encourage you to seek to find ways of linking up potential customers in an inexpensive way.		
Local Authority	1			a) Improve the time from order to delivery of service	Four Local Authorities responded to this question with only one having experience of connecting to our network. They commented that we could make our connections more timely.	
		3				
			2			
Regulators	0				No Regulators responded to this question.	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	0				Eight Supply Chain and Service Providers responded to this question; with none having experience of connecting to our network.	
		8				
			7	a) This question is not applicable to our company. b) Not applicable to us		
Utilities	3			a) This is covered in Q4 and Q7. b) Numerous calls made to your switchboard to get a connection date were not responded to. We had to escalate it and only then did the connection go ahead. We did lose valuable time and our customers goodwill in the interim. c) We compete against SSE but find that we do not always get the same point of connection as an S16 customer. This has led to us being more expensive and not a level playing field.	Six Utilities responded to this question with half having experience of connecting to our network. Comments relate to the need for us to improve our internal processes to ensure more timely connections.	
		3				
			1			
Other	3			a) Can be long periods to connection/hard to get confirmed dates. b) As with previous answer	Four people, classing themselves in the "Other" category, responded to this question; with three having experience of connecting to our network. Comments relate to the need for us to improve our internal processes to ensure more timely connections.	
		1				
			17			

**Question 10: Are there any particular environmental projects that you think we should undertake? If yes, please explain why.**

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If yes, please explain why	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 10 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Connections	1			a) Explore options for redesign of 132kV tower and wood poles to make them more pleasing in the landscape Consider more undergrounding of 11kV lines Compile a strategic plan for grid connections and test through the Strategic Environmental Assessment process. To improve public acceptability of the grid strengthening required to fully develop renewable energy potential.	Two connections stakeholders responded positively to this question. One was concerned that environmental impact was considered as part of every project; the other felt that we should focus on visual amenity of overhead lines.	Key Theme: In total 27 positive responses were received to this question. Over half of the responders felt our primary focus should be the Undergrounding of Overhead Lines for Visual Amenity, with another key area being the measurement and consideration of the entire environmental impact of our projects.  Our Response: In the RIIO-ED1 period, we propose to increase our focus on Visual Amenity and increase our engagement and consultation with the relevant authorities. We are also revising and reissuing our Environmental Impact Assessment Procedures and our Policy on Undergrounding in consultation with our stakeholders.
		4		a) Every single network development you undertake as part of your business should pay due attention to its environmental credentials, in the same way the health & safety is embedded in every project, and not a stand-alone consideration.		
			7			
Consumer Representatives	1			a) Funding of environmental projects in the community through established charities that have a good and long record of delivery. Avoid spin and jargon and meaningless 'greenwash.' The White Goods scheme is a fine example of helping the environment and the fuel poor.	Only one CR stakeholder responded positively to this question and felt that we should fund environmental community projects aimed at the fuel poor	
		0				
			0			
Customer	7			a) Get off the wind farm's they cost too much in rent and the wind is not controllable. b) Co2 reduction from coal c) Use of bio disposable diesel fuel and low emission diesel in your smelly diesel generators. d) Widespread installation of voltage regulators to reduce customer power consumption e) get into the schools and explain what SSE currently does - they will then educate the parents f) Nuclear. The only reliable low carbon power	Seven customers responded 'yes' to this question; though none had particular focus on our activities	
		7				
			22			
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	0				No 'yes' responses to this question	
		1				
			0			
Energy Supply Companies	0				No 'yes' responses to this question	
		2				
			0			
Government and Public Sector Organisations	3			a) Mini hydro b) You may be aware that National Grid commissioned research (May 2011) to survey customer's attitudes to the additional cost to consumers of undergrounding NG transmission lines in AONBs and NPs. The survey found that about 80% of respondents stated they would pay for at least one of the scenarios they were offered. The survey can be found at <a href="http://www.s258888288.websitehome.co.uk/AccentWTPreportfinal.pdf">www.s258888288.websitehome.co.uk/AccentWTPreportfinal.pdf</a> The Cotswolds Conservation Board strongly supports the programme of the selective undergrounding of distribution networks for amenity purposes in protected landscapes - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks. The cost of such schemes is considerably outweighed by their value in improving visual amenity in the most cherished landscapes, for very limited impact on bills which appears to be acceptable to the majority of consumers. c) introduction & investment of pay to charge points on street lighting columns for electric vehicles in car parks	Three positive response were received for this question with a strong focus on Undergrounding for Visual Amenity	
		0				
			6			

## Question 10: Are there any particular environmental projects that you think we should undertake? If yes, please explain why. (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder feedback			b) If yes, please explain why	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 10 and our response
	Yes	No	No Response			
Innovation Community	1			a) Tidal, reliable and performing well in sea trials.	One positive response was received, again no focus on PD activities	(see page above for details)
		0				
			0			
Landowners and Estates	1			a) Undergrounding of overhead wires	Two responses were received in this area with both responses emphasising the importance of Undergrounding for visual amenity	
		0				
			3	a) I am very concerned to read that you have somehow gained a message from customers that environmental considerations are not as important as other activities. May I take this opportunity to assure you that within protected landscapes, such as AONBs, environmental considerations are extremely important. AONBs are naturally important landscapes, nationally designated, and locally managed with a significant proportion of nationally allocated resources. We would, therefore, strongly urge you to lead by example in your approach to environmental activities (page 27) and give high priority to environmental projects. You could, give attention to low environmental impact vehicles, alternative and low environmental impact materials, and, of course, the potential impacts on the functional landscape and visual aspects. I have already mentioned our disappointment at the lack of environmental engagement from April 2010 until summer 2012 and I would hope that there will never be a repeat of that in the future.		
Local Authority	3			a) Not a single project, but with regard to environmental benefits, approaches should ensure that impacts on the historic environment are minimised, through continuation of the established consultation process. b) continuation of undergrounding cables in National Parks / AONB's and other environmentally sensitive areas c) Ensure where possible that overhead lines in AONB and other designated areas are removed or rerouted to minimise impact.	Three positive response were received for this question with a strong focus on Undergrounding for Visual Amenity. Additionally, it was felt that the entire environmental impact of a project be considered and consulted upon.	
		1				
			2			
Regulators	0				No 'yes' responses to this question	
		0				
			1			
Supply chain and service providers	4			a) Product innovation may also be considered in environmental projects. b) Evaluation of the impact of proposed EU regulation on transformer losses. This will have a significant cost implication as well as potential network issues due to equipment physical size increase. c) A coordinated approach to renewable d) Design network schemes to minimise system losses. All distribution networks have losses naturally, but these can be managed and reduced. Approx 5% of all energy generated in the UK is wasted through system losses before it even gets to the end users. I am not aware of any DNO in the UK who works on this aspect these days - I may be wrong of course, but the numbers and £££s involved is huge!	There were four positive responses to this question mostly emphasising the importance of innovation and new technologies. One responder was also concerned with the reduction of system losses.	
		6		a) The projects seems already really wide		
			5			
Utilities	1			a) Bunding of all substations to prevent oil leaks into the environment.	One positive response was received focusing on the mitigation of oil leaks. One responder believed that we should not focus on any other environmental projects as the DNO environmental impact was small	
		4		a) The environmental impact of DNOs is small compared to electricity generation and other sectors, and DNO schemes often focus on aesthetic improvements rather than ecological ones.		
			2			
Other	3			a) Underground more supplies for reliability, more blx and abc b) RSPB Scotland is committed to the development of renewables but projects must be designed and sited well to avoid harm to birds and wildlife. Birds can collide with overhead lines, this can be an issue for particular species such as white-tailed eagles. We therefore suggest that specific environmental projects should include removing or undergrounding overhead lines to reduce bird collisions for specific areas at risk, undertaking research into the success of installing bird deflectors for power lines and general environmental enhancement projects. The proposed approach to use a 'cost-benefit' analysis when evaluating projects is unsuitable and would not ensure that projects meet their legal requirements. This also seems to contradict the title of the document which refers to a 'greener' future. The RSPB and its million members would be very concerned if projects are not carried out in a way that ensures minimal environmental change. Potential impacts on designated sites and protected species have legal implications and need to be addressed early in the process to avoid lengthy delays, which ultimately result in increased costs for consumers. The RSPB would be happy to hold further discussions to explain the requirements of the Habitat Regulations and protected species legislation. c) The Chilterns Conservation Board considers that SSE should fully take part in the OFGEM undergrounding of overhead wires in protected landscapes scheme and should fully utilise the available funding in the period from 2015 to 2023. Such an involvement would be a clear demonstration of SSE's statutory duty to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONBs within its area (under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). Previous willingness to pay surveys have clearly demonstrated that customers are happy for such funding to be utilised and the Board encourages SSE to continue the work it has recently done in connection with the OFGEM scheme in the period to 2015.	Three positive responses were received from Other stakeholders. The larger focus was again on undergrounding, although the RSPB were particularly concerned with undergrounding to reduce bird collisions.	
		3				
			15	a) In recent research undertaken by the National Trust for Scotland, transmission lines were considered by the general public to be one of the major detractors from landscape quality. Given the importance of landscape to both Scottish residents and visitors, it would have been helpful to see more consideration given to how the expansion of transmission networks can be managed to minimise adverse impacts, along with the costs and benefits of doing so.		

## Question 11a: What are your views on or proposed principle to provide stability and predictability on the costs to our customers and stakeholders?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder Feedback Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 11a and our response
Connections	<p>a) The proposed principle, “to provide a good service for the lowest possible cost under a stable, predictable, charging regime”, is fine as far as it goes, but requires further explanation of what are the reasons for price instability, and what can be done to achieve this. The report shows that distribution costs account for 18% of the average household bill. It seems unlikely that such costs are the primary source of instability in household bills, more likely that the main source of instability (mainly rises, rather than falls) is the price of fossil fuels.</p> <p>This consultation refers to the period 2015-23, in other words the end of the business plan period is more than 10 years away, a time when fossil fuel prices could well be substantially higher than they are at present, and availability substantially more difficult. More evidence is needed of long term thinking about the cost parameters faced by SHEPD over this whole period.</p> <p>b) Good</p> <p>c) Our principle grid operational cost is the Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charging. We welcome Ofgem’s proposed EDCM for generation scheme, particularly the recent changes which will ensure stability and predictability of DUoS for generation. Stability and predictability is crucial to be able to raise project finance.</p> <p>d) Costs should stay in line and only increase with inflation or if a better service is provided.</p>	Four connections customers provided responses to this area. In general these were supportive of our approach to provide stability and predictability, particularly given the potential volatility of other bill components. One connections customer noted that increases should be limited to inflation, or if a better service is provided.	<p>Key theme: A significant majority of respondents were supportive of the principle of providing a good service at the lowest possible cost under a stable, predictable regime, with particular emphasis placed on the value of being able to plan for the future on a predictable basis.</p> <p>Our response: We are pleased that stakeholders are supportive of our approach. This principle of stability and predictability will be incorporated into the cost and expenditure forecasts which we will include as part of the Business Plan that we will submit to Ofgem and our other stakeholders in July 2013.</p>
Consumer Representatives		No comments were made by consumer representatives	
Customer	<p>a) Sound</p> <p>b) You are doing well</p> <p>c) Approve your proposals</p> <p>d) This is important particularly for the elderly</p> <p>e) Good</p> <p>f) Damned good idea, if you stop more people will look to find cheaper supplier</p> <p>g) Broadly agree</p> <p>h) its all part of a good service if provided - if a service is unpredictable its a bad service - stability is the certainty that the service will be repeated - two golden must haves for any service</p> <p>i) Allows for planning into the future</p> <p>j) Too many Tariffs to understand, could it be set at ten?</p> <p>k) Value for money and stable voltage supplies</p>	Eleven customers responded to this question, and the majority endorsed our approach to providing stability, noting that it allowed effective planning for the future and was particularly important for the elderly.	
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies		No comments were made by emergency services and NHS bodies	
Energy Supply Companies		No comments were made by energy supply companies	
Government and Public Sector Organisations	a) Keep bills as low as possible whilst trying to keep the predictability as high as possible.	One governmental and public body responded, noting that low bills and high predictability are important	

## Question 11a: What are your views on or proposed principle to provide stability and predictability on the costs to our customers and stakeholders? (continued)

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder Feedback Free text response	Feedback by stakeholder group	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 11a and our response
Innovation Community	a) Responsible.	One member of the innovation community responded, agreeing with our responsible approach.	(see page above for details)
Landowners and Estates	a) It may be self evident that it is not just what a customer pays but what they get for their payment. The AONB says, that service in terms of costs is a key element. The AONB includes environmental responsibility within that service and we would hope that in your next business plan environmental responsibility will take a key position. b) We need consistency of supply and price	Two landowners responded, with one noting that cost should not compromise environmental responsibility.	
Local Authority	a) Excellent - Keep it up b) Excellent if it is achievable	Two local authorities responded to this question, both agreeing with our approach.	
Regulators		No comments were made by regulatory bodies	
Supply chain and service providers	a) Good b) "We must do this without compromising any of the service standards we described in the section on Responsiveness" Products quality is a major subject to be addressed when high service standards are concerned. c) Price stability and predictability allows us to carry out forward planning with regards to investment and business resources. d) To be able to have a sustainable network that is robust and also to explore new ways of building and renewing networks e) From all points of view "predictability on the costs", above all on this period of financial tensions, is one of the key aspect for planning our future activities. f) Refreshing to know that someone cares about the consumer. g) Excellent h) In light of seemingly annual increases (well above RPI) in the retail cost of gas and electricity, added to the reduction in true competition now in the supply market - I guess this is a major concern amongst customers. They see the industry as a cartel - same as they do the oil companies. i) Good	Nine supply chain companies and service providers responded to this point, with the majority endorsing our approach. Two noted that stability allows planning for future activities. One noted that product quality (i.e. responsiveness) should not be compromised. Another noted that we should also consider new ways of building and renewing networks.	
Utilities	a) This will depend on the detail for each worksite and must take account of the overall safety of personnel and environment. b) Principle is sound, the more certainty we all have on costs will help provide stability in these turbulent (times) c) This is welcome as long as the costs are comparable across customer groups.	Three utilities responded to this question, and were generally in agreement with our principle, so long as costs are consistent across consumer groups, and do not compromise safety and the environment.	
Other	a) Good if individuals can predict expenditure for longer periods. b) Latest announced increases by all DNO's do not help confidence by the public. c) Good idea d) a) We would like to highlight the financial benefits of early engagement with stakeholders to ensure potential conflicts are avoided to avoid progressing projects in unsuitable locations. Early engagement can help to ensure that projects are progressed more quickly, therefore saving costs. e) No views	There were four responses from Uncategorised bodies, with two agreeing with our principle of stability. One noted that regular increases do not help public confidence in the industry. One noted that early engagement with stakeholders can help save costs.	

## Question 11b: Is there anything else we should be taking into account?

Stakeholder group	Stakeholder Feedback	Summary of stakeholder feedback to question 11b and our response
Connections		<p>Key theme: Our stakeholders have identified a range of issues that they would like us to consider within our business plan and day-to-day business activities.</p> <p>Our response: We seek to work with local communities and their representatives through our day-to-day activities. This includes, working with local communities to let them know what we are doing in their area; as well as ensuring that we consider and engage with all our customers both during planned and unplanned power outages. We are also committed to ensuring that we consider the effect of our approach on vulnerable and fuel poor consumers and our views on this can be found in our consultation response to Ofgem. We have captured this activity within our stakeholder engagement implementation plan.</p>
Consumer Representatives	a) Being involved in local communities.	
Customer	a) The customer is always right-they will tell you what they see b) Majority of shareholders should be UK citizens.	
Emergency Services and NHS Bodies	a) Cannot emphasise enough that resilience of distribution network should be the key priority for the organisation throughout the coming decades.	
Energy Supply Companies	a) The economic climate	
Government and Public Sector Organisations	a) More assistance with elderly & infirm on severe low incomes with fuel cost in winter	
Innovation Community	a) Promoting intelligent building management to reduce consumer consumption.	
Landowners and Estates	a) Some contractors attitude to landowners when accessing land for maintenance of the network is poor.	
Local Authority	a) Your role as a Category 2 responder and liaison with Local Resilience Foras so that partner organisations are informed of changes/new practices and you are aware of collective policies and practices for the response to emergencies.	
Regulators		
Supply chain and service providers	a) Look at the profit the company makes and feed some of it back to consumers by way of reduced unit charges. b) Competition drives efficiency	
Utilities	Other points that you might also wish to consider for RIIO ED1 are: a) Since the mid 1990s, DNOs have been focused through price regulation on saving costs. Many achieved this partly through de-skilling, and the use of staff from a “blue collar” background to fill previously professional roles, without fully developing them through academic or vocational training. SSE Power Distribution itself at this time developed and “up from the tools” policy in staffing many engineering roles. SSE Power Distribution along with other DNOs might need to consider if such staff, often using their latent craft skills alone and operating on the edge of their technical ability, would be well placed to interface with customers taking supplies from future “smart grids” and intelligent or active distribution networks. SSE Power Distribution might wish to consider taking full advantage of Workforce Renewal allowance in DPCR5 and hopefully in RIIO ED1 and set a minimum academic attainment level for staff engaged in the operation of its network so as to prepare for the future of distribution networks. b) Discuss with Ofgem whether network design standard P2/6 which has its origins in the former nationalised electricity board remains fit for purpose. It specifies network resilience on the basis of power demand, and not on the economic consequences of power failure. Perhaps P2/6 should be seen as a minimum standard, with certain customers or blocks of customers in the industrial and commercial sectors justifying a higher level of supply security than, for instance, a block of domestic customers with the same power demand. This might mean a different interpretation or even amendments to the Standard Distribution Licence Conditions that require non-discrimination between types of customers. c) As we move towards more active distribution networks or even smart grids, ENA Standard G/59 needs to be more prescriptive and also possibly enshrined in the regulatory framework so as not to become an unnecessary barrier to distributed generation. Ofgem might consider seeking amendments to G/59 and putting it on the same regulatory footing as P2/6. d) Reliability Centred Maintenance (RCM) techniques might be considered in both network maintenance and Non Load Related asset replacement that considers both risk and economic consequences of failure. For instance, a transformer supplying a block of domestic customers with relative low economic losses resulting from supply interruptions might be run to failure, whilst a similar transformer supplying high economic value commercial and industrial customers might be proactively replaced.	
Other		