Annex 3: ED3 Stakeholder Engagement and Decision Log

How to read this log. We have selected 13 examples, covering all four ED3 outcomes, where stakeholder engagement was most material to consumers or expenditure, involved a genuine choice or trade-off, and can be traced from what we heard to a decision in the plan. Each example sets out the purpose, format, coverage, timing and depth of engagement; which stakeholder groups were most and least represented; where views diverged; and the type of influence engagement had (see key at the end). Consumer research is recorded in the Consumer Research Log and is referenced here only where it tested, quantified or informed a trade-off on an issue raised by stakeholders. Stakeholder engagement informed decisions throughout ED3 development, but did not determine them in isolation. Feedback was considered alongside consumer research, engineering evidence, regulatory requirements, affordability, cost-benefit analysis and deliverability assessments. Emerging proposals were reviewed through workstream governance, executive and board discussions where relevant, and challenged by independent groups including the Independent Stakeholder Group (ISG), advisory boards and expert panels. This log records where engagement influenced decisions, how competing views were considered and, where relevant, why alternative options were not adopted.

ED3 Outcome	Policy Area	Type of Engagement Undertaken	Stakeholder Groups	Summary Feedback	Impact on Business Plan
The primary ED3 outcome to which the engagement relates	*The policy area or areas to which the engagement relates*	*How did you engage with stakeholders? For example, through webinars, roundtables, surveys, through third parties, representative bodies, trade associations etc*	*Which stakeholder groups were represented through the engagement and provide commentary on the relative balance of stakeholder voices. Were any relevant groups not represented?*	*What feedback and key messages did you hear from your stakeholders? Where different views were expressed, what were the relative weighting of these?*	*What impact has the feedback received had on your business plan? Provide specific examples of relevant decisions that have been influenced by the engagement. Where you have made a decision might be seen as counter to the feedback received, explain why this is and set out what measures you have taken to address the feedback received.*
Resilient Networks	**Example 1: Worst-served customers and repeat interruptions Reliability and interruptions**	**Purpose:** challenge; options testing. **Timing:** Feb–Sept 2026, from strategy development to commitment testing. **Depth:** reviewed the draft (ED3-S04) Reliability Strategy and targeting criteria; scored commitments for support and ambition via live polling; discussed bill impacts. **Coverage:** eight sessions plus ISG challenge: Future-Proofing Power webinar (Feb 2026); worst-served customer roundtable; London Climate Action Week roundtable with DNOs and water companies; Water UK/ENA session, drawing on interviews with nine water companies (Mar 2026); Southern Water and Portsmouth Water bilaterals; Baringa Power Resilience Roundtable (June 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026). Citizens Advice Lights Out report (Mar 2026).	**Groups:** local authorities and councillors; water companies and other critical-infrastructure operators in transport, telecoms and healthcare; consumer and vulnerability representatives, including Citizens Advice and PSR customers; community partners; other DNOs, NESO, trade bodies and consultants; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards local authorities, industry, and water and other critical-infrastructure operators, reflecting the focus on targeting criteria and the knock-on impacts of interruptions. The views of worst-served customers were represented through consumer and vulnerability representatives, building on direct engagement with this group during ED2.	– High satisfaction did not mean standing still: at the Feb 2026 webinar, 82% were satisfied with reliability, but 89% valued further improvement and 89% strongly supported targeted spending on worst-served customers. Customers with repeat unplanned interruptions were the top priority. – In Sept 2026, reliability commitments scored 3.9/5 for support but 3.2 for ambition. Stakeholders wanted targeting based on harm and vulnerability, not geography alone. – Stakeholders wanted action where harm is greatest, including short interruptions affecting SMEs and customers reliant on digital services or healthcare, with clearer communication, coordinated planned works and transparent investment decisions. Citizens Advice highlighted a shift from average performance to repeat, localised interruptions. – All nine water companies said even sub-three-minute interruptions can halt pumping and trigger pollution incidents. They wanted clearer DNO obligations, control-room protocols and visibility of investment plans; Baringa participants wanted clearer resilience standards and a common language.	**Influence: Changed (allocation and scale); Originated (early warning, critical-infrastructure coordination); Refined (targeting and delivery)** Our July draft proposed £24m for worst-served customers. Strong stakeholder support (89%), which customers also judged fair in deliberative research (see Consumer Research Log), led us to allocate £52.76m to improve service for 13,329 customers, around half of those who qualified at March 2026. **Earlier intervention.** Calls for earlier action led to an early-warning investigation trigger (around four to six HV interruptions a year), which customers can also initiate, and £25m for a harm-led programme on short and multiple interruptions (£1m evidence and mapping; £24m targeted measures, use-it-or-lose-it). **Critical infrastructure.** Water-company bilateral and roundtable feedback led to a whole-system assessment of critical-infrastructure dependencies, with better data sharing, direct operator contacts and common standards. **Transparency.** We will publish guidance for domestic, PSR and non-domestic customers by Year 2, share performance data with non-domestic customers on request, and survey stakeholders in Years 1 and 4. **Not adopted:** a universal reliability uplift, as stakeholders favoured targeting; reliability stays above 99.98%. Not all worst-served customers will be addressed in ED3, to allow action on short and multiple interruptions. **Other decision drivers:** Cost-benefit analysis, affordability and deliverability informed the final scale of targeted support for worst served customers, with around half of qualifying worst served customers (13,329) targeted in ED3 as remaining interventions become more complex and costly following ED2 delivery. Use-it-or-lose-it funding reflects uncertainty over where interventions will be required.
Resilient Networks	**Example 2: Severe-weather customer support**	**Purpose:** co-development; challenge. **Timing:** ongoing partnerships through ED2; dedicated sessions Jan–Sept 2026, from strategy development to commitment testing. **Depth:** set out expectations by PSR category; reviewed the draft (ED3-S06) Vulnerability Strategy, (ED3-S07) Targeted Customer Storm Support Strategy, vulnerability index and hub target. **Coverage:** nine sessions plus ongoing partnership engagement and ISG challenge: PSR Think Tank (Jan 2026); Customer Service and AI Think Tank; Future-Proofing Power webinar (Feb 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops (Mar 2026); Partners Roundtable (2026); Baringa roundtable (June 2026); Inclusive Service Panel, partner strategy refresh and ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026). Ongoing work with Local Resilience Forums, emergency services, local authorities and community groups.	**Groups:** Local Resilience Forums; police, fire and ambulance services; local authorities, community councils and councillors; water companies and other essential-service providers; charities and consumer groups, including Citizens Advice, NEA and British Red Cross; healthcare organisations and community interest groups; Inclusive Service Panel members with lived experience; vulnerability and delivery partners; other DNOs and GDNs; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards resilience partners, local authorities and vulnerability partners, reflecting their roles in emergency response and in identifying need. The views of customers in vulnerable circumstances were represented through the Inclusive Service Panel, charities and consumer groups. Business customers and their representatives were not engaged on storm support, this gap will be addressed in the run up to ED3.	– Partners, the Inclusive Service Panel and think tanks said any customer can become vulnerable in a storm, so support should extend beyond PSR customers. – Resilience partners and rural stakeholders said cost-per-customer or "rural" classifications do not reflect need; rural customers felt urban areas received welfare first and wanted transparency on where welfare goes and why. – Stakeholders wanted storm-specific service standards and clarity before a storm on what support is available. In March 2026 they set out expectations by PSR category, seeing SSEN as coordinator rather than provider for lower-need customers. – Digital exclusion, poor rural signal and the PSTN switch-off were major concerns. – Electricity and water leaders said support must be scalable, with clear roles and shared resources; stakeholders wanted SSEN to help communities support themselves. – In Sept 2026, stakeholders welcomed 100 resilience hubs. Some felt the number was too low, while others wanted hubs judged by the impact of the support they provide rather than the number reached. – **Views were mixed on SSEN's role:** PSR Think Tank participants saw SSEN as a "lifeline" in high-poverty areas but asked where support should stop before it becomes a social service.	**Influence: Changed (scope); Originated (vulnerability index, communications devices, proactive community support); Refined (collaboration); No change (hub target)** Our July strategy targeted storm support at PSR customers. In response, we will extend Storm Service Standards to all domestic customers by 2030, prioritising PSR and medically dependent customers. They include streamlined escalation, welfare visits for the most critical customers in power cuts over 24 hours, opt-in service levels and pre-storm communication. Ofgem has not taken forward our proposal for common standards across DNOs, so we will implement them ourselves and share learning. Rural concerns originated the Customer Vulnerability Storm Index, which combines fault, PSR and socio-economic data to mobilise welfare within one hour; the Inclusive Service Panel endorsed it. Communication concerns led to provisions for customers with poor connectivity and at least 1,300 smart UPS devices. Calls to work with communities led us to proactively offer at-risk communities support to co-develop resilience plans and hubs, rather than waiting for applications. Calls for shared support led to data and resource sharing with other DNOs, joint events with LRFs, post-storm reviews with partners, a joint preparedness campaign and at least 10 post-storm community events a year. Almost 90% of surveyed customers found storm standards helpful (see Consumer Research log). Not adopted: a larger hub target; we retained 100 communities by 2033 based on current capacity of established community groups and local authorities that can support. Impact will be measured post storm on metrics which are yet to be defined but likely to include response times, volume and variation of support offered. Other decision drivers: lessons from Storms Arwen and Éowyn, cost (£9.4m additional funding) and partner capacity.
Resilient Networks	**Example 3: Network asset management; climate resilience**	**Purpose:** challenge; options testing. **Timing:** 2025–Sept 2026, from strategy development to commitment testing. **Depth:** reviewed investment options, including ED3/ED4 phasing and the climate-resilience programme; rated priorities and ranked network risks via live polling. **Coverage:** eleven sessions plus ISG, board, executive and Ofgem review and ongoing cross-sector forums (Climate Ready Infrastructure Scotland, ENA climate resilience group): Sustainable Supplier Engagement Events and supplier survey (2025); SEPA bilateral (May 2025); circular asset management webinar (Dec 2025); EAP webinar; Future-Proofing Power webinar (Feb 2026; 20 voting); Climate Resilience webinar; ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops, Perth, Reading and online (Mar 2026); Baringa roundtable (June 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026); Dorset Council Climate Adaptation Steering Group (Oct 2026).	**Groups:** local and combined authorities and resilience partners; water, telecoms, transport and other critical-infrastructure operators; suppliers, manufacturers and contractors; other DNOs, NESO, trade associations, consultants, academics and research bodies; UK Government, DEFRA, Ofgem and SEPA; environmental stakeholders, landowners and community interest groups; consumer representatives; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards technical, supply-chain and critical-infrastructure stakeholders, reflecting the engineering nature of asset and resilience decisions. Consumer interests were represented through consumer representatives and tested through deliberative research (see Consumer Research Log).	– In March 2026, 68% favoured high asset-health investment and 57.9% supported balancing investment across ED3 and ED4; asset health ranked 2nd of 11 commitments in Sept 2026. At the Feb 2026 webinar, 75% gave top rating to setting a non-load baseline first. – Stakeholders wanted decisions based on condition, criticality and consequence of failure rather than age, and better asset data and monitoring. They challenged deliverability given workforce and supply-chain constraints. – All circular asset webinar participants supported refurbishment and reuse (87% strongly), provided reliability and safety are maintained. – At the Feb 2026 webinar, 70% (14 of 20) agreed the climate-resilience programme would improve resilience, ranking storms, flooding and extreme temperatures as top risks. The ISG called for stronger scenario planning, local plans and cross-sector collaboration; 52% of suppliers named intense rainfall and storms as their biggest climate risk. – In Sept 2026, stakeholders strongly supported the climate commitment but urged SSEN to look beyond storms to heat, flooding and snow, reflect local microclimates, publish plans locally and share data. Water and critical-infrastructure stakeholders raised cascading impacts; participants said designing to average conditions is increasingly "a nonsense". – **Views were mixed on pace and value:** 36% in March wanted more asset-health investment in ED3 to avoid a sharper rise in ED4, while a significant minority wanted clearer evidence of value from resilience investment.	**Influence: Refined (phasing and prioritisation); Changed (scope of climate approach); Originated (cross-sector commitments); No change (snow, large-scale heat hardening)** **Asset health.** Majority support for balancing ED3 and ED4, with affordability challenge, led us to balance timely investment against bill impacts rather than front-load all forecast need, while keeping a minimum level so risk does not build up. We will invest over £1.5bn in asset replacement and refurbishment (around 55% more than ED2) prioritised by condition, criticality and consequence. Conditional support made circular asset management a core NAMS pillar, and deliverability challenge led to phased delivery, standardisation and earlier supply-chain engagement. **Climate resilience**. Engagement broadened our approach beyond asset protection to outcome reporting, preparedness, welfare and collaboration with telecoms, transport and water operators. We will review design standards by Year 2, protect 27 high-risk sites from flooding, build a stress-testing tool by Year 3 and maintain Regional Climate Ready Plans. Cross-sector feedback originated an interdependency map, top-10 cross-sector hotspots, shared adaptation pathways for at least three sites. Investment includes 303km of overhead-line rebuild, 39.5km of undergrounding and 280km of cable replacement in clay soils. **Not adopted:** a blanket resilience programme, as stakeholders favoured targeting. Stress testing showed heat thresholds are rarely exceeded before mid-century and no material rise in snow and ice risk in 2028–33, so we will monitor heat at major substations (£6.3m) and use adaptation pathways for snow and ice. **Other decision drivers:** Ofgem climate stress testing, risk modelling, cost-benefit analysis and deliverability. Informed customers saw the 30p annual bill impact as good value.

ED3 Outcome	Policy Area	Type of Engagement Undertaken	Stakeholder Groups	Summary Feedback	Impact on Business Plan
The primary ED3 outcome to which the engagement relates	*The policy area or areas to which the engagement relates*	*How did you engage with stakeholders? For example, through webinars, roundtables, surveys, through third parties, representative bodies, trade associations etc*	*Which stakeholder groups were represented through the engagement and provide commentary on the relative balance of stakeholder voices. Were any relevant groups not represented?*	*What feedback and key messages did you hear from your stakeholders? Where different views were expressed, what were the relative weighting of these?*	*What impact has the feedback received had on your business plan? Provide specific examples of relevant decisions that have been influenced by the engagement. Where you have made a decision might be seen as counter to the feedback received, explain why this is and set out what measures you have taken to address the feedback received.*
Resilient Networks	**Example 4: Island resilience and decarbonisation Security of supply; place-based planning; diesel generation**	**Purpose:** exploration; co-development of local evidence; challenge. **Timing:** from ED2 planning (HOWSUM) and ICNZ work (Dec 2025) to commitment testing (Sept–Oct 2026). **Depth:** validated demand and generation projections to 2050 in in-person island workshops; discussed diesel transition and cost-sharing. **Coverage:** ICNZ workshops with around 60 stakeholders across Orkney, Shetland and the Outer Hebrides; iterative sessions with ISG; HOWSUM engagement with Regen, the Scotch Whisky Association and Islay and Jura distilleries; Isle of Wight Council, MPs and island forum (2025–26); local energy groups, Community Power Outer Hebrides, Community Energy Scotland and Local Energy Scotland (Sept–Oct 2026); Scottish Government bilateral and Demand Flexibility Workshop (Sept–Oct 2026); SEPA bilaterals (June and Sept 2026); NESO and SSEN Transmission; Resilience Challenge Workshop with Energy Systems Catapult (Sept 2026); Have Your Say webinars and GSP/SDP consultations; ED3 Stakeholder Workshops (Mar and Sept 2026).	**Groups:** island councils (Orkney, Shetland, Western Isles), Isle of Wight Council and local MPs; community energy groups, including Islay Energy Trust, Community Power Outer Hebrides, Tiree Community Development Trust, Argyll and Bute Renewables Alliance and the European Marine Energy Centre; ICNZ; industrial users, including the Scotch Whisky Association and distilleries, ports and ferry operators; Scottish Government, DESNZ, SEPA, NESO and SSEN Transmission; Regen and Energy Systems Catapult. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards island councils, community-energy and industrial stakeholders, reflecting the need for local, bottom-up evidence. Mainland customers who would share the cost were not engaged through stakeholder channels; their views were tested through deliberative research (see Consumer Research Log).	– Around 60 local stakeholders validated ICNZ projections and identified projects not yet in the pipeline. Island councils and community groups said electrification will come in step-changes tied to projects such as harbours, ferries and hydrogen, with grid capacity the main constraint. Distilleries provided forecasts of future energy needs. - When meeting with ISG, they emphasised the importance to capture the views of non-island views and this was captured through Fair Future Panel session 4 - see Consumer Research Log for further details. – Island stakeholders stressed reliance on single subsea cables that are slow to repair, asked what back-up SSEN would provide, and said diesel cannot go before secure replacements exist. – The Scottish Government has no plans to change diesel emissions regulations; SEPA preferred a phased approach and asked for diesel running scenarios. – Isle of Wight Council, MPs and an island forum asked for the island to be included in ED3 island resilience and load planning. – Island stakeholders supported flexibility but not as a substitute for reinforcement; Orkney's active network management trial was "a technological triumph but a contractual nightmare". – **Views were mixed on cost-sharing:** island stakeholders supported socialising costs given high energy costs and fuel poverty; some customers questioned this where benefits seemed local (see Consumer Research Log). Stakeholders warned against investing too early or too late.	**Influence: Changed (forecasting approach, Islay–Jura design, Isle of Wight scope); Refined (diesel transition); Constrained (timing of major investment)** tRESP pathways and connections data missed early-stage island projects, so we added ICNZ evidence and validated Strategic Energy Needs with island stakeholders, using only medium- and high-confidence evidence (weighted 50% and 80%). On Islay and Jura, distillery forecasts, alongside dialogue with Ofgem, led us to replace the original 33kV proposal with a 66kV pathway, removing reliance on Bowmore diesel generation by the end of ED3. With no change to diesel regulations, engagement with the Scottish Government and SEPA secured a derogation for non-compliant diesel (planned use until 2033, unplanned until 2039). We will secure each Scottish island group against loss of one subsea circuit by 2033, keeping emergency generation until alternatives give equivalent security. **Not adopted:** baseline funding for all prospective island schemes. We seek ex-ante funding only where need and cost are mature, with development funding for other island groups and construction funding through a proposed Islands Re-opener. **Other decision drivers:** cost-benefit analysis, tRESP pathways, engineering assessment and coordination with SSEN Transmission.
Investing for the energy transition	**Example 5: Ahead-of-need capacity and place-based planning Load-related expenditure; strategic planning**	**Purpose:** exploration; challenge; assurance. **Timing:** from 2025 DFES engagement, feeding NESO's tRESP inputs (Feb 2026), to commitment testing (Sept 2026). **Depth:** reviewed forecasting assumptions, SDP methodology and Build and Flex; ranked commitments at independently facilitated workshops. **Coverage:** 1,936 stakeholders engaged at 50+ events. Including DFES and SDP engagement with local authorities and developers, including Cherwell DC, Oxfordshire CC and the Oxford Growth Commission; Local Authority, DER, Housing Developer and ICP/IDNO Connections Forums (2025); Have Your Say strategic planning webinars (Oct 2025); DSO surveys and Autumn Series (2025); Utility Week and DSO Virtual Roundtables (Jan–Feb 2026); Whole System in Action seminar and ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops (Mar 2026); SDP methodology and options-assessment consultations; DNO Community Energy Working Group; GB Energy, Energy Systems Catapult and Regen bilaterals; NGET and NESO; Southampton Energy Coalition, Customer Connections Conferences and ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026).	**Groups:** local authorities and MPs; growth bodies and city coalitions, including the Oxford Growth Commission and the Southampton Energy Coalition (city council, Associated British Ports, university, hospital, Network Rail); housing developers, DER and storage customers, ICPs/IDNOs, and major and industrial customers; community energy groups; flexibility providers; NESO, NGET, GB Energy and government bodies; Energy Systems Catapult, Regen, consultants, academics and trade associations. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards local authorities, developers and connection customers who hold evidence of future demand. Energy suppliers and consumer bodies were represented to a lesser extent; bill-payer views on affordability were tested through research (see Consumer Research Log).	– Local authorities, developers and connection customers made ahead-of-need investment their top priority: it ranked first for housing developers at the 2025 forums, and in Sept 2026, 84% ranked "be ready for growing demand" highest of 11 commitments. - ISG said place-based planning should build on existing partnerships and reflect councils' differing resources and expertise. Members wanted consistent regional DNO support, accessible Strategic Development Plans and alignment with RESP to avoid duplication, with success measured by tangible local outcomes rather than plans or engagement metrics. – Local authorities identified capacity visibility as the biggest barrier to EV and fleet rollout, and wanted data aligned to LAEPs and statutory Local Plans, alongside regular strategic engagement. Community energy groups wanted clearer routes into SDP and RESP processes as projects emerge and scale. – The Southampton Energy Coalition wanted planning to reflect developments before formal applications, and endorsed a £150m investment programme. – Connection customers raised transmission constraints pushing connections to 2032 and beyond, and wanted SSEN to press NESO and transmission owners. – **A minority view** in Sept 2026 was that the commitments were too ambitious, and that SSEN shouldn't reinforce ahead of need without solid evidence that forecast heat pumps and EVs will connect.	**Influence: Changed (planning method); Originated (place-based planning commitments); Refined (baseline versus uncertainty mechanisms); Constrained (reliance on community flexibility)** Southampton is one example of local authority evidence informing our load-planning assumptions, with a joint working group of SSEN, Energy Systems Catapult, local authorities and NESO. In other areas we use growth evidence to inform reinforcement planning across the transmission–distribution boundary, such as around Inverness and Bicester. Local-authority and community-energy feedback led us to co-develop plans with all 72 local authorities, set up community-energy coordination, launch a Local Energy Support team by 2030, model late-emerging community load and review queue management for projects under 5MW. **Not adopted:** building ahead of all signalled demand. Given affordability and stranded-asset concerns, £2.3bn of baseline investment covers higher-confidence need, with over £700m through uncertainty mechanisms. We also reduced reliance on community flexibility as a baseline offset to reinforcement. **Other decision drivers:** tRESP pathways, network modelling, cost-benefit analysis and deliverability.
Investing for the energy transition	**Example 6: Proactive LV upgrades and unlooping LCT readiness; coordinated local delivery**	**Purpose:** options testing; co-development. **Timing:** Sept 2025–Sept 2026, from strategy development to commitment testing. **Depth:** chose between pace options and ranked prioritisation criteria; the Low-Voltage Local Authority Advisory Board (LAAB) reviewed the draft unlooping customer journey and target. **Coverage:** Local Authority Forum (Sept 2025); Housing Developer and DER forums (2025); Equal LCT webinar (Dec 2025; 21 participants); LCT, Energy Efficiency and Fuel Poverty Think Tank (Jan 2026); Utility Week roundtables (Jan–Feb and Apr 2026); Future-Proofing Power webinar (Feb 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops (Mar 2026); LAAB sessions and customer journey workshop (July–Sept 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026); ED2 LV pilots with three contract partners. Also Citizens Advice's Navigating the Network report (2026).	**Groups:** local authorities, including LAAB members across both licence areas; housing developers, LCT installers and DER operators; other utilities and infrastructure providers; consumer representatives, including Citizens Advice; community groups; energy suppliers; delivery contract partners. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards local authorities, utilities, developers and installers, reflecting their role in coordinating street works and enabling LCT connections. Households affected by unlooping were engaged through ENA collaborative research and the pilots (see Consumer Research Log), and their views were represented by Citizens Advice, whose Navigating the Network report draws on its research and casework with consumers installing low-carbon technologies.	– Local authorities, developers, installers and energy suppliers said looped supplies slow adoption of heat pumps, EV chargers and new housing. 17 of 21 Equal LCT webinar participants felt all homes should be upgraded proactively; installers called costs a "postcode lottery", and Citizens Advice called for proactive unlooping with consistent standards. - The ISG called for LV investment priorities to reflect vulnerability and demographics, not just early LCT uptake. They also highlighted the risks of deferring investment and urged coordination of unlooping, wider LV upgrades and retrofit works to reduce costs and repeat disruption. – **Views were mixed on pace:** in Sept 2025 local authorities split evenly between universal and demand-led upgrades; in March 2026, 63.7% favoured "Proportionate Progress" and 27.4% "Immediate Acceleration". In Sept 2026 the target of around 40,000 homes was generally seen as too low, though some feared numerical targets would favour urban areas over rural and island communities. – Local authorities and utilities wanted "dig once" coordination and early notice: 85% of Equal LCT participants said early visibility of LV programmes would help, and 76% at the Feb 2026 webinar rated coordinating works as very important.	**Influence: Changed (reactive to programmatic); Refined (prioritisation and delivery); No change (unlooping target)** In ED2 we unlooped reactively. Compelling evidence that looped supplies block LCT uptake led to a programmatic approach: we will proactively unloop 40,000 homes in ED3, four times ED2, at around 10% lower cost than reactive upgrades, while load-related LV upgrades enable 176,000 homes to install LCTs. Reflecting the preference for proportionate progress and rural concerns, work is prioritised by load need, asset condition and area vulnerability. The LAAB shaped our unlooping customer journey, and pilots (1200 surveys, over 80 service unloopings as of Nov 2026) are testing delivery. An alpha pilot learning workshop with SSEN and three delivery partners (Oct 2026) found customer trust was the main barrier (some asked "Is this a scam?"), customers did not always understand why they were selected or how they would benefit, more customers were vulnerable than expected, and data quality was poor. Recommendations include clearer SSEN branding and contractor identification, benefit-led messaging, vulnerability support pathways and a single source of customer data before scaling. Calls for "dig once" coordination led us to package unlooping, feeder and transformer upgrades into area-based programmes, seek collaborative arrangements with all 72 local authorities, publish street-level forward programmes through LAEP+ by April 2030, and fund a dedicated community support team helping customers overcome barriers to LCT adoption and dedicated support information. Affected communities can access our increased, shareholder-funded, Community Benefit Fund (£750,000 a year). **Not adopted:** a higher unlooping target. ED3 builds delivery capacity, with full internal and supply-chain capability by 2030 to scale up in the 2030s. **Other decision drivers:** load forecasts, unit costs, workforce and supply-chain capacity. Pilot learning on data quality and delivery consistency needed before scaling.
Investing for the energy transition	**Example 7: Connections information, accuracy and communication**	**Purpose:** challenge; commitment testing. **Timing:** from 2025 forums to testing of commitments and the draft (ED3-S16) Connections Strategy (Sept 2026). **Depth:** customer segments scored commitments for support and ambition; the Expert Panel and ISG reviewed the full set of outputs. **Coverage:** 23 ED3-focused connections events in 2025/26, including Customer Connections Conferences, North and South (2025 and Sept 2026); Local Authority, DER, Housing Developer and ICP/IDNO forums (2025); bespoke webinars, including on connections reform; Connections Customers online forums (July 2026; 57 attendees, 40 organisations); DER forums (June–July 2026; 23 attendees, 19 organisations); Connections Expert Panel survey (Sept 2026); installer and developer engagement; ISG review; ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026).	**Groups:** connection customers across generation, storage, demand and industrial and commercial segments; ICPs/IDNOs; housing associations and developers; installers and LCT adopters; major customers; local authorities; community energy groups; consumer advocates and groups; industry bodies, consultants and academia; the Connections Expert Panel and the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards professional and repeat connection customers, especially ICPs/IDNOs, developers and DER customers. Smaller and domestic applicants were represented less directly, through installers, LCT adopters and consumer advocates.	– Connection customers, especially larger ones, valued certainty as much as speed: accurate offers, realistic dates and transparency on risks. In Sept 2026, the one-page offer risk summary and named contract managers were among the most valued proposals. – Customers reported inconsistent service, unclear ownership and poor visibility of progress and queue position. 50% said customer-facing portals should be the top digital priority; the Expert Panel said digitisation must be system-wide. – Larger customers wanted detailed data and expert support; smaller customers and installers wanted clear requirements and faster, automated approvals. Access to experts must remain for complex projects and digitally excluded customers. – **Support was higher than perceived ambition:** connections customers scored the draft commitments 7.3/10 for support but 5.4 for ambition; DER stakeholders scored 8.1 and 7.5. Expert Panel confidence in a materially better experience by the end of ED3 was 3.75/5. – **Views were mixed on prioritisation:** some housing developers feared earlier connections could favour large data centres over community and housing projects.	**Influence: Changed (outputs); Originated (accuracy and ambition outputs); Constrained (scope)** Our July strategy targeted 50% of EHV customers using connection surgeries before applying. Expert Panel and ISG challenge that this measured activity rather than experience led us to replace it with an integrated pre-application service for all customers, combining self-service tools, surgeries and specialists, with support for digitally excluded customers. Feedback that certainty matters as much as speed originated an offer-accuracy output (publishing causes of scope changes) and extended one-page risk summaries to all projects above 1MVA/MW. Calls for accountability led to published Customer Standards of Service (90% compliance by 2030), a Connections Annual Report and annual Expert Panel review. Low ambition scores led to an energisation window for all EHV customers (earliest and backstop dates) and automated LCT quotes (within 24 hours for 80% of standard heat pump applications). **Not adopted:** quarterly risk and progress discussions for all projects; to keep this deliverable, we targeted projects lasting more than 24 months (90% compliance by 2030).

ED3 Outcome	Policy Area	Type of Engagement Undertaken	Stakeholder Groups	Summary Feedback	Impact on Business Plan
The primary ED3 outcome to which the engagement relates	*The policy area or areas to which the engagement relates*	*How did you engage with stakeholders? For example, through webinars, roundtables, surveys, through third parties, representative bodies, trade associations etc*	*Which stakeholder groups were represented through the engagement and provide commentary on the relative balance of stakeholder voices. Were any relevant groups not represented?*	*What feedback and key messages did you hear from your stakeholders? Where different views were expressed, what were the relative weighting of these?*	*What impact has the feedback received had on your business plan? Provide specific examples of relevant decisions that have been influenced by the engagement. Where you have made a decision might be seen as counter to the feedback received, explain why this is and set out what measures you have taken to address the feedback received.*
Smarter Networks	**Example 8: Flexibility markets and Build and Flex DSO; whole-system planning**	**Purpose:** challenge; co-development. **Timing:** 2024–Sept 2026, from ED2 market development to commitment testing. **Depth:** providers reviewed market design and Build and Flex; community groups explored participation routes; the DSO Advisory Board challenged draft commitments. **Coverage:** DSO Advisory Board (quarterly challenge and deep dives; 90 of 98 recommendations actioned in 2024/25); Autumn Series webinars, DER Connections Forum and DSO Annual Survey (2025); Day Ahead Flexibility webinar (Nov 2025); Utility Week and DSO Virtual Roundtables (Jan–Feb 2026); DSO Spring Series (2026); DNOA and Operational Decision Making consultations; DSO Digital & Data Showcase and Satisfaction Survey (June 2026); Community Energy Flexibility Webinar (July 2026); DNO Community Energy Working Group (Aug 2026); NESO and ENA; ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026). Also Citizens Advice and CSE evidence on fair access.	**Groups:** flexibility service providers and aggregators; storage, DER and renewable developers; housing developers; community energy groups; local authorities; consumer representatives, including Citizens Advice and the Centre for Sustainable Energy; NESO, ENA and other DNOs; technology vendors; the DSO Advisory Board. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards flexibility providers and market participants, reflecting the technical subject. Smaller and community providers and consumer representatives were represented to a lesser extent; households' views were represented through consumer representatives and DSO Advisory Board challenge on inclusion.	– Flexibility providers wanted longer contracts, revenue certainty and clearer long-term signals before investing. In June 2026 they saw SSEN as committed and innovative but asked for simpler processes, higher dispatch volumes and wider participation by smaller assets. – Community energy groups said participation is limited by uncertain viability, minimum contract sizes, software costs and uncertainty over whether flexibility will still be needed after reinforcement. They wanted clear routes in, financial modelling support and contracts matching asset life. – In Sept 2026, smarter-networks commitments scored 4.1/5 for support and the highest ambition score of the four areas (3.4), but some said flexibility is too complicated for many customers. Earlier access to connect was strongly supported, but its 5GW target was seen as too modest. – Stakeholders valued flexibility as a complement to reinforcement, not a substitute, built into day-ahead and real-time operations. – Consumer representatives warned that flexibility benefits go mainly to higher-income, digitally capable households. The DSO Advisory Board challenged us to show how flexibility would support vulnerable groups.	**Influence: Originated (inclusive access); Changed (assessment method); Refined (market design and access); No change (earlier-access target)** Provider feedback on investment signals led to a three-stage cost-benefit approach in Build and Flex optioneering, expected to save [REDACTED]. Calls for simpler access shaped FlexForward, a Market Incubator, simpler routes for smaller and community providers, a Flex Toolkit, operational envelopes from 2028 and Local Energy Support Team help for community schemes. Demand for dependable delivery led to a 95% pre-dispatch fill-rate target and a market-confidence score of at least 9/10. By 2032, we'll work with local partners, flexibility providers and trusted community organisations to enable at least 25,000 low-income and vulnerable households to access flexibility, smart energy services or tailored energy advice, increasing participation from groups currently under-represented in flexibility markets. **Other decision drivers:** cost-benefit analysis, engineering requirements, NESO coordination and regulation.
Smarter Networks	**Example 9: Network data and local energy planning tools Data and digitalisation**	**Purpose:** exploration; co-development; testing. **Timing:** from scoping data needs (2025), through testing tools and priorities (Dec 2025–June 2026), to commitment testing (Sept–Oct 2026). **Depth:** users ranked development priorities and tested the Centralised Network View; testing was mainly with professional users. **Coverage:** DSO Annual Survey, Data & Digitalisation workshop and Breakfast with the DSO Team webinar (2025); Local Authority Forum (Sept 2025); DER and ICP/IDNO Connections Forums (Oct 2025); Microsoft and AWS learning sessions (Dec 2025); Utility Week and DSO Virtual Roundtables (Jan–Feb 2026); DSO Spring Series (2026); DSO Digital & Data Showcase and Satisfaction Survey (June 2026); DNO Community Energy Working Group (Aug 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026); Local Energy Scotland bilateral (Oct 2026).	**Groups**: local authorities and Local Energy Scotland; renewable, storage and DER developers, ICPs/IDNOs and flexibility providers; community energy groups and Community Energy England; technology partners (Microsoft, AWS); industry and data specialists via Utility Week roundtables. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards local authorities, developers and technical users. Community groups and less frequent users were represented to a lesser extent. Domestic and digitally excluded customers were not directly represented, because the tools are mainly used by professionals such as planners and developers. Consumer evidence on digitalisation, particularly for customers at risk of being left behind, is limited – a gap also noted at ED2. This will be an area of focus for future enagement during the remainder of ED2 and as we move into ED3.	– Stakeholders valued progress on open data, heat maps and LENZA (now referred to as LAEP+), but only 55% of Data Portal users could find data quickly and easily. Data availability and quality were their top priorities. – Developers and flexibility providers wanted more granular capacity, queue, constraint and LV data, regular updates and self-serve tools. – Local authorities, community groups and smaller organisations lacked resources to interpret data and wanted insight and advice, including where schemes could viably connect. – Technology partners and roundtable participants said more data needs standards and collaboration, warning that "five DNOs may develop five different solutions". – Views on the 95% local network visibility target were split; some asked who would be in the remaining 5%. Stakeholders also wanted headroom methodology, secure access and faster data responses.	**Influence: Changed (service model); Refined (data priorities)** Feedback that our data was fragmented and hard to find led us to commit to a connected data ecosystem, with stronger metadata and lineage, and the Centralised Network View as a single source of network information. Requests for advice led to a Local Energy Support Team supporting at least 100 communities and businesses a year by 2030, and sharing future work plans with local authorities through LAEP+. Feedback on speed led to cutting Data Portal response targets from 20 days to 5 by 2029, using AI. Where publication is unsuitable, data will be shared through a controlled Central Data Sharing Framework. **Not adopted / open:** the target of 95% local network visibility by 2031, from secondary substation monitors and smart metering and published through our data portal, was kept. For the remaining 5%, we will use network models, forecasting and targeted monitoring, prioritising areas where limited visibility presents the greatest risk to customers or network operation. We will keep coverage under review throughout ED3. Other decision drivers: data quality, industry data standards and cyber security.
Responsible & Sustainable Business	**Example 10: Priority Services Register and tailored support Customer service and vulnerable consumers**	**Purpose:** co-development; challenge; testing. **Timing:** from reviewing ED2 support (2025), through scoping standards (Jan–Mar 2026), to commitment testing (July–Sept 2026). **Depth:** the Inclusive Service Panel reviewed commitment wording and personas; workshops set out expectations by PSR category; partners discussed battery eligibility and cost. **Coverage:** Inclusive Service Panel (quarterly since Sept 2025); Customer Vulnerability Strategy webinar (2025); PSR Think Tank (Jan 2026); Partners Roundtable (2026); ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops (Mar 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop, partner strategy refresh and Citizens Advice meeting on batteries (Sept 2026); medical advice on welfare provisions.	**Groups:** consumer and vulnerability representatives (Citizens Advice, NEA, charities and support partners); Inclusive Service Panel members with lived experience; local authorities and community councils; healthcare advisers; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards consumer and vulnerability representatives and lived-experience panel members, reflecting the subject. Healthcare stakeholders were represented to a lesser extent, mainly through medical advice. PSR customers' own views come from consumer research (see Consumer Research Log).	– Consumer representatives and partners wanted clear minimum standards for each PSR category, but cautioned SSEN not to "try to be all things to all people". In March 2026, expectations ranged from guaranteed back-up power for the highest-need category to signposting for others. – 71.1% of March 2026 workshop stakeholders had heard of the PSR, but only 43.7% felt knowledgeable about it. – The Inclusive Service Panel said a percentage reach target alone was not meaningful, highlighted hidden customers such as park-home and sheltered-housing residents, and asked how customers without internet would get support. – Partners wanted support through trusted voices, continuing after an outage. – Battery recipients valued them (92% acceptance; under 1% returned), though some wanted smaller sizes. Personal Resilience Plans were seen as "common sense" and unappealing. – **Diverging views on batteries:** Citizens Advice and some Sept 2026 attendees wanted the scheme widened; a councillor felt local hubs would be better value.	**Influence: Originated (service standards; park homes); Changed (PSR target framing); Refined (batteries; resilience plans); Constrained (battery scope)** Calls for minimum standards, building on PSR focus groups (see Consumer Research Log), originated service standards and customer journeys for every PSR category, phased in over the first two years of ED3 so each can be tested. Inclusive Service Panel challenge on using a percentage alone reframed our July commitment ("over 1.5m eligible households") as a 40% increase in registrations, reaching at least 90% of eligible customers by 2030 (from 81.9%). Its evidence on hidden customers originated a commitment to contact all known park homes and sheltered accommodation, with in-person resilience planning for at least 100 at-risk communities. The Panel also informed our personas. Feedback from recipients of the batteries in ED2 has led to a number of enhancements to the programme for ED3. This include issuing a further 10,000 batteries (a 50% uplift), broadening the range of battery sizes available to better reflect different customer needs, and enhance targeting for issuance using a combination of PSR needs code, customer location and previous network fault history. Redesigned Resilience Plans will reach 500,000 customers by 2033, online, by post and by phone. **Not adopted:** batteries for all eligible customers, given the cost to bill payers, import logistics, environmental impact and Ofgem's steer towards network investment. We mitigate this through targeting, smart UPS units for medically dependent customers without a battery, and Resilience Plans. After medical advice that oxygen users typically have around six hours of back-up, we chose better communication over supplying oxygen tanks. **Other decision drivers:** affordability, operational capacity and SSEN's role alongside government, local authorities and health services.
Responsible & Sustainable Business	**Example 11: Fuel poverty and a fair transition Vulnerable consumers; energy efficiency**	**Purpose:** challenge; co-development; testing. **Timing:** from reviewing ED2 with partners (2025–early 2026), through designing the support model (Jan–Mar 2026), to testing the July target (Sept 2026). **Depth:** partners reviewed ED2 delivery; stakeholders tested whether the target was ambitious enough. **Coverage:** Customer Vulnerability Strategy webinar (2025); Partners Roundtable with Citizens Advice Hampshire, Citizens Advice Scotland, NEA and CSE (2026); quarterly partner bilaterals; LCT, Energy Efficiency and Fuel Poverty Think Tank (Jan 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops (Mar 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop and partner strategy refresh (Sept 2026); ISG challenge; Change Works and CSE delivery partnership.	**Groups:** fuel-poverty and advice partners (Citizens Advice, NEA, CSE, charities and energy advisers); local authorities; housing associations; community energy groups; Energy Systems Catapult; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards fuel-poverty and advice partners, who see need first-hand and speak for the households they support. Housing providers were represented to a lesser extent. Households in fuel poverty were not engaged directly as stakeholders; their views come through partners and consumer research (see Consumer Research Log), and the localised model has not yet been tested with them.	– Fuel-poverty partners reported rising demand, debt and complexity, alongside reduced national funding, and wanted SSEN to be more ambitious. In Sept 2026, stakeholders called the July target of 75,000 households "insufficient" and wanted the commitment to be "far more ambitious". Across the Responsible and Sustainable Business commitments as a whole, 82% supported them but only 35% rated them ambitious (scores of 4 or 5, around 50 responses). – Partners said customers in crisis need immediate financial help before behaviour change. The think tank identified confusion, low confidence, digital exclusion, high costs and a lack of aftercare after LCT installation as barriers. – Stakeholders wanted support delivered locally through trusted organisations, and judged by impact rather than numbers reached. – Partners warned that uncertainty over successors to ECO and the Warm Homes Plan risks a "postcode lottery". The ISG stressed co-benefits and devolved policy.	**Influence: Changed (scale); Originated (multi-tier model); Refined (aftercare)** Our July draft proposed 75,000 households (60,000 fuel poverty, 15,000 LCT). Partner and workshop challenge led us to increase this to at least 240,000 by 2033 (200,000 fuel poverty; 40,000 low-carbon transition), more than triple ED2. The think tank originated a multi-tier partnership framework (fuel crisis, fuel poverty, energy efficiency, low-carbon transition) that customers can enter at any stage. It will be delivered through a licence-wide partner, local partnerships and trusted collaborators, targeted by fuel-poverty mapping (around 28.7% of households in SHEPD, 10% in SEPD). Aftercare concerns extended LCT support to purchase and use, which is being tested with Change Works and CSE. We will also provide up to 10,000 energy-efficiency packs and support at least 600 warm and cool hubs. **Constrained:** SSEN's role is as an enabler; housing, affordability and national policy are outside our control. **Other decision drivers:** affordability, partner capacity and government funding.

ED3 Outcome	Policy Area	Type of Engagement Undertaken	Stakeholder Groups	Summary Feedback	Impact on Business Plan
The primary ED3 outcome to which the engagement relates	*The policy area or areas to which the engagement relates*	*How did you engage with stakeholders? For example, through webinars, roundtables, surveys, through third parties, representative bodies, trade associations etc*	*Which stakeholder groups were represented through the engagement and provide commentary on the relative balance of stakeholder voices. Were any relevant groups not represented?*	*What feedback and key messages did you hear from your stakeholders? Where different views were expressed, what were the relative weighting of these?*	*What impact has the feedback received had on your business plan? Provide specific examples of relevant decisions that have been influenced by the engagement. Where you have made a decision might be seen as counter to the feedback received, explain why this is and set out what measures you have taken to address the feedback received.*
Responsible & Sustainable Business	**Example 12: Environmental Action Plan Pollution prevention; nature; circular economy; carbon**	**Purpose:** challenge; options testing; assurance. **Timing:** from early nature engagement (Dec 2024), through testing pillars and habitat priorities (Nov 2025–May 2026), to commitment testing and ISG review (July–Sept 2026). **Depth:** ranked pillars and habitats via live polling; regulators and water companies reviewed the fluid-filled cable programme. **Coverage:** Nature for Networks webinar (Dec 2024) and engagement series (May 2025); SEPA bilateral (May 2025); ENA Environment & Sustainability subcommittee (Sept 2025); Sustainable Supplier Engagement Days, Perth and Reading; ISG sessions (Nov 2025 to Aug 2026); circular asset, EAP and Future-Proofing Power webinars (Dec 2025–Feb 2026); ED3 Stakeholder Engagement Workshops (Mar 2026); double materiality assessment (49 surveys, 16 interviews; May 2026); coastal restoration conference survey (48 stakeholders) and Parliamentary Roundtable on seagrass (around 25 participants; July 2026); Environment Agency and water-company engagement on fluid-filled cables; ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026).	**Groups:** regulators (Environment Agency, SEPA, and Ofgem via the ENA subcommittee); water companies; environmental NGOs and restoration partners; policymakers, investors and scientists (seagrass roundtable); suppliers and contract partners; local authorities and charities (double materiality assessment); DNO peers; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards regulators, environmental bodies and suppliers, reflecting the technical and compliance focus. Customer views were represented less directly and tested through research, where environmental action ranked below reliability and affordability (see Consumer Research log).	– The Environment Agency and water companies supported proactive fluid-filled cable replacement, and water companies provided letters of support. At the ENA subcommittee, Ofgem encouraged more ambitious removal. – Environmental stakeholders wanted SSEN to go beyond compliance, prioritising peatland (78%), woodland (56%) and seagrass (56%) over saltmarsh (39%). 81% agreed nature-based solutions belong in the resilience toolkit, but only where proven. – Restoration stakeholders welcomed SSEN's leadership on seagrass (88% said a minimum level of nature investment is proportionate); some wanted more ambition and more coastal habitats. – All circular-economy webinar participants supported reuse and refurbishment (87% strongly), if reliability is maintained. Suppliers backed the double materiality assessment but showed gaps in readiness (43% have a biodiversity policy) and wanted guidance and support. – 81% supported our science-based-target approach, including the 55% Scope 1 and 2 target. – **Views were mixed on priority:** reducing SSEN's own emissions ranked last of 11 commitments in Sept 2026, and the ISG challenged the transparency of funding trade-offs.	**Influence: Changed (fluid-filled cables); Refined (nature, circularity and supply chain); Constrained (overall ambition)** Habitat priorities shaped 1,294ha of nature-based solutions by 2033 (723ha peatland, 564ha woodland, 7ha seagrass) and at least 12 biodiversity interventions, complementing conventional resilience measures. We will seek Ofgem approval to use linear woodland as an alternative to undergrounding. Stakeholder support led to 8% circular economy target being set which reflects the assessed population of assets that can have their lives extended through refurbishment safely, more than doubling ED2 performance. Additionally, we will work with suppliers on asset redesign to find more sustainable solutions where appropriate (one transformer uses a tonne less material). Supplier feedback led us to apply our Supplier Sustainability Code to all new suppliers from 2028, with support, targeting 80% compliance by value by 2033. During ED3 we will further reduce the risk of pollution by removing 247.74km of fluid filled cables (FFC) representing [REDACTION]. This is part of our long term plan for full removal by 2050. **Constrained:** as environmental action ranked below reliability and affordability, environmental investment is framed around reducing whole-life costs and future liabilities. **Other decision drivers:** regulatory compliance, engineering and safety.
Responsible & Sustainable Business	**Example 13: Workforce and supply-chain capacity Deliverability**	**Purpose:** exploration; challenge; co-development. **Timing:** from the independent review (2025), through supplier and workforce sessions (Jan–May 2026), to testing ED3 volumes and commitments (July–Sept 2026). **Depth:** suppliers discussed volumes, specifications and commercial models and rated delivery confidence; the Sept 2026 workshop tested British manufacturing. **Coverage:** Efficio supply-chain review (57 suppliers, 19 interviews; 2025); supply-chain mapping questionnaire (18 contractors; 2025); GSP contractor and manufacturer sessions (2025–Jan 2026); ENA Workforce Working Group (Feb 2026); supply-chain webinars on cables, transformers, switchgear and overhead lines (Mar 2026); Supplier Roundtable (18 senior stakeholders; May 2026); SEPD GSP Programme Overview (July 2026); engagement with 27 long-lead suppliers and supply-chain assurance survey (11 suppliers; Sept 2026); Future Ways of Working workshops; DESNZ Sector Growth Plan working group; school series (around 250 students); ED3 Stakeholder Workshop (Sept 2026).	**Groups:** suppliers (and Tier 1 and 2 delivery partners); colleagues and trade unions; future workforce (school students); Energy & Utility Skills and DESNZ; ENA and DNO peers; the ISG. **Balance:** Evidence was weighted towards suppliers, contractors and the workforce, reflecting the deliverability focus. Direct customer views on the value of local sourcing were limited and came from research with large business users (see Consumer Research Log).	– Suppliers said long-term visibility was the main enabler (100% valued a plan beyond ED3; 92% early pipeline visibility). Design variation and late specification changes constrain production; large-transformer lead times are 120–160+ weeks. – In Sept 2026, stakeholders called SSEN's supply-chain relationship too "hands off", with conversations happening too late. – Workforce was the most discussed barrier in Sept 2026: stakeholders doubted SSEN could recruit and train enough engineers, and urged work with schools and colleges. Suppliers named authorised roles as the main skills gap (9 of 11); delivery partners warned against scaling faster than supervision allows; trade unions flagged stress in specific roles. – The ISG emphasised practical and digital skills and inclusive, local recruitment, and proposed recruiting home-educated young people. Suppliers suggested opening SSEN training schools to contractors. – **Views diverged on UK manufacturing:** government and local authorities supported growing it through ED3, with measurable targets, but large business users ranked it 36th of 39 sub-priorities (see Consumer Research Log).	**Influence: Changed (skills and procurement); Refined (UK sourcing); No change (one proposal not taken forward)** Supplier feedback led us to package work into regional programmes on multi-price-control frameworks, and adopt "Design Once, Build Many", earlier design freeze and asset rationalisation (pole types cut from 116 to 60). Suppliers rated delivery confidence in our ED3 volumes at 4.4/5. ISG challenge led us to revise and re-test our skills framework. Training bottlenecks led to faster adult-learner pathways (from up to four years to around 18 months where safe) and moving 10% of in-person training to blended learning. Our "scaling safely" approach ties growth to competence and authorisation, and framework suppliers must now show plans to grow their own key skills (in the GSP heads of terms). We will continue to work with SSE Group to support inclusive STEM outreach for all young people, including those who are home educated. We retained a commitment to UK manufacturers with a minimum 10% local-content tender weighting, reflecting supply resilience and government policy, but will not pursue harder targets on UK sourcing, to protect competition and affordability. **Not adopted:** contractor access to SSEN training schools, after a pilot showed very low uptake. The plan adds [REDACTED]. **Other decision drivers:** safety, affordability and procurement rules.

Influence types: Originated: engagement created a new proposal.
Changed: engagement materially altered a proposal.
Refined: engagement changed targeting, scale, timing or delivery.
Validated: engagement supported an established proposal.
Constrained: engagement prevented or reduced an option.
No change: evidence was considered but other factors prevailed.