

Stakeholder Feedback

Responses to focus groups and one-to-one interviews

November – December 2012

Introduction

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, and
- 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.

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. This series of focus groups and one-to-one interviews sought the views of our customers and wider stakeholders around our business activities over the period to 2023 and beyond. This report presents the detailed findings of our focus groups and one-to-one interviews which were held in November and December 2012.

Through focus groups, we heard the views of 113 stakeholders on the following topics:

- Major Connections
- Minor Connections
- Innovation
- Worst Served Customers
- Environment

Through one-to-one interviews we heard the views from three organisations who provide a voice for business people and their businesses; and one organisation who provides a similar service for domestic customers. We also heard from five environmental groups.

These tables set out the questions we asked, what you told us, what you would like us to do and our response to this. It also details our response as a business in terms of where we can deliver on what you would like us to do and the timeframe we will do this within. We also explain where we are unable to deliver on your wishes and why.

In addition to this, the results and key themes from this engagement have already been used to help inform our business plan and are quoted in Our Second Consultation: Innovating for a greener, more efficient future.

Index by Stakeholder Group:

Area	Pages
Major Connections	2 – 19
Minor Connections	2 – 19
Customer Representatives	20 – 27
Worst Served Customers	22, 24 – 31
Environment	32 – 49
Innovation	5, 50 – 65

Question 1: How supportive are you of our plan to make sure any new networks are ready for the low carbon future?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.2	Virtually all of participants were supportive of this.	Be more transparent around costs. Better explain the SSEPD vision of 'a low carbon future'.	Receive sign-on from Ofgem and then: (1) Update our Common Charging Methodology (CCMS) and our minimum design to address (will apply to all new connections). (2) Once completed, quote for all new connections 'fit for purpose'.	We will include the proposal to make sure that any new networks are ready for the low carbon future within our business plan and set out the impact that this would have. We continue to build our knowledge and expertise in innovative technologies. We will also engage with our stakeholders to ensure that they can help inform us of the best areas for network upgrades. See Question 5 for further details.	This requires to be in agreement with Ofgem as will increase new connecting customer costs by approx 10%.
Minor Connections	3.4.2	Almost all were supportive of this.	Provide incentives to engage more with 'the low carbon future'. Better messaging of the concept of 'a low carbon future.'			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers	3.5.8	The overwhelming majority were supportive of making networks ready for a 'low carbon future.'	Reassure us that this support is well placed and that customers will benefit from this.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 2: Do you agree or disagree that we should share the cost of upgrading old connections amongst all customers?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.3	All agreed that the cost of upgrading old connections should be shared among all customers.	Better explanation of rationale for upgrading old connections and 'what does this actually mean'. Provide greater transparency on the cost of upgrading old connections. Better communication of the benefits of upgrading old connections.	Actual cost-sharing will require to be agreed by Ofgem. Costs of upgrading existing networks in DPCR5 (the current price control period) are apportioned in accordance with the Common Charging Methodology Statement for all customers regardless of size, excluding Distributed Generation at LV of <16A per phase. In terms of providing greater transparency around costs, we are:	We will include the proposal to share the cost of upgrading old connections amongst all customers within our business plan and set out the impact that this would have. SSEPD supports the proposal to socialise the costs of upgrading small Low Carbon Technology connections across all customers in the RIIO-ED1 period.	We have to seek approval and agreement from Ofgem to share the costs of upgrading old connections amongst all customers. The regulatory mechanism is such that these costs are funded through Distribution Use of System Charges (DUoS). If Ofgem accept this proposal it would result in an additional £2/year for an average domestic customer's bill.
Minor Connections	3.4.3	Almost all agreed that the cost of upgrading old connections should be shared among all customers	Better explanation of the relationship/correlation between increase in cost and improved network performance (ie Every £ spend produces x% improvement in performance). SSEPD should be continuously investing in the network as part of its overall customer service commitment.	(1) updating our quotation letters to provide a clearer cost breakdown. (2) improving the information we provide on web site. (3) re-training call centre staff (CET) so that they can provide more detailed information. To minimise any costs in upgrading old connections, SSEPD are actively driving proposals for developing innovative solutions under the Low Carbon Networks Fund. This includes local smart charging of electric vehicles and other means of allowing Low Carbon Technology to connect without the need for expensive network reinforcement.		
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers	3.5.9	Close to two thirds supportive of the cost being shared across all customers.	Explain precisely what a 'low carbon' future means. Make sure that the cost is shared equitably. Pay for (make a contribution to) such upgrades out of SSEPD's profits. Consider how to respond to customers who don't wish to 'buy in' to the low carbon future.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 3: How supportive would you be of SSEPD prioritising network upgrades where we expect there will be lots of large renewable technologies connecting?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.4	All were supportive.	Better use of information/ data to manage the overall risk (review government policy, subsidies, local authority plans, tune into intelligence on what renewable technologies are being currently bought and sold etc). Setting priorities needs to reflect the different types of renewable technologies.	Our stakeholders are telling us that we should be considering prioritising network upgrades where there will be lots of renewable technologies connecting. We cannot invest ahead of need until Ofgem agrees to this strategy. We will reflect your views when we meet with Ofgem.	We will include the proposal to prioritise upgrading the network where we expect there to be lots of large renewable technologies within our business plan and set out the impact that this would have. We have to seek approval and agreement from Ofgem to share the risk that the upgrading will not be required amongst all customers. The regulatory mechanism is such that should the upgrade not be required after all, these costs are funded through Distribution Use of System Charges (DUoS). If Ofgem accept this proposal it would result in an additional £1/year for to an average domestic customer's bill.	We have to seek approval and agreement from Ofgem to share the costs of upgrading existing networks amongst all customers. The regulatory mechanism is such that should this upgrade not be required these costs are funded through Distribution Use of System Charges (DUoS). If Ofgem accept this proposal it would result in an additional £1/year for to an average domestic customer's bill.
Minor Connections	3.4.4	The majority were supportive.	Engage with local authorities to help prioritise network upgrades. Consult with Scottish government.			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 4: How interested would you be in developing a scheme where in return for a faster, cheaper connection, you may occasionally have to stop generating?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.5	The majority were interested in developing such a scheme.	Provide greater clarity (quantify) on the level of constraint. Provide these schemes in the shorter term as anything is better than nothing. Develop greater intelligence around network performance. More investment in SMART grid technologies.	Where it is a suitable and justified solution, as well as a conventional solution we will offer you an alternative faster or lower cost connection where you may occasionally have to stop generating, where there is customer interest.	Within our business plan, we will include the proposal to develop schemes where suitable and justified where in return for a faster, lower cost connection you may occasionally have to stop generating; and set out the impact that this would have.	All stakeholders requests have been addressed.
Minor Connections	3.4.5	Reaction was mixed as regards interest in developing a scheme. Some expressed interest. Others indicated that they were not interested.	Provide greater clarity on level of constraint to inform customer business model.			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.12	The vast majority said they would be interested in developing a scheme where in return for a faster, cheaper connection they may occasionally have to stop generating.	Provide greater clarity on constraint.			

Question 5: Who could help us forecast the areas in which there will be uptake of large renewable generators?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.6	All participants felt that local authorities should be involved, with almost all suggesting that generation developers should be involved.	SSEPD to consult with the following organisations when forecasting the areas where lots of large-scale renewable generators are likely to be connecting: local authorities; developers; MOD; major connections customers; NATS; research studies; DECC; Renewables UK; Scottish Renewables; Energy Consultants; Parsons Brinkerhoff; Mott MacDonald; AA Technologies; and, Garrad Hassan Wind.	We note the organisations that our stakeholders feel would be able to help us forecast where there is likely to be uptake of large renewable generators. We are in the process of developing a stakeholder engagement plan specifically to inform the connections area of the business. We will ensure that we engage with the organisations you have indicated to help us forecast areas in which there is likely to be large uptake of renewable generators.	Within our business plan, we will commit to working in partnership with our stakeholders to identify areas that we think there will be uptake of large renewable generators.	
Minor Connections	3.4.6	Just over half believed that generation developers and the UK and Scottish governments could help. Just under half mentioned local authorities.	SSEPD to consult with the local authority planners and developers when forecasting the areas where lots of large-scale renewable generators are likely to be connecting.			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 6: How supportive would you be of design costs being shared across everyone rather than only to those projects that go ahead?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.11	The majority were neither supportive nor unsupportive of this.	Provide greater clarity and transparency around cost. Consider offering a 'light weight service' to provide customers with an informal opinion. Continually update the Long Term Development Statement (http://www.ssepd.co.uk/LTDS/) and provide better quality maps.	Currently we do not charge any upfront fees to carry out the design work required in order to quote a customer for a connection. Instead we recover these costs for all our designs from those projects that do go ahead. For smaller projects with little design and a high expectation of them progressing this is reasonable. However for larger often speculative projects such as for Distributed Generation this can mean that the minority of projects that do go ahead are burdened with considerable costs incurred by the majority that do not. We believe it would be fairer for these particular projects to fund the design work whether or not the project goes ahead. We along with other DNOs will continue to pursue this with DECC.	We believe this objective will be achieved by 31 March 2015.	We are in the process of seeking agreement from DECC to be able to charge for the design work for all larger projects rather than just recovering all our costs only from those that are accepted and go ahead.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 7: Should we provide your quotation with both a cost for us to do all the works and a cost just for the element we have to do?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.15	All participants believed that SSEPD should provide quotations that include both costs.	Split out costs to meet the principle of transparency. Reduce delivery times for all inclusive quotes.	Following response from Major Connections, this process went live for all larger connections quotes from 01 December 2012.	Having listened to our stakeholders we plan to provide all major quotations in this form by 31st March 2015.	All stakeholder requests are achievable.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 8: If we reduced the number of days it takes us to connect minor customers, do you agree/disagree that SSEPD should be financially rewarded?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.7	The majority agreed that SSEPD should be financially rewarded in this situation.	If a premium service is made available ensure that existing services continue to be adequately resourced. Ensure that a premium service is available to all customers (eg both rural and urban).	We will provide Key Performance Indicators on the average time it takes us to quote and complete a connection. These will be published in our Annual Connections Report.	Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1. We intend to provide a Connections Report which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.	The regulatory mechanism is such that funding or incentives for costs to provide and improve this are funded through Distribution Use of System Charges (DUoS).
Minor Connections	3.4.7	Most disagreed with the view that SSEPD should be financially rewarded for this.	Provide reduced connection times as part of a commitment to customer service improvement/excellence rather than charging customers directly for such a service.			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 9: Do you agree that, rather than simply reducing the time to connect for major customers, we match their connection times with their individual project needs and priorities?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.8	Unanimous agreement for SSEPD matching their connection times with their individual project needs and priorities.	Provide a more flexible commercially orientated service with customers willing to pay for increased flexibility. Revise SSEPD connections standards to reflect the different types of technologies. Customers believe that standard contracts are inappropriate and SSEPD should consider more flexible payment terms. Provide a customer liaison contact/advocate/representative. Provide more flexibility in service offerings. More customer focus.	Following lobbying by SSEPD and others, Ofgem have now removed proposals for a 'time to connect' incentive as part of RIIO-ED1. This has been replaced with a more appropriate incentive for DNOs to provide better information to their Major Customers. Under this initiative SSEPD are building Major Customer work plans, starting with our Distributed Generation work plan, now available on our website. We will use this format to address our customer concerns, in the first instance by putting in place Contract Managers as suggested starting with our Distributed Generation customers.	<p>Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1.</p> <p>We intend to provide annual business plans for each of our Major Connections groups which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.</p>	Our licence conditions mean that we are required to treat all connections in the same way. This means that we cannot make any judgements based on type of technology, social impact, project likelihood or worthiness.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 10: As a major connection customer, how important is it to you to be able to tell Ofgem how your connection project went?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.9	The majority agreed that it is important to be able to tell Ofgem how their connection project went.	Important from the perspectives of monitoring, independence and accountability.	Ofgem's proposals are now to remove Major Customers from the Customer Satisfaction Survey that ran through DPCR5 and replace with an incentive for DNOs to provide better information to their Major Customers (named ICE). This will be judged through indepth interviews with customer and groups identified by our regulator together with evidence from ourselves of constructive annual engagement with our Customers. Under this initiative SSEPD are building Major Customer work plans, starting with our Distributed Generation work plan, now available on our website. We will use this format to address our customer concerns, in the first instance by putting in place Contract Managers as suggested starting with our Distributed Generation customers... one of our major connections customers groups.	Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1. We intend to provide annual business plans for each of our Major Connections groups which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 11: As a major connection customer, would you still want to tell Ofgem how your connection project went even in an open competitive market?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.10	All said that they would still want to tell Ofgem how their connection project went even in an open competitive market.	Provide greater clarity on the features of an open competitive market. Provide customers with the opportunity to comment on service in real time to allow SSEPD to address problems as they arise rather than waiting to the end of a project.	Ofgem's proposals are now to remove Major Customers from the Customer Satisfaction Survey that ran through DPCR5 and replace with an incentive for DNOs to provide better information to their Major Customers (named ICE). This will be judged through indepth interviews with customer and groups identified by our regulator together with evidence from ourselves of constructive annual engagement with our Customers. Under this initiative SSEPD are building Major Customer work plans, starting with our Distributed Generation work plan, now available on our web site. We will use this format to address our customer concerns, in the first instance by putting in place Contract Managers who will provide support during on-going projects as suggested starting with our Distributed Generation customers.	Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1. We intend to provide annual business plans for each of our Major Connections groups which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 12: What questions do you think Ofgem should be asking once a job is done?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.9	Suggested that Ofgem should be asking questions relating to monitoring, feedback, price and payment terms, timescales, opportunities and reliability.	Provide a mechanism for customers to provide feedback directly to SSEPD on a real time basis.	Ofgem's proposals are now to remove Major Customers from the Customer Satisfaction Survey that ran through DPCR5 and replace with an incentive for DNOs to provide better information to their Major Customers (named ICE). This will be judged through indepth interviews with customer and groups identified by our regulator together with evidence from ourselves of constructive annual engagement with our Customers. Under this initiative SSEPD are building Major Customer work plans, starting with our Distributed Generation work plan, now available on our web site. We will use this format to address our customer concerns, in the first instance by putting in place Contract Managers who will provide support during on-going projects as suggested starting with our Distributed Generation customers.	Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1. We intend to provide annual business plans for each of our Major Connections groups which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 13: At the moment, we have standard timescales to provide a quote for your connection. Which, if any of these, do you think needs to be changed?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.11	A number of participants were unable to express a view on SSEPD's standard timescales to provide a quote due to lack of awareness of the process.	Promote awareness of standards among customers. Provide greater consistency in the delivery timescales for quotes.	We will provide Key Performance Indicators on the average time it takes us to quote and complete a connection. These will be published in our Annual Connections Report.	Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1. We intend to provide a Connections Report which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.	
Minor Connections	3.4.8	As regards the timescales for SSEPD to provide a quote for minor connections, there was limited awareness of SSEPD standards in relation to connection times and different participants had different views on the various standards. However, overall it was felt that there is a need to revisit all of the current standards and reduce the timescales for quotes.	Promote awareness of the standards among customers. Use resources more effectively to reduce connection times. Ensure that connection times are consistent.			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 14: When connecting new customers to the network, we cannot reduce quotation times without increasing costs.

With this in mind, we asked connections customers which of the following two options they would prefer?

- a) Provide the accelerated quotation service to everyone with the additional costs shared across everyone's connection charge
- b) Provide an accelerated quotation service to those who want to speed up the quotation turnaround time but pass the cost directly to them

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.12	All said that if SSEPD reduced the quotation times the cost for this service should be passed directly to those customers using the quicker service rather than all customers.	Provide a quicker service and become more responsive to customers.	For our major connection customers we propose to work up proposals for 'different' services with associated costs and present these firstly to Ofgem to agree and then back to our stakeholders via our Common Charging Methodology. For our minor connection customers the new Time to Connect incentive, proposed by Ofgem, will incentivise an improvement in our average time to provide our services. The costs for these improvements will be shared across all customers.	Within our business plan we will lay out our strategy of how we intend to improve information to all our customers. This will be an ongoing message throughout RIIO-ED1. We intend to provide a Connections Report which will include an annual report on performance and will seek requests from our stakeholders on what you would wish to see next. By April 2015 at the latest this will be clearly signposted and available on our web site where there will also be a facility for our major customers to 'get involved'.	For our major connection customer proposals, Ofgem would be required to agree we could provide different services, with charges.
Minor Connections	3.4.9	The majority believed that if SSEPD were to reduce quotation times for all customers then the additional cost associated with doing so should be shared across everyone's connection charge.	Provide greater consistency between on-line quotes and onsite quotes. Provide greater consistency of service regardless of mode of contact (ie Face-to-face, telephone, email etc).			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 15: How long would you like your quote to be valid for?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.13	The majority felt that a quote should be valid for 90 days.	Provide a 90 day service with the options to extend and revalidate. Provide greater clarity on the cost implications of extending and revalidating. Be more sensitive to the commercial realities facing customers. Keep quotes simple. Offer 90 day quote with option to revalidate if 'no competition' with other customers.	From our stakeholder response we recognise that we need to continue to explain both why our quotations are only automatically valid for 30 days but also how a customer may, through a simple process, revalidate their quotation to extend it to up to 160 days validity. The reason we ask our customers to request a revalidation after each 30 day period instead of an automatic validation period of 160 days is to reduce the occasions of inactivity. A quotation automatically valid for 160 days may be of no interest to the original applicant but, because it would have to be taken into account, disadvantages all subsequent customers. This situation has recently become more common as electricity usage from Low Carbon Technology uptake through to Distributed Generation has a growing influence on our networks.	By April 2015 we plan to be providing an Annual Connections Report which will detail our performance against each of our guaranteed quotation standards but also our average times to quote benchmarked against other DNOs and with clear plans on how we intend to improve these.	
Minor Connections	3.4.10	The majority felt that a quote should be valid for 90 days.	Provide flexibility regarding extensions and revalidations.			
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 16: In principle would you support a better web-based process for applying and monitoring your projects?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.16	The vast majority are supportive of a web-based process for applying and monitoring their projects.	Redesign and make the on-line application form more user friendly (eg pull down menus with predefined answer categories).	We are very keen to progress your ideas and expect a new web-based system which allows connection customers to apply for and monitor their projects to be live on our website during 2014. We are consulting stakeholders as we develop and trial the user interface and will make feedback areas available as we release each new idea so that we can constantly improve your experience.	We have listened to our stakeholders through these and other events and are in the process of improving our on-line processes to provide these. This will be completed for 1st April 2015.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 17: Are there specific elements of your project you would particularly like to access on-line?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.17	All participants wanted to see the following on-line: network information and indicative costs; application forms; acceptance and payment; project progress; and, designer/engineer contact details.		We are very keen to progress your ideas and expect a new web-based system which allows connection customers to apply for and monitor their projects to be live on our website during 2014. We are consulting stakeholders as we develop and trial the user interface and will make feedback areas available as we release each new idea so that we can constantly improve your experience.	We have listened to our stakeholders through these and other events and are in the process of improving our on-line processes to provide these. This will be completed for 1st April 2015.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 18: Would you be willing to participate in a trial of SSEPD's on-line application process?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections	3.2.15	All our participants agreed to participate in a trial of our on-line application process. In return, they wish feedback from SSEPD.	All agreed to participate in a trial but want the results communicated to them.	We are very keen to progress your ideas and expect a new web-based system which allows connection customers to apply for and monitor their projects to be live on our website during 2014. We are consulting stakeholders as we develop and trial the user interface and will make feedback areas available as we release each new idea so that we can constantly improve your experience.	We have listened to our stakeholders through these and other events and are in the process of improving our on-line processes to provide these. This will be completed for 1st April 2015.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 19: Do you think that if a fault occurs SSEPD should supply your power from a different source so you do not have to wait at all until the fault is fixed?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Unfortunately we are not funded to provide increased levels of supply security within the current price control period (DCPR5). We are unable to increase security of supply without installing additional circuits.	Within our business plan, we propose to improve the security of supply to around 5200 Worst Served Customers. This would be achieved by improving the reliability of supply and by installing new alternative circuits to provide a switched alternative.	It is not always economically viable to provide an alternative source of supply for all customers. We will consult with stakeholders via Our Second Consultation, Our Stakeholder Events and On-line Survey to gain an understanding of how willing our customers are to pay for increased supply reliability.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.1	The majority considered SSEPD should supply their power from a different source.	Consider the needs of the specific area affected, including rural areas, and respond accordingly.			
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 20: Are you prepared to pay more so that all customers can have this back up supply?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>Unfortunately we are not funded to provide increased levels of supply security within the current price control period (DCPR5). We are unable to increase security of supply without installing additional circuits.</p>	<p>We note that our stakeholders are conscious of costs. Therefore, within our business plan, we propose to focus on improving security of supply to around 5,200 Worst Served Customers. The increase in supply reliability will require additional investment which will increase costs. This investment will be in the form of new circuits which will give us a switched alternative to supply customers with.</p>	<p>It is not always economically viable to provide an alternative source of supply for all customers.</p> <p>We will consult with stakeholders via Our Second Consultation, Our Stakeholder Events and On-line Survey to gain an understanding of how willing our customers are to pay for increased supply reliability.</p>
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.2	Opinion was split; half said yes whilst the other half were unsure.	Look at the cheapest (and most effective in the long term) ways of providing viable backup systems which are not reliant on oil powered generators. Consider, with sensitivity, what contribution (if any) people in fuel poverty should be asked to make. Consider protecting this group against any further increases in the baseline cost of supplying energy by basically introducing a capping system.			
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 21: Do you agree or disagree that we should invest more in underground lines to reduce risk of power cuts due to severe weather in future?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will continue to monitor network performance and target areas that are particularly vulnerable to weather related faults, taking decisions on network investment to mitigate this risk.	Our business plan includes a proposal to invest in improving the reliability of supply to 5200 of our Worst Served Customers in the SHEPD area, including undergrounding of parts of the network where appropriate.	We cannot practically install underground cables in rocky and remote areas which do not suit the trenching and installation of underground cable systems.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.3	Majority agreed that SSEPD should invest more.	Provide us with further information on the cost you quoted ie £7 per year. How did you derive this? Underground certain areas – for example on the Islands or in areas of natural beauty. Prioritise what lines you will underground first to maximise the return on investment.			
Worst Served Customers	3.5.11	The majority agreed with investing in undergrounding. However, a significant minority neither agreed nor disagreed with a similar proportion disagreeing.	Provide us with further information on the cost you quoted ie £7 per year. How did you derive this? Consider different costs per region to take account of rurality. Be open about the types of problems undergrounding would and would not solve (eg rusting of transformers).			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 22: Supply reliability: Which investment strategy would you prefer we adopt? 1. Maintain current investment and same duration of power cuts or 2. Increase investment to reduce duration of power cuts. Typical increase of £1.50 per year

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will continue to monitor network performance and target areas that are particularly vulnerable to weather related faults, taking decisions on network investment to mitigate this risk. We will also carry out resilience tree cutting to reduce the effects of storms on our overhead lines.	Our business plan includes a proposal to improve the resilience of our networks and particularly the overhead line circuits. This will include increased tree cutting and enhancing the structural strength of wood pole circuits.	It is not always economically viable to provide an alternative source of supply for all customers. We will consult with stakeholders via Our Second Consultation, Our Stakeholder Events and On-line Survey to gain an understanding of how willing our customers are to pay for increased supply reliability. We will prioritise work on the areas of the network which are particularly vulnerable to weather related faults as we can't address all areas within the price control.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.4	Opinion was split as regards which investment strategy interviewees would prefer SSEPD to adopt; half said maintain the current investment and the same duration of power cuts; the other half would prefer SSEPD to increase investment to reduce duration of power cuts at a typical increase of £1.50 per year.	Prioritise investment and focus on the prevention of power cuts rather than investing in remedial solutions.			
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 23: Compensation or investment? Which one would you prefer?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will continue to review badly performing networks and Worst Served Customers and consider where we can achieve improved network performance at reasonable cost, or within the current Ofgem allowance of £1000 per customer.	Our business plan includes a proposal to invest around £67.5 million in addressing around 5200 Worst Served Customers in our SHEPD area during the RIIO-ED1 period. These customers are those who suffer the highest number of high voltage interruptions on their networks, as defined by Ofgem. They will suffer at least 3 high voltage interruptions each year and at least 15 in total over a 3 year period. The proposed investment will deliver improvements in performance for these customers such that they fall outside of this criteria. The investment is recognised as necessary to improve the reliability of supply to the worst of the Worst Served Customers ie those who suffer the very most interruptions.	We cannot reasonably address or remove all Worst Served Customers on our remote networks in the Highlands and Islands within the RIIO-ED1 period at a total investment level that is likely to be acceptable to our customers.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.5	All participants would prefer SSEPD to prioritise network investment in preference to paying out compensation, even if it increased the average domestic customer bill by £15 more per year.	Invest: Compensation should not be paid to compensate for bad service.			
Worst Served Customers	3.5.5	This issue raised a lot of debate. Some considered that it should not be an 'either/or' issue. Others favoured an investment approach. Several declined to 'vote' on this issue. Of those did, over two thirds favoured investing to improve reliability (approximately £15 per year).	Focus on providing an acceptable service. Show us what SSEPD is already investing in the network. Explain why/where further investment is necessary/beneficial. Prove to us that the network will perform better, and there would be less paid out in compensation (which would also cost us) if we opted to invest.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 24: We want to make claiming compensation easier following a power cut. Which one would you prefer? 1. Arrange a rebate on your electricity account 2. Send a voucher to the account holder 3. Send the account holder a cheque or BACS payment

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RII0-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				These arrangements will not be introduced until after the end of DPCR5.	Our business plan will introduce automatic payments to customers on the Priority Services Register during RII0-ED1. We are looking to introduce ways to make it easier for customers to claim compensation during such events through an improved website interface. Ofgem have produced a table setting out the Guaranteed Standards of Performance (http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Networks/ElecDist/QualofServ/GuarStandds/Documents1/GS%20additional%20links.doc). This table describes the service, expected performance level and the Guaranteed Standards payments associated with each.	We will investigate the options for working with suppliers to directly credit customers' electricity accounts or to make payment direct to your bank account.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.6	In terms of claiming compensation following a power cut, the vast majority of those interviewed said they would prefer a rebate on their electricity account.	Keep it simple arrange a rebate. Ensure that customers know they have received a rebate.			
Worst Served Customers	3.5.6	Well over half indicated that, if SSEPD had to pay them compensation, they would prefer a rebate to their electricity account. However, a significant minority (just over one fifth) said they would prefer a cheque. Just under one fifth opted for the payment to be directly transferred to their bank account.	Tell us precisely when compensation does and does not apply and what is and is not covered by the compensation. Set up customer-friendly systems that enable us to get a rebate under any of the three mechanisms we cited. Tell us how to access and activate these.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 25: Use of [mobile] generators. Which approach would you prefer?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>We will normally take a balanced approach to the provision of mobile generation in such cases. The cost of providing such generators is a cost that is generally borne by customers as a whole, so needs to be reasonable and appropriate. Many customers are happy to agree planned interruptions of their supply provided adequate notice is provided. This minimises costs which would otherwise be passed on through increased charges in their bills. The current guaranteed standard for notification of planned supply interruption is 48 hours. However SSEPD normally provides 5-7 days notice in such cases.</p>	<p>We intend to continue with our current approach because we are balancing this against the strong stakeholder feedback that whilst people do want a reliable supply they want this to be delivered cost effectively. We plan to provide at least 7 days notice of planned interruptions in the RIIO-ED1 period to enable our customers to make alternative arrangements to meet their needs on the day.</p>	<p>We need to be able to provide customers with reasonable notice and be able to disconnect their supply to carry out pre-planned essential works. The costs of providing such generation is paid for by customers as a whole so needs to be considered economically. We cannot provide mobile generation for all customers on every occasion within the funding provided under the price control. We cannot economically or practicably provide mobile generation to every customer for every planned or unplanned interruption of their supply.</p>
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.7	<p>The three respondents who supported this idea all represented SMEs in some form and felt strongly that if a business would suffer loss of trade as a result of a planned power cut then an alternative supply should be made available.</p>	<p>Provide a mobile generator in areas where there are a lot of businesses grouped together ie a high street to minimise the loss of trade and impact on businesses during a planned power cut. This is particularly important to SMEs who are unlikely to have access to an alternative power supply. Support the cheapest option in this situation as it's a planned for event however, if a household or business had a particular requirement or need then access to generator back up supply should be made available. Disconnect the power supply for planned maintenance and do not supply a generator, as long as the community affected has been given enough prior notice of when the power will be turned off.</p>			
Worst Served Customers	3.5.12	<p>Of those that expressed a view on the use of mobile generators, just over half considered that a generator should be provided when a customer needs supply. However, close to one third favoured SSEPD taking the lowest cost option of always disconnecting supplies after providing adequate notice.</p>	<p>Provide key customers with supply eg hospitals etc. Consider covering the cost of a mobile generator where it is needed – SSEPD to take this out of its profits rather than charge customers. Give special consideration to businesses and those working from home – if we have to be off supply, then SSEPD should pay for it. Tell us how long the disconnection is going to last and what's involved in installing a mobile generator (including costs). This will help us decide whether or not a mobile generator is warranted.</p>			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 26: Given that customers pay for investment, which is your preferred option? Invest the same; Invest more (approx. £1 more per year); Invest less (approx. £1 less per year)

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We continue to monitor faults and fault performance to identify poorly performing circuits. We have initiated resilience tree cutting on our high voltage networks to reduce the risk of fallen trees affecting supplies during severe weather. These high voltage networks are the circuits that supply electricity to large numbers of customers so their reliability is important. We will work with communities to ensure that they are aware of our planned and ongoing works.	Our routine and resilience tree cutting programmes will continue and improve reliability on our network. Our network refurbishment works will improve circuit reliability by addressing defects. Our proposals for investing to address Worst Served Customers during RIIO-ED1 will dramatically improve the reliability of supply to our most remote and poorly performing circuits in our Highlands and Islands area. Our investment plans are targeted at circuits that provide the maximum benefit to the most customers and provide optimum investment return.	We cannot eliminate all types of faults on the network. This includes third party damage, bird strikes, lightning and severe weather.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives	3.6.8	There were mixed messages from participants. Business representatives supported the idea of increasing investment in the network to improve supply reliability. However, domestic customer representatives did not support this approach if it meant increasing the cost to domestic customers.	Representatives of the business community we supportive of SSEPD investing in the network to ensure increased security of supply. However, this was caveated by the need to manage the network efficiently.			
Worst Served Customers	3.5.7	This question stimulated the same sort of debate as the 'compensation/investment' question where similar views were expressed.	Again, focus on providing an acceptable service. Show us what SSEPD is already investing in the network. Explain why/where further investment is necessary/beneficial. Prove to us that the network will perform better, and there would be less paid out in compensation (which would also cost us) if we opted to invest.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 27: In the event of a power cut, SSEPD is committed to updating customers on a regular basis. In your view, what is a reasonable period for updates?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We continue to monitor the feedback from customers on the means and frequency of providing updates during network faults. This includes telephone answering, text, smart phones and internet. Our performance improvements are monitored through analysing customer feedback scores for this area.	As for DPCR5, we commit in our business plan to providing regular updates within the 3 to 6 hourly time bracket in the event of a power cut.	We cannot identify, with certainty, the time taken to restore supplies on all parts of the network, until such time as the fault location is identified. However we do strive to provide regular and frequent updates during the progress of the fault repair.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives				We commit to regularly reviewing the time scales that our customers want to be updated in and modify our systems/ procedures appropriately.		
Worst Served Customers	3.5.2	Every 3 to 6 hours was the most common choice in terms of being a reasonable period for information updates on power cuts.	Ensure that systems are in place to provide information updates at this type of frequency.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 28: During storms power cuts may affect many people all at the same time. What is the best way for us to keep you informed about when we will be able to get your power back on?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We can and do provide these methods.	We can and do provide these methods.	
Minor Connections				We commit to regularly reviewing our customers needs and emerging technology to ensure that we are communicating in the best way possible.	We have launched a smartphone app that will keep customers up to date on power cuts in their area. Our website also has this facility. Recorded telephone messages and text updates can also be used to keep our customers up to date. Our work with local authorities continues so that we can ensure emergency plans for vulnerable people are co-ordinated. Our telephone system is being upgraded to ensure that customers can communicate with us in their chosen method; text, recorded messaging, customer service representative etc.	
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers	3.5.3	The preferred way to keep customers informed during a power cut was by via a recorded telephone message (islands-Islay and Shetland) and by text (Henley-on-Thames).	Set up systems that do this. Make sure that the information about how to access them is widely available. Make sure the message keeping customers informed is intelligible and specific about what has happened citing the impacts locally, using terminology people will understand. Link in with local emergency plans and consider the needs of vulnerable people. Consider establishing a network of people in local areas who can cascade calls.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 29: Do you agree that SSEPD is doing enough to keep your power on?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We continue to monitor faults and fault performance to identify poorly performing circuits. We have initiated resilience tree cutting on our high voltage networks to reduce the risk of fallen trees affecting supplies during severe weather. These high voltage networks are the circuits that supply electricity to large numbers of customers so their reliability is important. We will work with communities to ensure that they are aware of our planned and ongoing works.	Our routine and resilience tree cutting programmes will continue and improve reliability on our network. Our network refurbishment works will improve circuit reliability by addressing defects. Our proposals for investing to address Worst Served Customers during RIIO-ED1 will dramatically improve the reliability of supply to our most remote and poorly performing circuits in our Highlands and Islands area. Our investment plans are targeted at circuits that provide the maximum benefit to the most customers and provide the best value for money.	We cannot eliminate all types of faults on the network. This includes third party damage, bird strikes, lightning and severe weather.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers	3.5.4	There were mixed views on whether or not SSEPD is doing enough to keep the power on. Whilst the majority (primarily on the islands) agreed, one quarter (primarily in Henley-upon-Thames) disagreed. One fifth neither agreed nor disagreed.	Those who considered SSEPD was not doing enough. Tell us what is causing the power cuts. Tell us what SSEPD does and is doing to reduce power cuts. Do more for small businesses that are affected by the power cuts. Show us that you are doing things – be more visible to the local community as you carry out these actions.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 30: How willing or unwilling would you be to change your energy use pattern to help the network cope?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>As part of our Thames Valley Vision project we are trialling energy demand management schemes that are focussed on large commercial customers (including public bodies) ahead of domestic customers. This trial of automatic demand-side response technology will provide our commercial customers with the means to reduce their energy consumption at certain times to ensure that our network can meet demand safely and securely. This trial will inform our development of suitable commercial models for enrolling other large commercial users as well as small and medium enterprises on demand-side response schemes.</p> <p>The roll-out of smart metering technology up to and during RIIO-ED1 will further increase the potential opportunity for customers to respond to a price signal or instruction from their energy supplier or distribution network operator to alter or change their power consumption to meet the needs of the instructing party. This would provide information on actual energy usage and potentially provide customers with the means to reduce their energy usage. Managing customer demand, particularly during peak demand periods, can help us to ensure the network can supply the demand securely and safely.</p>	<p>In addition to the commercial demand-side response trial in our Thames Valley Vision project, we are developing and evaluating suitable market models to incentivise domestic customers to change their energy consumption, particularly during peak demand periods, to ensure the network can meet demand reliably and safely. There are a range of possible tariff-based models within the scope of this ongoing investigation. The results will inform our planned deployment of demand-side management technology during RIIO-ED1. For domestic customers during RIIO-ED1, this technology will primarily be smart, efficient space and water heating systems which create a source of flexible demand on our network while maintaining high levels of customer comfort. This ongoing investigation will inform the development of similar market models for small and medium enterprises and larger commercial customers.</p> <p>We will also investigate and pursue suitable opportunities for demand-side management provided by smart meters as they are rolled out during RIIO-ED1. For example, these may include the provision of price signals or instructions to customers from their energy supplier or distribution network operator to alter or change their power consumption to meet the needs of the instructing party.</p>	<p>As a distribution network operator we do not directly set the tariffs charged to customers located on our network (although customer bills do contain a regulated element which covers the use of our network infrastructure). As a result, tariff-based models for demand-side management will require interaction with electricity supply companies and potentially wider market and regulatory change.</p>
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers	3.5.10	Whilst just over two-thirds would be willing to change energy use patterns to help the network cope, just under one third would not.	Focus on bigger energy users – private companies, public bodies ahead of domestic users. Provide us (domestic customers) with a financial incentive to change our energy use. Help us identify where we can gain most (ie reduce our bills) by providing information on our actual energy use against various devices. Also tell us if doing things at different times of the day is cheaper or dearer.			
Environment						
Innovation						

Question 31: In terms of oil and SF6 leaks from our asset base, which option would you support?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will continue to refurbish or replace cables which are leaking and we will replace or refurbish assets containing SF6 which have a high leakage rate.	We propose to replace the worst SF6 plant. For example, If we replace the top 10 worst offenders, this would remove 24% of the reporting year 2011/12 leakage. We also propose to replace 60km of fluid-filled cable.	If assets such as fluid-filled cables are working well and pose no imminent environmental threat then there is no reason to replace it. To do this would place an unnecessary financial burden on the customer. With specific regard to SF6, there is no viable alternative on the market, so it cannot be replaced with another asset.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.2	Unanimous support to reduce or eliminate all leaks.	Take a very proactive approach to this ie not just targeting worst offenders or repairing gear when it leaks.			
Innovation						

Question 32: Transmission Network Operators are incentivised for “being green”. How supportive are you of the this incentive being applied to Distribution Network Operators?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Ofgem have detailed in their final strategy paper that they will not be incentivising Distribution Network Operators to be greener.		
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.3	Vast majority supportive of ‘green’ incentive being extended to distribution network operators.	Explain in plain language what ‘being greener’ means. Convince us that in becoming ‘greener’ SSEPD is instrumental and material, rather than merely ornamental.			
Innovation						

Question 33: How important do you feel undergrounding is for visual amenity/ aesthetics?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our focus in this area by increasing our engagement with stakeholders and increasing our delivery in this area.	We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	We cannot amend this to include other areas of interest such as SSSIs, as Ofgem have explicitly restricted us to these three designations.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.4	Universal perception that undergrounding was either 'important' or 'very important' for visual amenity/ aesthetics.	Act in a manner that reflects how important this is to us.			
Innovation						

Question 34: Given that we can only underground up to 1.5% of overhead lines in ‘designated’ areas, what environmental criteria do you think we should apply when assessing a proposal?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will review and reissue our Undergrounding Policy with respect to designation of an area (considered to be very important); impact on archaeology; stakeholder opinion; impact on the ‘setting’; impact on ‘cultural issues;’ impact on the local economy; impact on biodiversity – landscape, habitat and wildlife; impact on waterways; and visual impact.		
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.5	A range of criteria were proposed for assessing applications for undergrounding. These included: designation of an area (considered to be very important); impact on archaeology; stakeholder opinion; impact on the ‘setting’; impact on ‘cultural issues;’ impact on the local economy; impact on biodiversity – landscape, habitat and wildlife; impact on waterways; and visual impact.	Give due regard to ALL of these, especially the designation of the area and the presence of archaeology.			
Innovation						

Question 35: How supportive would you be of SSEPD helping communities to identify if an area is suitable for undergrounding?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy.	We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.6	All were supportive of SSEPD helping communities to identify if an area is suitable for undergrounding.	Support communities by suggesting options and carrying out the consultation process and reporting on it. Leave the final decisions on which projects actually go ahead to the community.			
Innovation						

Question 36: How confident are you that SSEPD would be an honest broker in driving projects undergrounding projects for visual amenity forward?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy.	We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.7	Mixed levels of confidence in SSEPD being perceived as an honest broker in this context.	Build trust between communities and SSEPD. Help communities with identifying options. Do the consultation. But leave the final decisions on what projects go ahead to the community. Community retains control.			
Innovation						

Question 37: How informed or uninformed would you say your organisation is about the undergrounding for visual amenity allowance in terms of:

a) the areas this funding applies to b) the aims of this initiative c) how much funding is available?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Engage in the run-up to RIIO-ED1 by informing stakeholders of the Ofgem proposals and what effect that may have on our proposals.	Continue engagement through the price control via focus groups and community groups.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8/3.1.9/ 3.1.10	All participants rated their organisation as uninformed about the undergrounding for visual amenity allowance and the aims of Ofgem's Network Undergrounding Proposal.	Actively provide customers with more information on all of these aspects.			
Innovation						

Question 38: Since April 2012, has your organisation contacted SSE, or any other DNO, with a view to applying this mechanism in your area?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We have highlighted to Ofgem that the existing mechanism, for undergrounding for visual amenity, has poor visibility with stakeholders.	We will continue to engage directly with stakeholders and keep them informed about the mechanism for undergrounding for visual amenity.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8	None of the organisations consulted had done either of these.	N/A			
Innovation						

Question 39: Under the current arrangements, who do you perceive is responsible for initiating the application process?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy on undergrounding for visual amenity.	We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8	No-one appeared to be clear on whose responsibility it was to initiate the application process to have an area of the network undergrounded.	As part of the information campaign, make it clear whose responsibility it is to initiate the process to have an area of the network undergrounded.			
Innovation						

Question 40: How would you rate your staff's level of knowledge in relation to being able to support the application process itself?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy on undergrounding for visual amenity.	We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.11	Although most organisations had staff skilled in applying for funds, there was not necessarily specific knowledge of this allowance for undergrounding for visual amenity.	Actively provide specific information about this allowance for undergrounding for visual amenity to enable staff to become more knowledgeable.			
Innovation						

Question 41: What's your perception of your own organisation's current level of staff to support the application process?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy on undergrounding for visual amenity.	We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.12	The majority considered they were under-resourced.	Keep the application process , for undergrounding an area of network for visual amenity, as simple as possible.			
Innovation						

Question 42: SSEPD is considering the possibility of using some of the funding to provide a dedicated project manager to support organisations through the application process, for undergrounding an area of the network for visual amenity benefit, from beginning to end. The amount of funding involved would be a very small percentage of the funding pot, but would vary from project to project. We are currently thinking it would operate as follows: The project manager would be responsible for: identifying stakeholders; identifying potential projects; producing desktop studies and plans; project management of the undergrounding scheme. Customers would be responsible for: providing the Project Manager with requested information and selecting the projects to go ahead. If the scenario were to be implemented as described above, how supportive or unsupportive would you be of that idea?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections					We will remove the burden of driving the projects forward from stakeholders. SSEPD will proactively drive these projects forward. We propose to put in place an open and transparent process whereby parties can put forward parts of our overhead lines located in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks or National Scenic Areas to be considered for re-routing or undergrounding. We will engage with the local community to establish options that can be reviewed by our customers. Where there is a compelling case with sufficient support from customers, we will endeavour to undertake the necessary works.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.13	The vast majority were supportive of SSE's proposal to provide a dedicated project manager to support the application process.	Provide a project manager to carry out the duties described.			
Innovation						

Question 43: When reviewing applications to have an area of the network undergrounded for visual amenity benefit, SSEPD currently use the following criteria: importance of the area; the built environment; situation; density of wirescape; and visibility. In the context of undergrounding applications... Which one of these do you consider to be the most important and which one the least important?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy on undergrounding for visual amenity.		
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.14	In terms of the various criteria to be used to assess an application, the 'importance of the area' was considered to be the most important; 'the built environment', the least important.	Review the application process and take our views on the criteria, and the weight to be attached to each, into account.			
Innovation						

Question 44: Would you propose that SSEPD use any other selection criteria when considering an area which has been put forward for undergrounding for visual amenity benefits?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy on undergrounding for visual amenity.		
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8	Interviewees proposed four other criteria for consideration when evaluating an application – Defining what is ‘important’, conservation, public enjoyment of an area, risk to the landscape if undergrounding had to be removed at some point.	Consider these factors as part of the application process.			
Innovation						

Question 45: Overall, how important or unimportant is it to your organisation that an allowance for undergrounding for visual amenity is available?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Engage in the run-up to RIIO-ED1 by informing them of the Ofgem proposals and what effect that may have on our proposals.	Continue engagement through the price control via focus groups and community groups.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.15	All respondents considered that having such funding available was important.	Ensure that communities/key stakeholders are made aware of the funding and how it can help them.			
Innovation						

Question 46: If there was to be no increase in the overall level of funding awarded for undergrounding for visual amenity, would you like to see the available funding being used in any different way?

Also, If there was to be any increase in the overall level of funding awarded, would you like to see the funding being used in any different way?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We will increase our stakeholder engagement in this area and invite comments on our revised policy on undergrounding for visual amenity.		
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8	<p>Respondents found it difficult to differentiate between these subtle options and this was compounded by their lack of knowledge regarding the details of the scheme. Notwithstanding this, they suggested that SSEPD consider the following in determining how funding for undergrounding is used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Identify the most ‘important’ areas and include public enjoyment as one of the criteria in such an assessment; – Consider where the greatest overall benefit is to be obtained. – Consider environment restoration projects and environment enhancement projects such as peat land restoration work. – Consider the importance of sites adjacent to ‘designated’ sites. 	Consider the factors cited as part of the application process.			
Innovation						

Question 47: As you know, the current funding is available for National Parks, National Scenic Areas (Scotland) and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (England & Wales). Do you think there are geographical areas/types of areas, other than those already mentioned, which a) it would be better for this funding to target in terms of improving visual amenity? and/or b) are as equally deserving in terms of improving visual amenity?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				National Parks are already a designated area under this mechanism. We will share your views with Ofgem, but we are restricted by regulatory requirements. However, other designations (SSSIs etc) will have an impact during the project evaluation and development process.		
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8	For most respondents, it was important to protect the funding for undergrounding for designated areas. However, a number of other areas were considered equally deserving including: Historical and cultural landscapes; the National Parks; areas where is a high density of flight paths; and, areas of sensitive habitat.	Consider the other areas suggested as part of the application process, wherever possible.			
Innovation						

Question 48: Do you have any other comments on this funding initiative or SSEPD's operation of it?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections						
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment	3.1.8	There were no further comments.				
Innovation						

Question 49: Do you agree or disagree with where our innovation is focused? ie getting best value for money; minimising disruption to electricity supplies; putting our innovations into action

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>Our portfolio of innovation projects addresses the long-term needs of the distribution network. For example, we are proactively seeking to understand and adapt to long-term trends in low carbon energy technologies, as well as reducing the environmental impact of our operations.</p> <p>We are using innovation stimulus funding to enable us to undertake higher-risk innovation in several first-of-their-kind projects, such as demand-side management of domestic heating and novel commercial arrangements for third parties to provide energy storage services.</p> <p>Proactive engagement with energy generators and suppliers from the micro to multi-MW scale is central to a range of our innovation activities up to March 2015. For example, converting active network management involving generators to business-as-usual will require proactive engagement of those generators.</p> <p>We are continuing to collaborate at a number of levels within the industry to facilitate mutual learning. Our collaboration encompasses formal structures, many of which we have been founding members of, including the Strategic Technology Partnership and Energy Storage Operators Forum. We are also strongly committed to collaborating through the primary DNO knowledge-sharing portals such as Low Carbon Networks Fund (LCNF) events and other industry R&D working groups. Our ongoing informal dialogue with supply chain and project partners facilitates collaboration to identify synergies between our respective service/product lines.</p> <p>Our active innovation portfolio addresses our social obligations. Thermal energy storage demand-side management, which we are trialling on Shetland with a view to a wider UK roll-out, is intended to distribute its associated financial benefits to the participating customers.</p> <p>Smart grid technologies and other innovations to increase the capacity of the network for generator and demand connections constitute the majority of our ongoing innovation activities. Novel development and deployment of energy storage, demand-side response measures, active network management, network reconfiguration capability and power electronics are among the primary examples.</p> <p>Our ongoing innovation activities include the development of essential new sustainable commercial arrangements that reflect our changing relationships with our customers in three main categories: large/commercial customers, domestic customers and suppliers/aggregators. For example, our I2EV (Innovation-Squared Managing Unconstrained Electric Vehicle Connections) LCNF Tier 2 project will demonstrate a pioneering, replicable partnership between SSEPD and a non-DNO third party, which provides an alternative to a purely DNO-led approach. The partnership approach reflects our changing relationship with our customers, with the benefit of tapping into the additional capabilities and commercial flexibility of a third party organisation.</p>	<p>Our focus on long-term, cost-effective innovation is demonstrated by our low voltage network monitoring and modelling innovations, which we plan to implement as business-as-usual during RIIO-ED1. These innovations will provide a suite of long-term, customer-focused planning and operational tools for SSEPD.</p> <p>Our commitment to collaborating with a range of partners and stakeholders will continue during RIIO-ED1. For example, we will continue our industry-leading European collaboration to optimise our use of smart meter data. We will also continue to engage in existing or established electricity network operators' forums in the innovation areas we are proposing to focus on in RIIO-ED1. Our commitment to cross-network zone applicability and effective knowledge-sharing will facilitate this collaboration with other distribution network operators. A number of our proposed priority innovations for RIIO-ED1, such as domestic demand-side management, may require expanded engagement with electricity suppliers. More widely, the delivery and sustainability of many of our key innovations in RIIO-ED1 will depend on effective collaboration with local authorities and academic institutions. Collaboration with customers will also be essential for us during RIIO-ED1. For example, successfully deploying our community demand management and domestic demand-side management schemes will require active collaboration with our customers.</p> <p>SSEPD's commitment to operating in an ethically and socially responsible manner underpins several of our key innovations for RIIO-ED1. For example, we plan to leverage the UK-wide smart meter roll out to implement enhanced supply monitoring and support for vulnerable customers during unplanned power outages. We will also target our community energy efficiency coaching scheme on vulnerable customer communities.</p> <p>A number of our key innovations also address the requirement to reduce the carbon intensity of our activities. For example, using bidirectional hybrid generators during power outages or following storm conditions will reduce fossil fuel consumption. Our smart electric vehicle charging innovation will facilitate the connection of low-carbon emission electric vehicles during RIIO-ED1, while our community energy coaching innovation will promote energy efficiency at a grassroots community level, potentially reducing consumption of carbon-intensive electricity.</p> <p>We will maintain the alignment between government policy and our innovation areas during RIIO-ED1, in areas such as the utilization of smart meter data, electric vehicle roll-out, energy efficiency measures, and alternative overhead line supports to creosote-impregnated wood poles.</p>	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.2	Half agreed that SSEPD innovation should be focused on putting its innovations into action with less than half agreeing that SSEPD innovation is focused on getting value for money and minimising disruption to electricity supplies.	Should be focusing on long-term innovation rather than short-term innovation. Be less risk averse. Proactively interact and engage with energy generators and suppliers. Collaborate more effectively with others. Realign core values of SSEPD to ensure that innovation reflects the values of social responsibility and social obligation. Increase the capacity and intelligence of the network. Be aware of the changing relationships with customers (ie customers will become generators and suppliers). Consider innovation in the context of carbon emissions. Do more to engage with stakeholders, as service is seen as functional. Engage with the other major utilities and see innovation as a sector initiative rather than as a corporate initiative. Become more customer focused. Engage more effectively, particularly with local authorities and with current initiatives such as 'Green Deal'. Target innovation in areas of high population density. Innovation should reflect government policy, local authority planning and academic resources. Focus on localised integration of energy supply and demand. Invest in public education to tackle demand-side management on a longer-term basis. Better promote customer benefits of innovation.			

Question 49: Do you agree or disagree with where our innovation is focused? ie getting best value for money; minimising disruption to electricity supplies; putting our innovations into action (continued)

				<p>Consideration of the carbon emissions associated with SSEPD's activities is currently incorporated into the development of our innovation portfolio. For example, alternatives to sulphur hexafluoride (SF6) for insulation in electrical plant remain under review, due to the significant global warming potential of any SF6 leakage.</p> <p>Successful conversion of our innovations to business-as-usual is impossible without stakeholder engagement and participation. As a result, our ongoing innovation projects include comprehensive stakeholder engagement. For example, the ongoing customer participation in the Northern Isles New Energy Solutions project is underpinned by a range of communications media. We have established a low carbon community advisory centre in the Thames Valley to act as an engagement hub. As part of the flagship Orkney active network management (ANM) scheme we have established a public website which includes live system status information for generators participating in the scheme, thereby encouraging those generators to 'self help'. At a higher organisational level, we have established a dedicated phone number for public queries relating to any project(s) with our innovation portfolio. In addition to these more innovative engagement initiatives, we are continuing to engage stakeholders on the progress and benefits of our innovation projects through communications channels including the national and trade press, project websites, written reports and industry forums such as conferences and working groups.</p> <p>A fundamental driver behind the formulation and development of our innovation portfolio is cross-network applicability. For example, the LV network modelling and monitoring being developed through our Thames Valley Vision LCNF project are designed to be applicable across the UK. Replication of our innovations at the UK level is further facilitated by our strong commitment to industry-level knowledge sharing events. Our view of innovation as a sector initiative has also led to us becoming founding members of industry-wide forums such as the energy storage operators' forum (ESOF).</p> <p>Customers are at the heart of SSEPD's major innovation projects. For example, the trials being undertaken as part of our Thames Valley Vision LCNF project will allow us to anticipate, understand and support behaviour change in multiple customer groups as the UK moves towards a low carbon economy. Effective customer focus and engagement are also critical to successful completion of other ongoing trials within our innovation portfolio, such as domestic thermal energy storage.</p> <p>Effective engagement with local authorities is a critical aspect of several of our ongoing innovation activities. For example, Bracknell Forest Council is supporting the linkage between the outputs of our Thames Valley Vision LCNF project and the local planning process. We are also working in partnership with Hjalmland Housing Association to trial thermal energy storage demand-side management in Shetland.</p>	<p>We will continue our engagement with stakeholders during RIIO-ED1. Our multi-layered, multi-media approach is designed to target engagement with each key stakeholder group at an expert or general level as appropriate. Our multi-media approach will include, for example, press releases, information events and digital media with the SSEPD website retained as the core hub for reaching dedicated innovation/project 'microsites'. Our innovative public education activities will be continued during RIIO-ED1 and extended to incorporate initiatives such as community energy coaching to deliver reductions in energy consumption.</p> <p>Demand growth and low carbon technology deployment in high-population network areas are an important driver of our core innovations for RIIO-ED1. Advanced automated network reconfiguration and local smart electric vehicle charging infrastructure are key examples.</p> <p>Two of our core focus innovations for RIIO-ED1 are intended to integrate demand with local supply. Community demand management will actively manage local demand to enable the connection of local renewable generation. Thermal energy storage demand-side management will create a demand resource with the flexibility to respond to local energy supply conditions.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

Question 49: Do you agree or disagree with where our innovation is focused? ie getting best value for money; minimising disruption to electricity supplies; putting our innovations into action (continued)

				<p>SEPD's license area encompasses several areas of high population density; we are exploiting this fact to trial innovations targeting the associated network challenges. For example, our Thames Valley Vision and I2EV LCNF projects are directly addressing the challenges of low carbon technology deployment in areas of high population density.</p> <p>Government policy outwith the standard conditions of our Distribution License is a significant factor in the formulation of our innovation priorities. Connection of renewable generation and the de-carbonisation of transport through electric motors and fuel cells are primary examples of our innovation reflecting government policy. As explained above, effective engagement with local authorities is an important aspect of our ongoing innovation activities, for example in the Thames Valley. The prominent roles played by different universities in our major innovation projects also demonstrates the value we place on mobilising academic expertise to inform and progress our innovation activities.</p> <p>The major themes of our ongoing innovation projects reflect our belief that many low carbon-related network challenges can be mitigated or resolved by demand-side solutions, particularly those that integrate local supply and demand. For example, our portfolio includes a range of energy storage solutions as well as demand-side management to enable the connection of new local renewable generation.</p> <p>Our belief in the significant potential contribution of demand-side solutions, as described in the box above, is coupled with a commitment to providing the associated public education. For example, we are now operating a pioneering low carbon community advisory centre (LCCAC) in the Thames Valley. The LCCAC is intended to act as a hub for public education on a range of smart grid innovations including demand-side management. Our wider ongoing investment in public education on DSM in Shetland and the Thames Valley, for example, has also extended to local community meetings, direct written communication, home visits, press releases and dedicated websites.</p> <p>Our ongoing innovation major projects incorporate comprehensive promotion of the benefits to customers. For example, customers who will benefit from innovations in the Thames Valley Vision project can visit an energy advisory centre in Bracknell high street as well as a dedicated website. The promotion of benefits from projects such as Northern Isles New Energy Solutions is being undertaken through means such as local community meetings, direct written communication, home visits, press releases and dedicated websites.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Question 50: Is there anything else we should consider here?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Relevant international knowledge and experience is taken into consideration when evaluating prospective and ongoing innovation projects within SSEPD. In particular, the most authoritative DNO knowledge-sharing databases are consulted at early stage in order to determine the pre-existing knowledge and experience of relevance to a given innovation project.	The proposed LV network monitoring and modelling focus innovations will provide SSEPD and other DNOs with an unprecedented understanding of customers. This understanding will inform the development of customer-focused operational, planning and investment management tools for SSEPD. High-level information on the early stages of our research into LV network modelling can be found at http://www.ssepd.co.uk/HaveYourSay/Innovation/Portfolio/LV_NetworkModelling/ . The same information for LV network monitoring can be found at http://www.ssepd.co.uk/HaveYourSay/Innovation/Portfolio/LVMonitoringNetworks/	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.2	Participants suggested that SSEPD needed to consider the following factors as regards its innovation focus moving forward – demography, development and planning, customer support services, international experience, behaviour, localised agenda, public education, promoting benefits to customers and sharing the network.				

Question 51: [In relation to our innovation strategy] which of our areas of focus is the most important to you? ie energy storage; managing energy demand; faster, lower cost generation connections; integrating multiple energy networks

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>Several parts of our innovation programme are seeking to match energy sources with end users. For example, our thermal energy storage demand-side management innovation matches wind generation with demand from domestic heating devices. This reflects our belief in the importance of energy demand management as a tool to mitigate our evolving network challenges.</p> <p>While generation connections were perceived by participants to be the area of least importance, we are obliged to provide timely connection quotations. We are innovating to prepare our network for future trends in connections, to avoid the distribution network becoming a barrier to low carbon technology uptake.</p> <p>Up to and during RIIO-ED1 we expect to deploy innovations within specific network zones in order to resolve specific problems. Key examples include the Orkney active network management scheme and trialling smart electric vehicle charging infrastructure in southern England. We do not expect to undertake wholesale roll-outs to other geographies across our networks until there is greater certainty surrounding the future level of low carbon technology deployment in RIIO-ED1 and beyond.</p> <p>Effectively explaining our innovation programmes is converting successful innovations to business-as-usual. Examples of our engagement include local meetings, home visits, phone calls, written communication and online resources. We have also established a telephone service for public queries relating to any of our innovation projects. The SSEPD website provides links to dedicated project micro-sites. Our partnership approach in our large projects has improved the understanding of our projects among local authorities. For example, Bracknell Forest Council is supporting the linkage between the outputs of our Thames Valley Vision project and the local planning process.</p> <p>We anticipate that smart meters will play an increasing role in the delivery of the wider smart grid in RIIO-ED1 and beyond. Several of our ongoing projects will prepare us and other DNOs for smart meters. For example, we have deployed 'end-point monitors' in our Thames Valley Vision project to replicate smart meter functionality.</p>	<p>Two of our core focus innovations for RIIO-ED1 are intended to facilitate integration of local demand and supply. Community demand management involves active coordination of distributed generation and community-level demand. Thermal energy storage demand-side management actively coordinates distributed generation and demand from domestic water and space heating devices.</p> <p>Energy demand management and long-term demand reduction opportunities are also addressed within our core focus innovations for ED1. Automatic commercial demand-side response involves the processes and tools to enable commercially incentivised automated curtailment of commercial load in order to reduce peak network demand. Community energy coaching will seek to develop the capacity of local communities to sustain ongoing reductions in energy consumption, thereby reducing peak network demand.</p> <p>Our smart metering development work within the RIIO-ED1 period will focus on establishing the systems and business processes to use smart meter data and provide a foundation to analyse data from smart meters and other network-connected devices. We anticipate this analysis will impact upon a number of our processes including network planning and investment, fault management, LV voltage management, and customer engagement. For example our proposed 'last-gasp' monitoring innovation will ensure we get notifications from customers' smart meters as soon as they go off supply. The impact of smart metering is likely to increase in proportion to roll-out volumes through RIIO-ED1.</p>	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.3	Half of all participants believed that managing energy demand was the most important focus for them. Faster, lower cost, generation connections was perceived to be the area which was of least important to focus on.	Focus innovation on matching energy sources with the end user. Focus on reducing demand for energy and prioritise this approach. Develop innovation models (eg NINES) which are relevant to different geographies/better explanation of current innovation programs/initiatives. Promote a better understanding of energy storage technology. Consider focusing on innovations relating to thermal energy/and better explain the terminology around innovation. Focus innovation on dynamic technologies such as SMART grids and meters.			

Question 52: Who do you think should own and operate large-scale energy storage equipment? Only electricity distribution network operators or any licensed operator?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>We consider matching local supply and demand to be a cost-effective tool in resolving many low carbon-related network challenges. Our innovation portfolio includes a range of energy storage solutions, including domestic and community-scale technologies.</p> <p>We are also pioneering new commercial models to enable licensed third parties to own and operate energy storage equipment connected to our distribution networks. This development is focused on our Orkney Energy Storage Park project, which created the commercial incentives for a third party energy storage provider (ESP) to install an energy storage system on Orkney and will now investigate more widely what commercial markets are open to ESPs that are located on distribution networks.</p>	<p>Two of our core innovations for RIIO-ED1 are intended to create a demand resource with the flexibility to respond to local energy supply conditions: community demand management and domestic thermal energy storage DSM.</p>	<p>We are prioritising demand-side management and demand-side response during ED1 as a more cost-effective approach to matching local generation and supply than more conventional energy storage technologies such as batteries.</p>
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.5	The vast majority of participants believed that any licensed operator should be able to own and operate large-scale energy storage equipment.	Provide localised solutions which match energy generation with demand.			

Question 53: If financial incentives existed, how would you rate your level of interest in providing energy storage facilities?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>We are currently pioneering the commercial models necessary to incentivise energy storage. In our Orkney Energy Storage Park project we are investigating the commercial opportunities available to third-party energy storage providers located on our networks.</p> <p>Our Northern Isles New Energy Solutions (NINES) project is developing and demonstrating new financial incentives for thermal energy storage by our domestic customers. We are using our learning from this development in our Thames Valley Vision project, to expand the controllable load for demand-side response among our commercial customers.</p> <p>Successful development and implementation of these innovative financial incentives depends on effective engagement with the participating customers or third parties. As a result, providing clarity on the financial incentives we are developing is a significant element of these projects. In addition, our engagement with Hjaltland Housing Association (HHA) to deliver affordable warmth to the participating HHA residents represents a replicable model for local authority engagement in the area of thermal energy storage for domestic demand-side management.</p>	<p>Our wider innovation portfolio during RIIO-ED1 will include a detailed assessment of the market opportunity for energy storage and related demand-side management. This assessment will be undertaken from the perspectives of customer and DNO, thereby providing significantly greater clarity on the financial incentives available to customers.</p>	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.6	All participants who answered indicated they would be interested in providing energy storage facilities if financial incentives existed.	Provide greater clarity on any financial incentives. Explore the potential with local authorities of using energy storage technologies to address the issue of affordable warmth within the context of social obligation.			

Question 54: If you would be interested in providing energy storage, what would be single your greatest concern? Initial cost; maintenance; size of system; reliability; safety or something else?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				SSEPD's ongoing assessment of the costs and benefits of different commercial models for energy storage includes lifecycle considerations, with costs presented on a per-kWh basis. In the Northern Isles New Energy Solutions (NINES) project we are pioneering incentives for domestic thermal energy storage. The customer engagement plan underpinning the NINES project provides a replicable approach for us to clarify the opportunities and incentives available to customers through energy storage. Potential reliability and safety concerns are central to our assessments of the feasibility of introducing novel energy storage technologies.	Our wider innovation portfolio will include a detailed assessment of the market opportunity for energy storage and demand-side management. This will quantify the associated lifecycle value for customers and network operators, thereby clarifying any proposed incentives.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.7	Initial cost was cited as the single biggest concern by almost half of the participants.	Consider the lifetime cost and not just the initial cost associated with energy storage technologies. Provide greater clarity/transparency on any incentives proposed. Address concerns around reliability given the potential adverse impact on reputation (eg local authorities).			

Question 55: If you could save money, how likely would you be to alter/reduce your energy use at certain times?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>The roll-out of smart metering technology up to and during RIIO-ED1 presents up with potential new opportunities to implement demand-side management or response. In these applications customers may respond to a price signal or instruction from their energy supplier or distribution network operator to alter or change their power consumption to meet the needs of the instructing party. This could provide customers with the means to reduce their energy usage. Our development of automated demand reduction among customers is currently focused on large commercial customers, with the trialling of building management solutions that include automatic demand-side response capability. This will provide our commercial customers with the means to reduce their energy consumption. We plan to utilise our ongoing learning in this regard to identify sustainable commercial models for engaging other large commercial users, small and medium enterprises, and domestic customers on automatic demand-side response schemes. The learning will also be directly applicable to public sector organizations.</p> <p>Alleviating any related concerns among domestic customers is a core aspect of our ongoing Northern Isles New Energy Solutions project. In that scheme, control of storage-enabled domestic heating remains with the customer, and we are organising information days as well as a variety of written communication to build customers' trust in this regard.</p> <p>The installation of smart metering systems has been assigned to energy supply companies, and is being supported by SSEPD. We are building a degree of flexibility into our business systems and processes to respond to variety in smart meter roll-out.</p>	<p>The community energy coaching core innovation will involve direct consultation and engagement with a social enterprise to develop the capacity of local communities to sustain ongoing reductions in energy consumption. Business-as-usual conversion of the innovation is expected to entail applications in numerous other areas with a suitable social profile.</p> <p>During RIIO-ED1 we will optimise our smart meter interfacing and data analysis systems, while facilitating as much standardisation as possible among the smart metering equipment provided by electricity suppliers and other third party suppliers.</p> <p>Conversion of the low voltage network modelling core innovation to business as usual will enable us to understand and anticipate behavioural change in individuals, small businesses and larger companies as the UK moves towards a low carbon economy. This understanding will facilitate more targeted engagement of different stakeholder segments.</p>	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.8	<p>Almost all said that if they could save money, they would be likely to alter/reduce their energy use at certain times.</p>	<p>Provide consumers with the means to reduce their energy usage (eg price signalling devices, knowledge/education etc). Address the concerns around public concerns regarding comfort loss etc. Build trust with customers in relation to innovative technologies to control demand. Focus initially on public sector organisations. Use standardised SMART meters. Consult and engage with social enterprises to better access and engage with communities. Positively affecting behaviour change will require targeting (also different messaging) of different customer and stakeholder segments. Consider motivators to behaviour change other than cost.</p> <p>We note that the response from the innovation community was very different to the response from Worst Served Customers in Question 30.</p>			

Question 56: What would be your main motivation to alter your energy use at certain times? ie Avoiding power cuts; keeping UK energy bills down; environmental benefits; personal (or organisational) financial benefits; avoiding financial penalties or something else.

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				A significant aspect of our ongoing innovation programme is the development of an incentive reward structure for automatic demand response (ADR) among commercial customers. This aspect will be extended to identify the key criteria for end user participation and develop 'best fit' incentives for ADR across a range of customer categories. We also promote existing governmental low carbon promotion incentives to communities participating in our major innovation projects.	We will promote SME and domestic demand-side response applications during RIIO-ED1 through the development and application of commercial incentives and customer-focused products. We will partner with a range of organisations to promote these incentives and products, including consortiums of participating or potential commercial customers, housing associations who may engage with domestic demand-side management and supporting consultancies.	As a distribution network operator we do not directly set the tariffs charged to customers located on our network (although customer bills do contain a regulated element which covers the use of our network infrastructure). As a result, tariff-based models for demand-side management will require interaction with electricity supply companies and potentially wider market and regulatory change.
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.9	Most identified personal (or organisational) financial benefits as being their main motivation to do so.	Focus on effort and reward as the motivation for changing behaviour.			

Question 57: If you were to alter your energy use at certain times, how would you prefer to do this? Turn equipment on and off myself; automated system that I can over-ride; fully automated system with no over-ride

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Our current R&D into automating demand reduction is largely focused on large commercial customers. The current trials incorporate a customer override capability. We will utilise the resulting learning to explore the applicability of similarly automated demand-side management to small and medium enterprises, and domestic customers.	The proposed domestic thermal energy storage DSM core innovation combines an automated supply to 'charge' domestic thermal energy storage assets with full customer control over the timing and nature of the use of that energy.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.10	All participants who expressed a view preferred the option of an automated system that they can override if they were to alter their energy use at certain times.	Explore ways of promoting the concept of automated control as well as clearly defining 'control'.			

Question 58: How interested would you be in developing a scheme where the energy generated is mainly used on site?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Our ongoing innovation portfolio reflects the differences in the types of distributed generation that we are connecting in our different license areas. For example, our Thames Valley Vision LCNF project will reduce the network constraints to the connection of PV generators, particularly in SEPD's license area. Our portfolio also includes novel commercial and regulatory approaches to improve the co-location of generation and demand. For example, the Orkney storage park is underpinned by a pioneering commercial agreement for a third party to provide a local network support function. Similarly, the Aberdeen Hydrogen Project is assessing the feasibility of co-locating an electrolyser and small/medium-scale wind farm in constrained networks.	Where existing regulatory boundaries are challenged by our innovation activities during RIIO-ED1, we will work with the Regulator and other stakeholders to develop suitable new codes of practice. We anticipate that greater flexibility in the distribution of energy generated by this embedded generation will then be provided by two focus innovations: community demand management, which will actively match local demand and local renewable generation, and thermal energy storage DSM. In addition, the appropriate placement of embedded generation to supply local loads during RIIO-ED1 will be informed by our LV network monitoring and modelling innovations.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.11	Almost all said they would be interested in developing a scheme where the energy generated is mainly used onsite.	Sites and areas need to be suitable, with greater flexibility in the distribution of this energy locally. Focus on the regulatory barriers to address and challenge any barriers. Could be further facilitated by making available price signaling technology.			

Question 59: How interested would you be in developing a scheme where in return for a faster, cheaper connection, you may occasionally have to stop generating?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>We actively engage with generators and other stakeholders about the likely impact of constraints imposed by an ANM system. Numerous independent studies have concluded that implementing ANM in a representative distribution network can facilitate the connection of significant new renewable generation capacity with an expected level of constraint that does not impact on the economic viability of that capacity.</p> <p>We will continue to closely monitor and regularly review the condition of network assets that may be subjected to a higher-than-expected utilisation due to inclusion in an active network management trial.</p> <p>A primary focus of our ongoing innovation portfolio is establishing alternative uses for energy that would otherwise be curtailed. Examples include co-locating electrolysers and small/medium-scale wind farms in constrained networks, managing domestic energy storage assets in coordination with the amount of renewable energy on the network, and community demand management.</p>	<p>Business-as-usual conversion of Active Network Management generator constraint management during RIIO-ED1 will involve the provision of real-time information on the operational status of the Active Network Management system to customers, including the level of generator constraint.</p> <p>This information will enable customers to 'self serve' if they believe there may be an issue with the system. We believe this will demonstrate a level of constraint over the lifecycle of a generator that does not impact on the economic viability of that generation project.</p>	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.12	The vast majority said they would be interested in developing such a scheme.	Provide clarity on the level of constraint. Consider the inconsistency of this type of service offering in the context of a national policy of network resilience. Consider alternative uses for the energy being generated rather than stopping generation. Consider the risk to brand image of having a generational resource not operating to capacity.			

Question 60: SSEPD is striving to minimise energy loss/waste. We think this is best done by integrating energy networks. How supportive are you of this approach?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				<p>Optimising the use of our existing network assets is a key driver within our ongoing innovation portfolio. Facilitating the connection of ground source heat pumps are also an active element of our portfolio, particularly in monitoring the associated load profile and power quality impact.</p> <p>We openly promote the benefit available to our innovation and learning activities through effective collaboration. Our continual open dialogue with our innovation stakeholders through various media is intended to facilitate this collaboration in practice.</p>	<p>Asset utilisation and the associated opportunities to defer conventional reinforcement will continue to be a core priority for our innovation activities during ED1. It is the motivation for ten of our twenty core innovations, falling primarily within the Connections and Reliability primary outputs.</p>	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.13	Almost all were supportive of integrating energy networks to minimise energy loss/waste.	Provide greater clarity on the cost of integrating energy networks. Maximise the use of the current infrastructure. Consider innovations relating to ground sourcing. Highlight to others the opportunities for greater collaboration.			

Question 61: What is the SINGLE most important way we help you to innovate?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				We are in the process of establishing a telephone service for public queries relating to any project(s) in our innovation portfolio. This service will be promoted through various media including widely distributed business cards, pens and on-line. The SSEPD website also provides links to dedicated project micro-sites, which contain the relevant points of contact within SSEPD.	We will continue to promote the different methods available to contact us, to a wide range of stakeholders. We will also provide greater clarity on the innovation subsection of the SSEPD website about the key customer relationship management contacts.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.14	Almost half believed that SSEPD providing a dedicated member of staff for their innovation would be the single most important way that SSEPD can help them to innovate.	Provide those in the innovation sector with customer relationship contacts to make SSEPD more accessible.			

Question 62: How [else] can we help you to be 'energy-innovative'?

Stakeholder Group	Section of Full Report	Stakeholder Feedback		Our Response		
		What our customers told us...	What our customers would like us to do...	What we propose to do by 31 March 2015	What we propose to do within the RIIO-ED1 Business Plan Period (01 April 2015 onwards)	What we cannot do and why.
Major Connections				Customers are at the heart of many of our innovation projects and as a result, we are committed to discussing the related issues with customers in a helpful and pragmatic manner. We are adopting a range of methods to achieve this objective in our large innovation projects, including local meetings, home visits, phone calls, written communication and online resources. The face-to-face engagement provides background information, advice and the opportunity for customers to raise concerns.	We anticipate that successful conversion of core innovations such as thermal energy storage demand-side management and automatic commercial demand-side response to business-as-usual during RIIO-ED1 will require more extensive contact between SSEPD and our customers. Where there is a clear need we will assess options for intensive face-to-face engagement, such as appointing a local representative to act as a point of contact during roll-out.	
Minor Connections						
Customer Representatives						
Worst Served Customers						
Environment						
Innovation	3.3.9		More face-to-face contact to have 'complex conversations'. Address issue of brand confusion. Engage more effectively with local authorities. Make available/ more accessible SSEPD expertise. Challenge the negative press.			