Questionnaire: WPD Consultation on Connection Interactivity, Acceptance Validity and Reservation of Capacity

Please provide you responses in the template set out below. A standalone editable version of this template is available on our website and upon request.

Please indicate the type of stakeholder you represent

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.Domestic customer (or representative) | [ ]  | 7. Community energy scheme | [ ]  |
| 2.Business customer (or representative) | [ ]  | 8.Consultant | [ ]  |
| 3.Local authority / council officer | [ ]  | 9.Energy / utility company | [ ]  |
| 4.Parish councillor | [ ]  | 10.Regulator / government | [ ]  |
| 5.Developer / connections representative | [ ]  | 11.Academic / education institute | [ ]  |
| 6.Distributed Generation developer | [ ]  | 12.Other | [ ]  |

Interactive Connection Schemes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Impact of extending queue on 1st place | 1) Should the initial moratorium period be extended where new offers are made within this period? |  |
| 2) Should the moratorium extension be conditional on the initial party(ies) not accepting within the initial moratorium? |  |
| Joint 1st place / allowing multiple successful connections in a queue | 3) Do you think that our minded to position of allowing multiple offers to be accepted where the network constraints allow, is the correct way forward or should there only ever be one successful party in an interactive queue? |  |
| 4) Can you propose any alternative solutions to this issue which may be fairer and more efficient? |  |
| Interactive sub-queues | 5) Where a party is unsuccessful due to a secondary constraint should a party further down the queue who is only limited by the primary constraint be allowed to connect or should the interactive process be restarted for all unsuccessful parties. |  |
| 6) Should the minded to position of allowing multiple successful connections in an interactive queue also apply where there are secondary interactive queues? |  |
| Joining another interactive queue due to new minimum scheme | 7) Where a connection offer has been unsuccessful in an interactive queue and the new minimum scheme for this connection requires it to join another queue, should the position in the queue be based on the original application date or the date of reapplication under the interactive queue process? |  |
| Joining together of queues | 8) Do you agree with our proposed approach to join together interactive queues where an application incorporates the constraints on each queue or can you propose an alternative approach? |  |
| Competition in Connections point of connection provision | 9) Do you believe there is any value in providing notice of potential interactivity at the POC design stage for competition in connections schemes given that the situation can change prior to issuing the offer? |  |

Use of Section 22 Agreements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Use of Section 22 Agreements | 1) What is the best way to facilitate sharing of information between developers? |  |
| 2) Would you be likely to participate in sharing arrangements between developers? |  |
| 3) Do you have a proposal of how we should treat situations where further applications cause the most economic reinforcement to have a longer implementation timetable than the initially planned reinforcement? |  |

Acceptance validity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Acceptance validity | 1) Do you agree with our proposed milestones for acceptance validity?  |  |
| 2) Do you consider the milestones to be split into appropriate groups? |  |
| 3) What are your views on our proposed approach to extensions of validity? |  |
| 4) What if any are the appropriate exemptions which should be included and accepted to extend the timescales of the milestones? |  |

Payments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Payments | 1) Do you agree with our proposal to maintain our current policy regarding the request of stage payments? |  |

Visibility of post acceptance queue

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Visibility of post acceptance queue | 1) In your view how useful would this information be on the queue of accepted not yet connected scheme? |  |
| 2) Is the level of information we are proposing to publish suitable? |  |

Changes to application and effect on queue position

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Changes to application and effect on queue position | 1) Do you think we should allow applicants to be able to alter their requirements both during the application and post acceptance without losing their position in the interactive queues?  |  |
| 2) In particular do you think that a change of capacity or a change to the site of the connection should be allowable without altering the position in the queue? |  |

Reservation of capacity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Reservation of capacity | 1) Should a developer be able to contract to pay for infrastructure upgrades on condition that they have exclusive rights to the capacity created for a period of time without having specific proposed connections at the time of entering the agreement? |  |
| 2) Should a customer be able to seek/continue with a connection agreement for capacity (either import or export) and reserve it (by paying appropriate UoS charges) where it is significantly in excess of that which their plant is capable of using? |  |

Combined feasibility / offer process

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Combined feasibility / offer process | 1) Do you think the date of the feasibility application (or date of payment for feasibility study) should be used as the initial application date for potential interactive queues? |  |

Queues for ‘Smart’ Offers an interaction with conventional queues

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Queues for ‘Smart’ Offers an interaction with conventional queues | 1) Do you believe our proposal to incorporate these smart offers into the interactivity process is the most fair and efficient approach? |  |
| 2) Do you have an alternative solution? |  |

Interaction of ‘Smart’ offers with cancellation of an acceptance in a conventional queue

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Issue | Question | Response |
| Interaction of ‘Smart’ offers with cancellation of an acceptance in a conventional queue | 1) Where capacity is released by a cancelled connection, should applicants with smart connections / offers be offered a conventional connection before later parties? If so, should this be an enduring principle if/as capacity becomes available? |  |