Appendix 1 - Consultation Responses and Questions

1.1. Ofgem would like to hear the views of interested parties in relation to any of the issues set out in this document.

1.2. We would especially welcome responses to the specific questions which we have set out at the beginning of each chapter heading and which are replicated below.

1.3. If you have any questions on this document please contact:

James Veaney Head of Distribution Policy Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, SW1P 3GE 0207 901 1861 <u>Connections@Ofgem.gov.uk</u>

1.4. Responses should be sent, preferably by e-mail by 21 March 2014 to the address above.

1.5. Unless marked confidential, all responses will be published by placing them in Ofgem's library and on its website www.ofgem.gov.uk. Respondents may request that their response is kept confidential. Ofgem shall respect this request, subject to any obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

1.6. Respondents who wish to have their responses kept confidential should clearly mark the document/s to that effect and include the reasons for confidentiality. Respondents are asked to put any confidential material in the appendices to their responses.

1.7. Next steps: Having considered the responses to this consultation, we intend to publish our decision in relation to ENWL's Competition Notice in April 2014.

Each of the questions asked by this consultation is set out in the template below. **Note that an editable version of this response template is available on our website as an associated document to this consultation.** If you do not wish to use our response template, please ensure that you indicate the RMS and DSA to which your experiences relate.

When considering your responses to these questions, please consider your experiences, the actions that ENWL has undertaken and the actions that you consider it could reasonably undertake.

When answering the questions below, please check the RMS(s) that are relevant to your response.

Chapter Two

Question	RMS(s)	Response
One: Are customers aware that competitive alternatives exist?	Metered Demand LV DG LV Unmetered (Other)	From our perspective we believe that ENW have always been very proactive in making customers aware of competitive connection alternative arrangements. We note that it may be difficult to arrange for competition to thrive in some areas and particularly when considering connection alternative arrangements whereby O/H connections are required .
Two: Do customers have effective choice (ie are customers easily able to seek alternative quotations)?	Metered Demand LV DG LV Unmetered (Other)	See above
Three: Does ENWL take appropriate measures to ensure that customers are aware of the competitive alternatives available to them?	Metered Demand LV DG LV Unmetered (Other)	From our own perspective we have no concern in that ENW does ensure that customer have the option and facility to engage fully with regard to alternative arrangements for competitive connections. There remain concerns relating to some technical considerations but would confirm that ENW are fully engaged with customers and ICP's through the DG Technical Workshops etc to resolve outstanding issues.
Four: Are quotations provided by ENWL clear and	Metered Demand LV	We have never encountered problems with the quality and constancy of the quotations provided. Likewise we have not encountered any problems

Question	RMS(s)		Response
transparent? Do they enable customers to make informed decisions whether to accept or reject a quote?	DG LV Unmetered (Other)	\boxtimes	when we have subsequently reverted to ENW with requests for assistance or further information.
Five: Have customers benefitted from competition? Have they seen improvements in ENWL's price or service quality or have they been able to source a superior service or better price from ENWL's competitors?	Metered Demand LV DG LV Unmetered (Other)		We believe that the service from ENW has always been to a high standard. We do occasionally encounter minor problems, but these tend to be relating to 'standards' rather than quotation issues. We note however that it may be difficult in some areas gaining a quotation from suitably accredited ICP's for, say, overhead line work.

Chapter Three

Question	RMS(S)		Response
One: Does the level of	Metered Demand		Whilst there is considered to be scope for competition to develop it should
competitive activity in the	LV		be noted that there may be little appetite for ICP's to consider work in any
RMSs show that there is the		\boxtimes	RMS where overhead line work is a major constituent of any actual
potential for further	DG LV		connection. (Is this type of work too specialised and inconsistent?).
competition to develop?			One further consideration relating to the above is that potentially cheaper
	Unmetered		O/H connections may, by necessity, require a more expensive U/G
	(Other)		connection if the work is to be undertaken / performed by an ICP.
Two: Consider the	Metered Demand		We have encountered few problems with ENW.
organisational structure of	LV		
ENWL's business and its		\boxtimes	
procedures and processes –	DG LV	_	
(a) how do they compare to	Unmetered		
those you encounter	(Other)		
elsewhere in the gas and			

Question	RMS(S)	Response
electricity markets or other industries? Do they reflect best practice?		
(b) do they enable competitors to compete with the timescales for connection (from quote to energisation) offered by ENWL? Or do they offer ENWL any inherent advantage over its competitors or prevent existing competitors from competing with them effectively?		'Time to connect' remains an issue throughout the industry and ENW has been better than most of the other DNO's in managing the overall process. This comment relates to both competitive and statutory connections
(c) do they assist, obstruct or delay connections providers entering the RMSs?		No Comment
Three: Are the non- contestable charges levied by ENWL for statutory connections in the RMSs consistent with those levied for competitive quotations? Are they easily comparable with competitive quotations?	Metered Demand LV DG LV Unmetered (Other)	There is not considered to be a discrepancy between competitive and statutory connections quotations such that this would be a barrier to competition.

Question	RMS(S)	Response
Four: What factors are key influences on development	Metered Demand LV	N/A
of competition in the RMSs? In particular, if you are an existing/potential competitor	DG LV	
(a) what is the potential for you to enter new RMSs, or grow your share of an RMS you already operate in?	Unmetered (Other)	N/A
(b) are there are any types of connection in any of the RMSs, or geographic locations in ENWL's DSA, that by their nature, are not attractive to competition? Please explain your response.		N/A. Please note the comment regarding overhead line work.

Chapter Four

Question	RMS(S)		Response
One: Do you agree with the	Metered Demand		
methods used by ENWL to	LV		
analyse the level of		\boxtimes	
competition in each of the	DG LV		
RMSs covered by its			
application? In particular,	Unmetered		
do you consider that ENWL	(Other)		
gives a clear indication of			
the current level of			
competitive activity?			
Two: Do you consider that	Metered Demand		
competitive activity is at a	LV		
level that in itself indicates		\boxtimes	
that effective competition	DG LV		
exists?			
	Unmetered		
	(Other)		

Chapter Seven

Question	RMS(S)	Response
One: Do you consider customers have an effective choice of connections provider? In particular, do you feel that levels of	Metered Demand LV DG LV	We must assume that the information provided was supplied against a
choice, value and service will be protected and will improve if the restriction on ENWL's ability to earn a margin is removed?	Unmetered (Other)	common template ?
Two: Do you consider that there is scope for competitors to grow their	Metered Demand LV	See above

Question	RMS(S)		Response
market share (for example,	DG LV		
if ENWL put up its prices or			
if its quality dropped), or	Unmetered		
are there factors	(Other)		
constraining this?			
Three: Do you consider that	Metered Demand		
there is scope/appetite for	LV		
new participants to enter		\boxtimes	
the market? Do you	DG LV		
consider that new entrants			See above
would be able to provide	Unmetered		See above
similar or better services	(Other)		
than existing participants or			
are there factors			
constraining this?			
Four: Given your overall	Metered Demand		
view of ENWL, do you	LV		In general we believe that ENW has made excellent improvements in their
consider that we can have		\boxtimes	business strategy towards customer consultation / customer's requirements
confidence in them to	DG LV	_	and competitive connections. However we still have reservations (as with
operate appropriately in the			all of the DNO's) to situations whereby price regulation may be lifted but no
event that price regulation	Unmetered		competition exists or is likely to exist for the immediate future.
is lifted?	(Other)		
Five: Do you consider that	Metered Demand		
there are factors not	LV		
addressed in this		\boxtimes	
consultation that should be	DG LV	_	See above. No further comment
taken into consideration in			
determining whether price	Unmetered		
regulation should be lifted?	(Other)		