

REA response to Connections Ofgem's end-to-end review consultation

The Association for Renewable Energy & Clean Technology (REA) is pleased to submit this response to the above consultation. The REA represents renewable electricity, heat and transport, as well as Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure, Energy Storage and Circular Economy companies. Members encompass a wide variety of organisations, including generators, project developers, fuel and power suppliers, investors, equipment producers and service providers. Members range in size from major multinationals to sole traders. There are around 550 corporate members of the REA, making it the largest renewable energy and clean technology trade association in the UK.

Question 1b. Do you agree with proposal 1a (new regulatory requirement on single digital view tools)? Do you have any views on how this should be implemented?

We agree with proposal 1a, this would allow all the data that a developer may need to submit an adequate connection application in the right grid entry point a lot more accessible as it is all from one source. Subsequently, reducing the amount of speculative applications. In light of Clean Power 30, this should be the primary approach.

Question 2a. Do you agree with the issues we have set out under Theme 2 - Improved standards of service across the customer journey (not including "minor connections")? Are there any other issues under this theme that we should consider or be aware of?

Yes we agree, it is imperative that customers are given a good and reliable service regardless of which DNO they're applying for a connection with, and it is important that they receive a fair service and not one that is delayed due to poor communication between the T/D boundaries. Improving customer journey will also help improve investor confidence in a project and help get more viable clean energy projects over the line.

Question 2c. Do you have any views on proposal 2b (new prescriptive condition(s) around standards of service)? Do you have any proposals for any specific areas of the connections customer journey that should be subject to such a requirement?

There should be a minimum speed of response time from the DNOs and TOs for getting back to customers at each stage of the connection process.

Question 3d. Do you have any views on proposal 3c (a financial instrument designed to offer recourse to connecting customers who face detriment due to delays)? Do you have any views on how this should be implemented?

This could be an effective method of prompting network operators to be more efficient in the process of building additional network and getting customers connected but this would only be fair once planning reform has come into action so that any delays in connecting customers are really only down to the fault of the network operators, and if implemented it should be based on the amount of capacity the customer has applied for and should be initiated by the network operators to avoid possible floods of unnecessary applications from customers who want to receive financial compensation for what may not be worthy of receiving financial compensation.

Question 5a. Do you agree with the issues we have set out under Theme 5 - Ambition of connection offers? Are there any other issues under this theme that we should consider or be aware of?

Strongly agree, addressing these issues to allow for earlier than expected connection dates will be crucial to achieving Clean Power 30, but it should be aligned with the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan and Clean Power 30 plan to ensure the more crucial technologies at the time that are important for the desired energy mix are prioritised for an earlier than expected connection date where possible.

Question 6a – Do you agree with the issues we have identified? Are there any other issues under this theme that we should consider? Please provide data and evidence to support your views if possible.

Yes we agree especially when it comes to reforming the g98 rule but in a similar topic also want to highlight there should be changes to the g99 rule as well so that the export potential of an e.g. of a bigger than 4kw panel is not restricted by the size of the inverter (3.68kw) once the battery storage is full in a property.