



Local Energy **Oxfordshire**

February 2021 | Version 1

# Commercial MVS Report

Commercial MVS 001 - Assessment of Distributed Energy Assets with Low Levels of Flexibility

Origami Energy

*Image courtesy of Low Carbon Hub*



## Executive Summary

The Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) used in project TRANSITION will be provided by LEO partners, who have flexibility in the range of 4kW to 400kW. This Commercial MVS 001 was used to test a subset of the existing Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) questions for organisations with DERs that have low levels of flexibility.

A survey was issued on 13-Jan-21 to six LEO partners (EDF Energy, Low Carbon Hub, Nuvve, Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council and the University of Oxford). This survey sought feedback on all relevant TRANSITION PQQ questions and addressed the following areas:

- High-level Company Details (no. of employees and expected level of flexibility)
- General Information (name, address, contact details and VAT details)
- Pre-requisites (basic asset information and adherence to SSEN processes)
- Financials (liquidation and insurance,)
- Environment, Health, Safety and Quality (company procedures and past events)
- Management and Related Activities (companies', policies and commitments)

The survey uses BaU language, terms and requirements to determine the responses from LEO partners who will be new entrants to the DSO-procured flexibility markets. Each question had a standardised response to simplify the process together with the ability to add a free text response. The return date for responses was 19-Jan-21, with responses being confidential and used only to inform the suitability of PQQ questions.

The analysis identified the PQQ process may be time consuming for LEO partners, particularly those that are not used to collating such information and / or providing it to a third party. Although the larger LEO partners have specialists who can advise on the requirements, smaller organisations may have an undue burden. Furthermore, DSO's could consider providing explanatory information to accompany the PQQ questions to clarify the requirements and help organisations who are unused to providing such information. This could streamline the process and ensure a more positive experience for potential market participants.

The analysis and the key learnings from this MVS will be used to develop the TRANSITION PQQ. This will ensure that this process is fit for purpose and does not exclude assets with low levels of flexibility during, or after, the flexibility auctions that will be held later in 2021.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
1 Introduction .....	4
2 The Commercial MVS Trials .....	5
3 Commercial MVS 001 .....	5
3.1 MVS Details .....	5
3.1.1 Survey Participants .....	6
3.1.2 Data .....	6
3.1.3 Risks.....	6
3.2 MVS Survey.....	7
3.3 Responses.....	8
3.4 Analysis .....	8
4 Key Learnings.....	8
5 Summary and Future Works .....	9
Appendix 1 – Commercial MVS 001 Template.....	10
Appendix 2 – Commercial MVS 001 Survey .....	13
Appendix 3 – Analysis Question by Question .....	18

## 1 Introduction

Project LEO (Local Energy Oxfordshire) is a sociotechnical innovation project which aims to demonstrate that a functioning Smart Local Energy Systems (SLES) in Oxfordshire can maximise economic, environmental, and social prosperity in the area. As part of this project, a Local Flexibility Market is being created to maximise the utilisation of the electricity Distribution Network at minimum cost.

TRANSITION is an Ofgem Electricity Network Innovation Competition (NIC) funded project which explores the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) transition to a Distribution System Operator (DSO). The TRANSITION project is integral to Project LEO as it will deliver the network management system to facilitate the Local Flexibility Market.

TRANSITION will be conducting auctions for the selection and delivery of DSO-procured flexibility services during 2021 and throughout the remainder of the project. One of the first stages of the procurement process is a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) which is designed to evaluate and select potential providers for the delivery of DSO-procured flexibility services. The TRANSITION PQQ is in development and will be based on the PQQ expected to be used in TRANSITION in advance of holding flexibility auctions later in 2021.

The PQQ used by the flexibility team within SSEN has been designed for organisations familiar with the flexibility markets and who have Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) with a high level of flexibility (often greater than 1,000kW). The DERs initially available to TRANSITION will be provided by the LEO partners who have flexibility in the range of 4kW to 400kW. Further, the majority of LEO partners have a limited understanding of any flexibility markets outside of the knowledge they have received from engagements through LEO and TRANSITION.

Project LEO has devised an agile approach to developing and testing new flexibility services, business models and the multi-organisation procedure and communications required to operate a local flexibility market<sup>1</sup>. Each minimum viable system (MVS) trial represents the minimum set of participants and processes required to test a new process modification or asset use case. In doing so, potential value is identified and evaluated quickly at a small scale, before significant investment is committed.

Using this agile approach, the TRANSITION project designed a number of MVS trials to obtain feedback on a number of commercial areas (see Section 1). This Commercial MVS 001 involves an assessment of organisations with DERs that have low levels of flexibility. Its purpose is to determine the appropriateness of the existing PQQ questions for organisations with DERs that have much lower levels of flexibility than normally encountered by the BaU flexibility team and are provided by organisation unfamiliar with flexibility markets. The responses from LEO partners will provide market information to TRANSITION that helps understand any barriers for organisations with low levels of flexibility who are unfamiliar with flexibility markets. This will inform potential modifications in advance of TRANSITION trials as some of the questions may not be appropriate, may request information that is difficult or relatively time consuming to provide or where compliance may be difficult.

---

<sup>1</sup> [MVS procedural learnings, published by Project LEO, Jan 2020](#)

The survey was issued on 13-Jan-21 to six LEO partners (EDF Energy, Low Carbon Hub, Nuvve, Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council and the University of Oxford). The return date for responses was 19-Jan-21, with responses being confidential and used only to inform the suitability of PQQ questions.

## 2 The Commercial MVS Trials

In December 2020, the TRANSITION project conducted a short study that identified 26 commercial areas which would benefit from feedback. An evaluation to rank these 26 commercial areas identified four (4) MVS trials that would benefit from input from LEO partners during the first six months of 2021:

- MVS 001: Assessment of Distributed Energy Assets (DERs) with Low Levels of Flexibility
- MVS 002: Assessment of Reliability Index (implementation under discussion)
- MVS 003: Assessment of Monitoring Granularity for Different Assets and Services
- MVS 004: Baseline Methodology and Settlement

The four Commercial MVS' were defined using the same template to aid engagement with LEO and received very favourable feedback from discussions with the MVS Group within LEO.

The template produced for Commercial MVS 001 is provided in Appendix 1.

## 3 Commercial MVS 001

Commercial MVS 001 commenced in January 2021 to determine if a case-study of what TRANSITION's PQQ Assessment may look like was fit for purpose for assets with low level of flexibility. This MVS had a quick turnaround, with the LEO partners returning the surveys to SSEN within a week of them being issued. Briefings at key meeting ensured there were no issues with the short timescale involved. Origami Energy conducted analysis of the information captured in these surveys and completed an initial report before the end of January 2021. This analysis has been extended to be included in this Commercial MVS report which is similar in format to Technical MVS reports produced by Project LEO. This section will discuss the main findings, key learnings and hurdles experienced in the execution of this MVS.

### 3.1 MVS Details

The objective of this MVS was to determine the suitability TRANSITION's suggested PQQ process and whether any changes are required to accommodate all service providers, including assets with low levels of flexibility, to be fairly considered in auctions for DSO procured services. A survey was issued on 13-Jan-21 to the LEO Partners. The return date for responses was 19-Jan-21 with responses being confidential and used only to inform the suitability of PQQ questions.

### 3.1.1 Survey Participants

Table 1 summarises the key survey participants and their role.

Table 1: Survey Participants and their role

Parties	Assets
EDF Energy	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.
Low Carbon Hub	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.
Nuvve	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.
Origami Energy	Conducts survey, the analysis, and the report.
Oxford City Council	Optional party used to test the process; no assets involved.
Oxfordshire County Council	Optional party used to test the process; no assets involved.
SSEN	MVS owner / sponsor.
University of Oxford	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.

### 3.1.2 Data

The PQQ was issued on the basis that responses would be confidential and used only to inform the suitability of PQQ questions. This report contains the summary of findings which have been anonymised.

### 3.1.3 Risks

Table 2 summarises the risks for the delivery of this Commercial MVS.

Table 2: Risk matrix for delivery

No.	Category	Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Total	Mitigation
1	Delivery Schedule	Tight timetable for conducting the survey, analysing the results and producing a first draft before the MVS	Inability to deliver the Commercial MVS in line with the	Medium	Medium	Time allocated to conduct analysis, draft report and allow for initial review by MVS

		owner leaves the commercial team	delivery schedule			owner before left the TRANSITION Commercial team
--	--	----------------------------------	-------------------	--	--	--

### 3.2 MVS Survey

The survey sought feedback on all relevant TRANSITION PQQ questions. A total of 17 questions were asked in relations to the following topics:

- High-level Company Details (no. of employees and expected level of flexibility)
- General Information (name, address, contact details and VAT details)
- Pre-requisites (basic asset information and adherence to SSEN processes)
- Financials (liquidation and insurance,)
- Environment, Health, Safety and Quality (company procedures and past events)
- Management and Related Activities (companies', policies and commitments)

The survey uses BaU language, terms and requirements to determine the responses from LEO partners who will be new entrants to the DSO-procured flexibility markets. The format of the survey briefly explained the requirements and solicited feedback in four areas:

- Is the information required readily available?
  - Most questions had a pre-populated answer (No, Yes, Do not know) to make it easier for LEO partners to respond;
- Is the question easy to answer?
  - Most questions had a pre-populated answer (No, Yes, Do not know) to make it easier for LEO partners to respond;
- Does this question apply to your organisation?
  - Most questions had a pre-populated answer (No, Yes, Do not know) to make it easier for LEO partners to respond; and
- A free text box where LEO partners were asked to provide any other comments.

Figure 1 provide one question as an example and the entire survey is provided in Appendix 2.

### 1. General Information

1.1 General information is required about the company (name, address, contact details and VAT details)					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					

Figure 1: Extract from the PQQ survey

### 3.3 Responses

Four responses were provided by the closing date:

- EDF Energy;
- Low Carbon Hub;
- Oxford City Council; and
- University of Oxford.

No responses were provided by Nuvve or Oxfordshire County Council.

A spreadsheet was used to aid the comparison and analysis of responses.

### 3.4 Analysis

Analysis was conducted on a question-by-question basis. The results of this analysis are replicated in Appendix 3.

## 4 Key Learnings

The key learnings from the MVS are provided below.

- There was generally a high level of response which has made this exercise beneficial;
- A number of respondents commented they would have to engage with the wider organisation for the real PQQ, and providing this information could prove time consuming;
- A number of respondents were concerned about the burden for organisations (large and small) and the extent of information that may end up being collected for large organisations;
- There were concerns regarding the “one size fits all” approach;

- The responses indicate there may be a need to refresh the LEO partners on the substations that have been selected, and the DERs which were identified for use in TRANSITION trials;
- Need to provide clarity on requirements (this could be a function of the brevity of the questionnaire);
- Need to consider providing supporting information for PQQ questions to clarify the requirements and help organisations who are unused to providing such information; and
- The PQQ process may be time consuming for those that are not used to collating such information and / or providing it to a third party and could lead to an extra burden on smaller organisations.

## 5 Summary and Future Works

Commercial MVS 001 was used to evaluate the suitability of the TRANSITION PQQ for use in the upcoming TRANSITION trials. The LEO partners filled out a survey which used the language, terms and requirements of the TRANSITION PQQ to determine whether it was fit for purpose for DERs with lower levels of flexibility.

It was found that the PQQ process may be time consuming for LEO partners, particularly those that are not used to collating such information and / or providing it to a third party. Although the larger LEO partners will have specialists who can advise on the requirements, smaller organisations may have an undue burden.

It may therefore be prudent to consider providing supporting information for PQQ questions to clarify the requirements and help organisations who are unused to providing such information. This would streamline the process and lessen the negative experience of potential flexibility providers.

The future work is as follows:

- Use the analysis and the key learnings from this MVS to develop the TRANSITION PQQ. This will ensure that the process is fit for purpose and does not exclude assets with low levels of flexibility during, or after, the flexibility auctions later in 2021; and
- Use the analysis and the key learnings from this MVS to answer any of the relevant MVS Questions once they have been finalised; and
- TRANSITION has already justified the relevance of questions within a standard PQQ processes to minimise the amount of questions presented in this survey. The project team will ensure that a 'why' is provided next to each question to ensure only information deemed necessary is obtained.

## Appendix 1 – Commercial MVS 001 Template

<b>Lead</b>	SSEN	<b>MVS Identifier</b>	Comm 001	<b>Target Run Period</b>	Jan-21					
<b>Physical Service(s)</b>	Not applicable to this MVS									
<b>End to End process stage</b>										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
<b>Category</b>	Suitability to Contract									
<b>Description</b>	Determine if SSEN's existing BAU assessment processes (Company Assessment, Technical Assessment, PQQ Assessment) are fit for purpose for assets with low level of flexibility									
<b>How the MVS will be delivered (incl. how data collected supports LEO)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No precursors;</li> <li>Desktop evaluation to assess a number of assets with a low level of flexibility from different LEO partners using the SSEN BaU Assessment process;</li> <li>Comment on the suitability of the process;</li> <li>Provide feedback on potential improvements to the process (if any);</li> <li>A summary report will be provided to SSEN and a report on the MVS will be submitted to the MVS working group; and</li> <li>No specific data will be collected for analysis beyond providing feedback to SSEN.</li> </ul>									
<b>Parties</b>	<b>Assets</b>								<b>Permission Required?</b>	
EDF Energy	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.								No	
Low Carbon Hub	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.								No	
Nuvve	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.								No	
Origami	Not involved								No	
Oxford City Council	Optional party used to test the process; no assets involved.								No	

Oxfordshire County Council	Optional party used to test the process; no assets involved.		No
Piclo	[Assess suitability of all assets]		No
SSEN	[Assess suitability of all assets]		No
University of Oxford	Party used to test the process; no assets involved.		No
<b>Platforms</b>	Not applicable to this MVS		
<b>What is varied?</b>	Not applicable as implicit in capacity of assets selected		
<b>How will MVS be evaluated (incl. data upload)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of organisations passing the BAU Assessment process (excluding capacity);</li> <li>• Structured feedback (e.g. a spreadsheet) on potential improvements to the process provided to SSEN; and</li> <li>• A summary report will be provided to SSEN based on the feedback received and the report on the MVS that will be submitted to the MVS working group will reference the relevant MVS questions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Delivery Programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 08-Jan-21 – Inform LEO partners of MVS timetable;</li> <li>• 13-Jan-21 – Origami and SSEN agree draft survey;</li> <li>• 13-Jan-21 – SSEN review draft survey with procurement;</li> <li>• 13-Jan-21 – SSEN issues survey to LEO partners;</li> <li>• 19-Jan-21 – LEO partners return survey; Origami begins analysis;</li> <li>• 20-Jan-21 – Origami submits draft report to SSEN;</li> <li>• 21-Jan-21 – Origami and SSEN finalise report and issue to SSEN;</li> <li>• 29-Jan-21 – Origami submits draft MVS report to SSEN;</li> <li>• 08-Feb-21 – SSEN provides comments on draft MVS report; and</li> <li>• 12-Feb-21 – MVS report submitted.</li> </ul>		
<b>Potential Risks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial: None</li> <li>• Financial: None</li> <li>• Technical: None</li> <li>• Delivery: None</li> <li>• Reputational: None</li> </ul>		
<b>Opportunity for Learning</b>	Changes (if any) required to allow all service providers, including assets with low levels of flexibility, to be fairly considered in auctions for DSO procured services.		
<b>MVS Questions addressed</b>	<p><b>Q3.L2.A4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what market changes are required to meet the needs of new, existing and/or naive flexibility providers to access the market?</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is the relationship between decreasing the barrier to entry vs. liquidity in the system?</li> <li>• to what extent could market enable direct and/or aggregated access, particularly for assets with low levels of flexibility?</li> </ul> <p><b>Q4.L2.A5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is meant by fair market access?</li> <li>• what advantages could be conferred on assets with larger levels of flexibility (if any) and in what market?</li> <li>• what market requirements could affect fair market access and is there an alternative means to address?</li> </ul> <p><b>Q5.L2.A3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is required to release more flexibility at national, regional and local levels?</li> <li>• what are the barriers to increasing the existing level of flexibility?</li> </ul> <p><b>Q6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to be considered once level 3 populated</li> </ul>
<b>Other Comments</b>	None
<b>Summary of MVS Outcome</b>	To be completed once the MVS report is substantially complete.

## Appendix 2 – Commercial MVS 001 Survey

<b>Name</b>				
<b>Organisation Name</b>				
<b>How many employees do you have?</b>	Less than 10	10-50	50-250	More than 250
<b>Expected level of flexibility to be offered</b>	Number of Assets – Flexible Capacity (kW) -			
<b>Date this survey was completed</b>				

### 1. General Information

1.1 General information is required about the company (name, address, contact details and VAT details)					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					

### 2. Pre-requisites

2.1 Please confirm the DER is located within one of the auction zones					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					
2.2 Confirm that the DER is connected, or will be connected, under a standard connection agreement					

Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					
<b>2.3 Please indicate the month in which you expect the DER(s) to be available for use by TRANSITION</b>					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					
<b>2.4 You will be required to comply with the <a href="#">SSEN Information and Security Policy</a></b>					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					
<b>2.5 Organisations are required to confirm they adhere to the <a href="#">Responsible Procurement Charter</a> which presents basic principles for business conduct in all dealings with SSE.</b>					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A

Please add any other comments here
------------------------------------

### 3. Financials

<b>3.1 Confirm your company is not in liquidation, receivership, or administration</b>					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A
Please add any other comments here					
<b>3.2 Standard insurance cover will be required</b>					
N/A			N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
What level of General or Public Liability insurance do you have (actual level would be helpful)?			What level of Employer Liability insurance do you have (actual level of cover held would be helpful)?		
Less than £0.5M	£0.5M to <£1M	More than and including £1.0M	Less than £1.0M	£1.0M to <£5M	More than and including £5.0M
Please add any other comments here					
<b>3.3 A copy of the certificate(s) of the required insurances or a letter from your broker committing to providing the necessary insurances if you are successful in the next procurement stage</b>					
Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes

Please add any other comments here

#### 4. Environment, Health, Safety and Quality

This section of the PQQ includes questions on processes and / or policies in these areas to manage the risks.

##### 4.1 Information is required on your organisation's processes and / or policies for managing the Environment, Health, Safety and Quality requirements for flexibility service provision.

Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes

Please add any other comments here

##### 4.2 Please indicate whether or not there has been any health and safety or environmental enforcement on your organisation within the last 5 years

Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A

Please add any other comments here

#### 5. Management and Related Activities

##### 5.1 Information is required on your organisation's commitment to anti-bribery, including any documents or policies which detail your commitment to anti-bribery

Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A

Please add any other comments here

**5.2 Provide information on your organisation's policies/practices for Modern Slavery**

Is the information required readily available?			Is the question easy to answer?		
Do not know	No	Yes	Do not know	No	Yes
Does this question apply to your organisation?			N / A		
Do not know	No	Yes	N / A	N / A	N / A

Please add any other comments here

### Appendix 3 – Analysis Question by Question

There were four respondees to the questionnaire; where the total for any question is less than four, this means that one or more respondees did not provide a response to that question.

Question	Summary of Responses (anonimised and summarised)					
<b>Details</b>						
<b>How many employees do you have?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 to 50 – One respondee</li> <li>More than 250 – Three respondees</li> </ul>					
<b>Expected level of flexibility to be offered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poorly understood</li> <li>Only one respondee provided the information already been shared between LEO partners in the technical MVS process</li> <li>Need to help partners understood what is required to ensure higher response</li> </ul>					
<b>1. General Information</b>						
<b>1.1 General information is required about the company (name, address, contact details and VAT details)</b>	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know – 0	No - 0	Yes – 4	Do not know - 0	No - 0	Yes - 4
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - 0	No – 0	Yes – 4	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question on why VAT information was required, but probably due to not being aware of VAT.</li> </ul>						
<b>2. Pre-requisites</b>						
	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		

Question	Summary of Responses (anonimised and summarised)					
<b>2.1 Please confirm the DER is located within one of the auction zones</b>	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>1</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>3</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Question on definition of DER</li> <li>▪ Need to refresh on the Zones; LEO partners have forgotten the work with which they were involved to select target substations (each a Zone) and their assets in the Zones that could deliver services</li> <li>▪ Likely forgotten due to passage of time</li> </ul>					
<b>2.2 Confirm that the DER is connected, or will be connected, under a standard connection agreement</b>	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>0</b>	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>1</b>	Yes - <b>0</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>3</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Uncertainty over how (small) DERs behind an MPAN will be treated</li> <li>▪ One respondee believes their organisation could respond to this question, but it may be a burdensome process given the need to check records</li> <li>▪ Need to educate LEO partners on what a "standard Connection Agreement" is as some were confused by this question, although this is more likely due to the leads on LEO responding and not necessarily engaging further with the organisation at this stage</li> </ul>					
<b>2.3 Please indicate the month in which you expect the DER(s) to be available for use by TRANSITION</b>	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>3</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments					

Question	Summary of Responses (anonimised and summarised)					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Uncertainty over the dates when new DERs should be available</li> <li>▪ One resposdee suggested there should be space for more than a single answer as some DERs may be available periodically</li> <li>▪ Need for further clarity between LEO and TRANSITION trials and how they compare, contrast and overlap</li> </ul>					
2.4 You will be required to comply with the SSEN Information and Security Policy	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>1</b>	Yes - <b>0</b>	Do not know - <b>1</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>0</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Many could not gain access to the policy, believing further access rights are needed</li> <li>▪ There was some confusion that the policy was a statement of SSEN position and not for providers to comply with</li> </ul>					
2.5 Organisations are required to confirm they adhere to the Responsible Procurement Charter which presents basic principles for business conduct in all dealings with SSE.	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>3</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were some comments on the additional burden this places on providers when they are likely to already have policies that align with the requirements</li> <li>▪ One comment was on the need to sign up to Achilles which could be an additional burden on organisations</li> </ul>					
<b>3 Financials</b>						
3.1 Confirm your company is not in liquidation,	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>4</b>	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>4</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>3</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A

Question	Summary of Responses (anonimised and summarised)					
receivership, or administration	Additional comments					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>					
3.2 Standard insurance cover will be required	<b>What level of General or Public Liability insurance do you have (actual level would be helpful)?</b>			<b>What level of Employer Liability insurance do you have (actual level of cover held would be helpful)?</b>		
	Less than £0.5M - <b>0</b>	£0.5M to <£1M - <b>0</b>	More than and including £1.0M - <b>3</b>	Less than £1.0M - <b>0</b>	£1.0M to <£5M - <b>2</b>	More than and including £5.0M - <b>1</b>
	Additional comments					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One respondee believes their organisation could respond to this question, but it may be a <b>burdensome process</b> given the need to check records</li> <li>Three comments that this would have to be confirmed with relevant staff and this could cause delays</li> </ul>					
3.3 A copy of the certificate(s) of the required insurances or a letter from your broker committing to providing the necessary insurances if you are successful in the next procurement stage	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>1</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>1</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>
	Additional comments					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only one respondee provided details of insurances (a link)</li> </ul>					
<b>4. Environment, Health, Safety and Quality</b>						
4.1 Information is required on your organisation's processes and / or policies for managing the Environment,	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>0</b>	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>0</b>
	Additional comments					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncertainty over what evidence is required, that it could be burdensome for both small organisations (one size fits all and lack if staff) and large organisation (could have significant information and copies of ISO processes)</li> </ul>					

Question	Summary of Responses (anonymised and summarised)					
<b>Health, Safety and Quality requirements for flexibility service provision.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more clarity on specific requirements so respondees can deliver what is required and avoid wasting time and effort</li> </ul>					
<b>4.2 Please indicate whether or not there has been any health and safety or environmental enforcement on your organisation within the last 5 years</b>	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>2</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>1</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncertainty over what evidence is required, that it could be burdensome for both small organisations (one size fits all and lack of staff) and large organisation (could have significant information and copies of ISO processes)</li> <li>Need more clarity on specific requirements so respondees can deliver what is required and avoid wasting time and effort</li> </ul>					
<b>5. Management and Related Activities</b>						
<b>5.1 Information is required on your organisation's commitment to anti-bribery, including any documents or policies which detail your commitment to anti-bribery</b>	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>1</b>	Yes - <b>3</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>1</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One respondent commented on the one size fits all approach that could be burdensome to organisations</li> <li>One respondent provided a link to what they believe is the relevant policy (<b>check this and other links</b>)</li> </ul>					
<b>5.2 Provide information on your organisation's policies/practices for Modern Slavery</b>	<b>Is the information required readily available?</b>			<b>Is the question easy to answer?</b>		
	Do not know - <b>0</b>	No - <b>2</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>	Do not know - <b>1</b>	No - <b>1</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>
	<b>Does this question apply to your organisation?</b>			<b>N / A</b>		
	Do not know - <b>1</b>	No - <b>0</b>	Yes - <b>2</b>	N / A	N / A	N / A
	Additional comments					

Question	Summary of Responses (anonymised and summarised)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="506 403 1912 435">▪ One respondee commented on the one size fits all approach that could be burdensome to organisations</li><li data-bbox="506 459 1861 491">▪ One respondee provided a link to what they believe is the relevant policy (<b>check this and other links</b>)</li></ul>