Transforming Connections Data: Consultation Response Template

Publication date:	25 September 2026
Response deadline:	6 November 2026
Contact:	Alasdair MacMillan / Connections Policy team
Team:	Electricity Connections Policy Development
Email:	connectionspolicy@ofgem.gov.uk

How to respond

You may respond to all questions or only those relevant to your organisation, expertise or interests. There is no requirement to answer every question.

For each question you choose to answer:

- select your preferred option, where applicable
- provide an explanation of your views in the response field, including supporting evidence, examples or analysis where possible

The response fields will expand as needed.

You may provide any comments that do not relate directly to a specific question in the **Additional and overarching questions** section.

Please indicate in the **About you** section whether your response is confidential. Non-confidential responses will be published on our website.

Return your completed response template to connectionspolicy@ofgem.gov.uk by end of **6 November 2026**.

Contents

Package 1: Demand Capacity Register (DCR) questions 4
Question 1 4
Question 2 5
Question 3 6
Question 4 7
Question 5 8
Question 6 9
Question 7 10
Package 2: Distribution Works Register (DWR) questions 11
Question 8 11
Question 9 13
Question 10 14
Question 11 15
Question 12 16
Package 3: Electricity Connections Register (ECR) questions 17
Question 13 17
Question 14 18
Question 15 19
Question 16 20
Question 17 22
Package 4: Transmission Works Register (TWR) questions 23
Question 18 23
Question 19 25
Question 20 26
Package 5: Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instructions (TORI) questions 27
Question 21 27
Question 22 29
Question 23 30
Question 24 32
Package 6: Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register questions 33
Question 25 33
Question 26 35
Question 27 36
Additional and overarching questions 37
Question 28 37
Question 29 38
Question 30 39
Question 31 40
Question 32 41
Question 33 42

Transforming Connections Data: consultation response template

About you

Organisation (if applicable)

Scottish Renewables/ RenewableUK

Name (optional)

Sophie Boyle/ Peter McCrory

Job title (optional)

Policy Manager – Grid & Networks/ Head of Grid

Email address (optional)

sboyle@scottishrenewables.com/peter.mccrory@renewableuk.com

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation? (Select one).

☐ Individual ☒ Organisation

Is your response confidential? (Select one).

☐ Yes ☒ No

Which stakeholder category best describes your organisation?

☐ Transmission Owner

☐ Distribution Network Operator

☐ Independent Distribution Network Operator

☐ National Energy System Operator

☐ Developer

☐ Digital innovator

☒ Trade association

☐ Consumer representative

☐ Consultancy

☐ Other (please specify):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Package 1: Demand Capacity Register (DCR)-specific questions

Question 1

Where should the requirements to publish and maintain the DCR sit within the regulatory framework? (Select one).

☐ Licence conditions

☐ DCUSA

☒ Combination of licence, code and supporting guidance

Please explain the relative benefits, risks and practical implications of your preferred approach.

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK support a combination of licence obligations, industry codes and supporting guidance.

Licence obligations provide an appropriate mechanism for establishing minimum requirements and accountability for data publication, quality and maintenance. However, the detailed design and operation of the DCR are likely to evolve over time as users gain experience with the dataset and additional use cases emerge.

Industry code arrangements can provide the flexibility needed to maintain and refine the dataset, while supporting guidance can help ensure consistent implementation and interpretation across network companies.

A combined approach would therefore provide an appropriate balance between regulatory certainty, accountability and flexibility.

Question 2

Which of Options A to E provides the most appropriate approach to the project-level reporting threshold for contracted and quoted demand projects? (Select one).

Option	Contracted projects	Quoted projects
Option A	**1 MVA**	**Not included**
Option B	**5 MVA**	**Not included**
Option C	**1 MVA**	**1 MVA**
Option D	**1 MVA**	**5 MVA**
Option E	**5 MVA**	**5 MVA**

☐ Option A

☐ Option B

☐ Option C

☒ Option D

☐ Option E

☐ Other / alternative option

Please explain how your preferred option balances transparency, data quality and proportionality.

We support Option D as the best balance between transparency, data quality and proportionality.

Reporting contracted projects above 1 MVA would provide a comprehensive picture of committed demand on the network while maintaining visibility of projects likely to influence network utilisation.

For quoted projects, we support a higher threshold of 5 MVA. Earlier-stage projects are inherently less certain and data quality may be weaker. Applying a higher threshold to quoted projects reduces reporting burdens while ensuring visibility of larger projects that are most likely to have a material impact on network planning and future capacity requirements.

This approach is also broadly aligned with the existing enhanced information requirements for larger demand connections and strikes an appropriate balance between transparency and practicality.

Question 3

Should demand projects below the project-level reporting threshold be reported in aggregated form?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, at what level of geographical, capacity and technology aggregation, and how frequently, should that information be published?

We support the publication of aggregated information on projects below the reporting threshold.

This would allow users to maintain visibility of emerging demand trends without imposing excessive reporting burdens or publishing large volumes of project-level data with limited value.

We suggest aggregation at a licence area or primary substation level, with data grouped by capacity band and technology category where possible. Publication should align with the proposed monthly reporting cycle for the DCR.

This would improve visibility of cumulative demand growth while maintaining a proportionate approach to reporting.

Question 4

Which approach, or combination of approaches, should be used to categorise demand projects?

☒ Technology-based classification

☐ Sector-based classification

☐ SIC-based classification

Please explain your preferred approach and how the framework should accommodate mixed-technology projects and emerging forms of demand.

We support a technology-based classification approach.

This is likely to be the most useful category for network planning and for understanding the potential impacts of different forms of demand on the electricity system. It also aligns more closely with the way stakeholders currently assess emerging demand trends.

The framework should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate mixed-use projects and emerging categories of demand as they arise. Where projects incorporate multiple technologies or demand types, multiple classifications should be permitted.

We do not object to supplementary sector or SIC-based classifications where these are useful, but technology-based categorisation should form the primary reporting structure.

Question 5

Do you agree with the proposed DCR schema?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any fields that should be:

- **added**
- **removed**
- **amended**
- **reclassified as mandatory or conditionally applicable**

and explain your reasoning.

We broadly support the proposed DCR schema and welcome the emphasis on interoperability, standardisation and data quality.

In particular, we support:

- unique project identifiers;
- unique connection identifiers;
- location and point-of-connection information;
- reinforcement work identifiers;
- data correction flags;
- project milestone information where proportionate and practical to maintain.

These fields will help improve interoperability between datasets and support customers seeking to understand network developments and project dependencies.

We agree with the distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields. However, implementation guidance should clearly define the circumstances under which conditionally applicable fields may remain blank to ensure consistency between publishers.

We also encourage Ofgem to continue promoting alignment between the DCR and existing datasets including the ECR, TEC Register, TWR, TORI reporting and wider strategic planning publications.

Question 6

Should storage projects be included in the DCR?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If no, how should their import capacity be represented so that users can obtain an accurate picture of demand-side network utilisation without unnecessary duplication between the DCR and ECR?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Question 7

Do you have any other comments relating to the DCR proposals?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK welcome the progress made under Theme 1 of the Connections End-to-End Review and consider this area to be relatively well developed.

We are pleased to see that many of the issues previously identified by our members reflected in the proposals, including improvements to data quality, standardisation, interoperability and visibility of network developments.

As implementation progresses, we encourage Ofgem to maintain a strong focus on ensuring that datasets remain accurate, timely, machine-readable and interoperable. The value of these reforms will ultimately depend not only on the volume of information published, but also on whether customers can use the data effectively to inform decision-making and project development.

We also encourage continued efforts to align connections datasets with reinforcement reporting and strategic network planning information using common identifiers and consistent data standards, enabling users to track projects and associated network works across multiple datasets and publications.

Package 2: Distribution Works Register (DWR)-specific questions

Question 8

Do you agree with the proposed DWR schema?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any fields that should be:

- **added**
- **removed**
- **amended**
- **reclassified as mandatory or conditionally applicable**

and explain your reasoning.

We broadly support the proposed DWR schema and welcome Ofgem's efforts to improve visibility of reinforcement activity across distribution networks.

Our members have consistently highlighted the importance of understanding reinforcement works that may influence connection opportunities, delivery timelines and future network capacity. The proposed schema contains many of the fields required to provide this visibility, including unique package identifiers, linked queue project identifiers, delivery milestones, dependencies, forecast energisation dates and reinforcement drivers.

In particular, we support:

- unique identifiers to support interoperability and cross-referencing with other datasets;
- explicit linkages between reinforcement works and connection projects;
- visibility of delivery milestones, dependencies and delays;
- alignment with existing and emerging data standards;
- machine-readable publication formats; and
- mechanisms which allow users to report and track data quality issues.

We generally support the distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields. However, supporting guidance should clearly define when conditionally applicable fields may remain blank to ensure consistency across DNOs.

We also strongly support the use of common identifiers and links between the DWR and other datasets, including the DCR, ECR, TEC Register, TWR, TORI publications and wider strategic network planning outputs.

Question 9

Do you agree that the initial DWR should cover reinforcement projects at EHV?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If no, what threshold or scope should apply?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Should the DWR be extended to lower-voltage reinforcement over time, and what conditions should determine when this occurs?

Over time, we believe Ofgem should review whether the scope should be extended to include lower-voltage reinforcement activity. Any future expansion should be guided by demonstrable stakeholder demand, the availability and quality of underlying data, and evidence that publication would enhance users' understanding of network constraints, reinforcement requirements and future connection opportunities.

Where lower-voltage reinforcement works have a material impact on connection availability, customer outcomes or wider network development, consideration should be given to including those activities within future iterations of the DWR. However, maintaining data quality, consistency and usability should remain the primary objective throughout any expansion of scope.

Question 10

How should the capacity or wider network benefit delivered by reinforcement works be represented in the DWR, particularly where a scheme does not produce a straightforward increase in thermal capacity?

We recognise that reinforcement projects do not always result in a simple increase in thermal capacity and therefore support a flexible approach to representing network benefits.

Where quantifiable capacity benefits exist, these should be reported wherever possible. However, for projects that address wider system constraints, resilience requirements or operational limitations, narrative descriptions and standardised benefit categories may provide a more meaningful representation of the value delivered.

We therefore support an approach which combines:

- quantitative measures where available;
- standardised categories describing the type of constraint addressed; and
- concise narrative explanations describing the broader network benefit delivered by the works.

This would provide users with a clearer understanding of why reinforcement works are being undertaken and how they may influence future connection opportunities.

Question 11

What should the future relationship be between the DWR and NDPs?

In particular:

- **could the DWR replace or reduce the need for some reinforcement information currently provided through NDPs?**
- **or do the publications serve distinct purposes?**

We consider that the DWR and NDPs should be designed to complement one another rather than duplicate information.

The DWR should provide a consistent, standardised and regularly updated source of information regarding reinforcement project delivery and progress. NDPs continue to serve an important role in providing broader network planning context, future investment considerations and strategic development information.

Where practicable, information should be aligned between publications and supported by common identifiers to allow users to move easily between datasets and understand how reinforcement activities relate to wider network development plans.

Over time, there may be opportunities to reduce duplication across publications. However, any rationalisation should be driven by an improved user experience and should not reduce the availability of useful information.

Question 12

Do you have any other comments relating to the DWR proposals?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK welcome Ofgem's proposal to introduce a Distribution Works Report and consider this an important step towards improving transparency of network reinforcement activity.

Our members have previously highlighted the importance of providing visibility of the reinforcement works which underpin connection opportunities and project delivery. In particular, consistency of reporting, interoperability between datasets and the ability to link reinforcement projects to connection projects remain important priorities.

As implementation progresses, we encourage Ofgem to maintain a strong focus on data quality, common identifiers, machine-readable formats and alignment with existing reinforcement reporting and planning publications. This will help ensure that customers can effectively understand both current reinforcement activities and their implications for future network capacity and connection opportunities.

This is especially important where reinforcement works span transmission and distribution boundaries, where clear cross-referencing and consistent reporting will help improve transparency and customer understanding.

Package 3: Electricity Connections Register (ECR)-specific questions

Question 13

Do you agree with the proposed improvements to the ECR?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any further targeted improvements that should be prioritised.

We support the proposed improvements to the Electricity Connections Register (ECR) and welcome Ofgem's focus on enhancing data quality, transparency, interoperability and consistency.

Many of the proposed changes reflect issues previously raised by our members, particularly the need for more consistent locational information, improved visibility of network hierarchy, stronger data quality controls and greater alignment between related datasets.

We particularly support:

- improved locational and network hierarchy information;
- the introduction of additional data quality and maintenance information;
- consistent terminology for connection restrictions, subject to the commercial-sensitivity concerns set out in Question 29; and
- greater alignment with other connections datasets where appropriate.

Accurate and up-to-date ECR data remains critical to informing project development decisions and improving understanding of network capacity and connection opportunities.

A further area that should continue to be prioritised is interoperability between the ECR and related datasets, including reinforcement reporting and strategic network planning publications. The ability to trace projects, constraints and reinforcement activities across multiple datasets remains important to users.

Question 14

To what extent should the ECR schema be aligned with the DCR schema?

Please identify:

- **core fields**
- **definitions**
- **formats**
- **standards**

that should be common to both registers, as well as any areas where dataset-specific treatment should be retained.

We support greater alignment between the ECR and DCR wherever this improves consistency, interoperability and ease of use.

A common set of core fields, definitions and standards would help users navigate between datasets and develop a more complete understanding of connection activity across both generation and demand projects.

Areas that should be aligned include:

- unique project identifiers;
- unique connection identifiers;
- project lifecycle stages and status definitions;
- location and network hierarchy fields;
- consistent definitions of connection restrictions, without publishing commercially sensitive project-level information (see Question 29);
- data quality indicators;
- record creation and last updated dates; and
- references to associated reinforcement works where applicable.

However, we agree that complete convergence is neither necessary nor desirable. The ECR and DCR serve different purposes and should retain dataset-specific fields appropriate to generation and demand connections respectively.

The objective should be interoperability and consistency, rather than uniformity.

Question 15

Should information on Gate 1 projects continue to be published through the ECR, or should it be provided through a separate but linked dataset? (Select one).

☒ Through the ECR

☐ Separate but linked dataset

Please explain what information should be made available and why.

We support the continued publication of Gate 1 information, as it provides useful visibility of potential future connection activity and helps customers understand wider network demand and connection trends.

Whether this information is held within the ECR or a separate linked dataset is of less importance than ensuring the information remains accessible, transparent and clearly differentiated from contracted projects.

If retained within the ECR, Gate 1 projects should be clearly identifiable and appropriately distinguished from contracted projects to avoid confusion regarding project maturity and likelihood of progression.

Any approach adopted should seek to balance transparency with appropriate recognition of the greater uncertainty associated with earlier-stage projects.

Question 16

Should the ECR include quoted connection applications as well as contracted projects?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, should quoted applications be published at project level or in an aggregated form?

☒ Project level

☐ Aggregated

If at project level, what safeguards would be needed to address uncertainty, duplication, commercial sensitivity and data quality?

We support the inclusion of quoted connection applications within the ECR at project level.

Visibility of quoted projects can provide useful insight into emerging demand for network capacity and help customers, network companies and other stakeholders better understand future connection activity. Project-level reporting is likely to deliver significantly greater value than aggregated reporting, particularly when assessing local network developments, future constraints and reinforcement requirements.

However, quoted projects are inherently less certain than contracted projects and appropriate safeguards should therefore be introduced.

These should include:

- clear differentiation between quoted and contracted projects through distinct status categories;
- publication of project status and key dates to provide transparency regarding project maturity;
- clear guidance on data maintenance responsibilities and update requirements;
- mechanisms for identifying and correcting inaccurate or duplicate records;
- proportionate treatment of commercially sensitive information where justified; and
- common identifiers to support consistency and interoperability across related datasets.

The inclusion of quoted projects should improve transparency without creating confusion regarding the likelihood of project progression. It should therefore be clear to users that quoted projects represent potential rather than committed network demand.

Question 17

Do you have any other comments relating to the ECR proposals?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK support Ofgem's proposed approach to improving the ECR and welcome the focus on targeted enhancements rather than wholesale redesign.

The ECR is already a widely used and valuable dataset. We therefore support an approach which builds on existing strengths while improving consistency, interoperability and data quality.

As implementation progresses, we encourage Ofgem to maintain a strong focus on common identifiers, machine-readable formats, consistent definitions and interoperability with other connections datasets. These principles should underpin the wider Transforming Connections Data programme and help create a more coherent and connected data ecosystem for electricity connections.

Package 4: Transmission Works Register (TWR)-specific questions

Question 18

Do you agree with the proposed TWR schema?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any fields that should be:

- **added**
- **removed**
- **amended**
- **reclassified as mandatory or conditionally applicable**

and explain your reasoning.

We broadly support the proposed TWR schema and the distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields.

Our members have consistently highlighted the importance of improving visibility of transmission reinforcement works and understanding how those works relate to connection opportunities, delivery timelines and wider strategic network development. The proposed schema contains many of the fields required to support these objectives.

In particular, we support:

- the introduction of common identifiers;
- improved linkages between reinforcement works and connection projects;
- visibility of interdependencies between projects;
- inclusion of forecast energisation dates;
- location and network hierarchy information;
- data quality fields and correction mechanisms; and
- alignment with related datasets.

We also support the proposed approach whereby certain fields remain conditionally applicable where information may not be available or relevant in all circumstances. However, supporting guidance should clearly define when these fields are expected to be populated to ensure consistent reporting across organisations.

As a general principle, maintaining data quality and consistency should take priority over expanding reporting requirements where information cannot be reliably provided.

Question 19

Do you agree with the proposed common schema framework linking the TWR and TORI while retaining the distinct planning and delivery functions of the two reports?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any changes needed to make the framework effective.

We support the proposed common schema framework linking the TWR and TORI while retaining their distinct purposes.

Our members have previously highlighted the need for greater interoperability between reinforcement datasets and improved visibility into how transmission works relate to project delivery. The introduction of common identifiers and aligned data structures should make it significantly easier for users to track reinforcement projects across planning and delivery stages and to understand their relevance to connection projects.

We particularly support:

- the use of common package identifiers;
- clearer linkage between reinforcement works and queue projects;
- alignment of definitions and terminology across datasets; and
- improved interoperability with other connections datasets, including the TEC Register, ECR and proposed DCR.

The success of the framework will depend on maintaining clear and consistent identifiers across all relevant datasets and on ensuring information remains up to date as projects progress.

We also support the proposal for reinforcement projects at the transmission-distribution interface to be appropriately cross-referenced between transmission and distribution reporting. This will help users better understand project dependencies and avoid gaps in visibility where projects span organisational boundaries.

Question 20

Do you have any other comments relating to the TWR proposals?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK strongly support continued efforts to improve the visibility, consistency and quality of transmission reinforcement information.

Members have repeatedly highlighted the importance of understanding the status of reinforcement works, the dependencies between connection projects and network investments, and the implications of delays to enabling infrastructure. Improving the transparency of transmission works reporting will help developers make better-informed decisions and improve understanding of future connection opportunities.

We welcome Ofgem's focus on interoperability, common identifiers and stronger links between reinforcement datasets and queue transparency datasets. These proposals address several issues previously raised by our members and represent a positive step towards creating a more coherent and user-friendly connections data ecosystem.

As implementation progresses, we encourage Ofgem to maintain a strong focus on data quality, machine-readable publication formats and consistent reporting standards, ensuring users can easily track projects and reinforcement activities across multiple datasets and publications.

Package 5: Transmission Owner Reinforcement Instructions (TORI)-specific questions

Question 21

Do you agree with the proposed TORI schema?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any fields that should be:

- **added**
- **removed**
- **amended**
- **reclassified as mandatory or conditionally applicable**

and explain your reasoning.

We broadly support the proposed TORI schema and welcome Ofgem's efforts to improve the consistency, accessibility and usefulness of transmission reinforcement reporting.

Our members have consistently highlighted the importance of understanding the status of reinforcement works and the dependencies between network investment and connection projects. The proposed schema would significantly improve visibility of project delivery and support more informed decision-making by network users.

In particular, we support:

- the introduction of common Package IDs to support interoperability across datasets;
- visibility of linked queue projects and project dependencies;
- delivery milestones and forecast energisation dates;
- in addition to the proposed fields, we recommend an “Original forecast energisation date” field alongside “Current forecast energisation date”, so users can quantify the total delivery delay experienced during the works;
- reporting of project status and delay reasons;
- retention of the quarterly update narrative;
- improved planning and consenting information; and
- mechanisms to support data quality and correction.

We also support the distinction between mandatory and conditionally applicable fields. However, implementation guidance should clearly define expectations for conditionally applicable fields to ensure consistent reporting across Transmission Owners.

As a general principle, data quality and consistency should be prioritised over expansion of reporting requirements where information cannot be reliably provided.

Question 22

How should the constraint addressed, existing network limitation and estimated additional capacity or network benefit be represented within the TORI?

We recognise that transmission reinforcement projects can deliver a range of benefits which are not always easily represented through a single capacity metric. While some projects may provide a straightforward increase in thermal capacity, others may address system stability, fault level, voltage, resilience or operational constraints.

We therefore support a hybrid approach combining:

- standardised fields identifying the primary constraint(s) being addressed;
- quantitative information where additional capacity can reasonably be measured;
- descriptions of wider network benefits where quantitative measures are less appropriate; and
- alignment with wider planning and investment datasets through common identifiers where additional context is available.

This would provide users with both the consistency needed for analysis and the contextual information necessary to understand the purpose and value of reinforcement projects.

Question 23

What information should the TORI provide on project delays and delivery risks?

We support greater transparency regarding project delays and delivery risks through the TORI.

For connection customers, understanding the factors affecting reinforcement project delivery is important as delays to enabling works can have direct implications for project development, investment decisions and connection dates. The TORI should therefore provide visibility of:

- whether a project is on track, at risk or delayed;
- the primary cause of any delay or delivery risk;
- key project dependencies which may affect delivery;
- changes to forecast energisation dates; and
- a brief narrative explanation of material changes since the previous update.

Retaining the quarterly update narrative is particularly important as it provides context that cannot always be captured through structured data fields alone.

Should standard categories be used?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, which categories would be sufficiently informative without creating inappropriate commercial sensitivities?

We support the use of standardised delay categories to improve consistency, comparability and ease of interpretation across projects and Transmission Owners.

Categories could include:

- Planning and consenting;
- Outage availability or outage constraints;
- Land rights and access;
- Design changes;
- Procurement and delivery challenges;
- Third-party dependencies;

- Dependencies on other reinforcement projects;
- Environmental or regulatory requirements; and
- Network optimisation or strategic planning changes.

These categories would provide meaningful insight into the causes of delays while avoiding unnecessary commercial sensitivities. Where a project is identified as delayed or at risk, the standard category should be supplemented by a short narrative explanation to provide additional context and improve customer understanding of the issue and any mitigation activities underway.

Question 24

Do you have any other comments relating to the TORI proposals?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK welcome Ofgem's proposals to strengthen and standardise the TORI.

Our members have consistently emphasised the importance of transparent and up-to-date information regarding reinforcement projects that influence connection opportunities and project delivery. We therefore strongly support proposals which improve consistency between Transmission Owners, enhance interoperability with related datasets and provide greater visibility of project progress and dependencies.

We are particularly supportive of the proposed linkage between the TORI and TWR through common identifiers. This should make it easier for users to understand the relationship between strategic network planning, reinforcement delivery and connected projects.

As implementation progresses, we encourage continued focus on data quality, machine-readable publication formats, interoperability and user accessibility. These principles will be fundamental to realising the benefits of the wider Transforming Connections Data programme and improving understanding of how reinforcement activity supports future network capacity and connection opportunities.

Package 6: Transmission Entry Capacity (TEC) register-specific questions

Question 25

Do you agree with the proposed improvements to the TEC register?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any further targeted improvements that should be prioritised.

We support the proposed improvements to the TEC Register and welcome Ofgem's decision to improve and build upon the existing dataset rather than replace it.

The TEC Register is one of the most widely used connections datasets and plays an important role in helping customers understand transmission connection activity, network developments and project progression. The proposed improvements align with a number of priorities previously identified by our members, particularly in relation to transparency, interoperability and data quality.

In particular, we support:

- the introduction of stable project identifiers;
- stronger linkage with related datasets, including the TWR, TORI and distribution datasets;
- the addition of creation and last modified dates;
- improved transparency around data quality;
- retention of actual connection dates;
- clearer information on connection restrictions only where commercially sensitive project information is protected, as set out in Question 29; and
- enhanced geographic information.

We also welcome efforts to improve interoperability across connections datasets through common identifiers and consistent definitions. This will help users develop a more complete understanding of network developments, reinforcement activity and project dependencies.

As implementation progresses, continued focus should be placed on ensuring the TEC Register remains accurate, timely, machine-readable and easily linked to related datasets.

Question 26

Should the TEC register include quoted connection applications as well as contracted projects?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, should quoted applications be published at project level or in an aggregated form?

☐ Project level

☐ Aggregated

If at project level, what safeguards would be needed to address uncertainty, duplication, commercial sensitivity and data quality?

We do not currently support including quoted connection applications alongside contracted projects in the TEC Register.

In our view, Gate 1 projects provide sufficient visibility of potential future connection activity. Given the introduction of Gate 1 and Gate 2 statuses, we do not see a clear additional benefit from publishing applications that have only recently been submitted.

These earlier-stage applications introduce a further level of uncertainty and could make the register harder to interpret without materially improving users' understanding of future network connectivity.

The questions on project-level publication and safeguards are therefore not applicable to our preferred approach.

This is not a critical objection. We would welcome clarification of any distinct user benefit that quoted applications would provide beyond the visibility already offered by Gate 1 projects.

If Ofgem nevertheless decides to include quoted projects, publication should improve transparency while making clear that these projects represent potential rather than committed network demand.

Question 27

Do you have any other comments relating to the TEC register proposals?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK welcome the proposed improvements to the TEC Register and consider these changes an important contribution to the wider Transforming Connections Data programme.

Our members have consistently highlighted the importance of accurate, timely and interoperable transmission connections data. In particular, we welcome the focus on common identifiers, stronger dataset linkages and retention of historic information. Any reporting of connection restrictions should protect commercially sensitive project information, as set out in Question 29.

We also support efforts to improve linkage between the TEC Register and reinforcement reporting datasets. Understanding the relationship between connection projects, reinforcement works and network constraints remains important for project development and investment decisions.

As implementation progresses, we encourage Ofgem and NESO to continue prioritising data quality, interoperability and consistency across datasets. The value of the TEC Register will ultimately depend not only on the information it contains, but on how effectively users can connect that information with the wider connections data ecosystem to support informed decision making.

Additional and overarching questions

Question 28

Do you agree with the proposed common design principles for connections datasets, including standardisation, machine-readability, human accessibility, interoperability, and the use of common identifiers?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please identify any additional principles that should apply.

We support the proposed common design principles and consider them fundamental to the success of the Transforming Connections Data programme.

In particular, we strongly support:

- standardised data structures and definitions;
- machine-readable publication formats;
- human-readable outputs for non-technical users;
- interoperability between datasets;
- common identifiers; and
- consistent approaches to data quality and governance.

These principles will improve usability, reduce duplication and help users build a more complete understanding of connection activity, network development and reinforcement requirements.

In addition, we consider that accuracy, timeliness and consistency of published information should remain core principles throughout the programme. The value of increased transparency ultimately depends on users being able to access data which is reliable, current and comparable across organisations and datasets.

Question 29

Is a single "restricted connection" indicator sufficient to describe whether a customer's access to network capacity is constrained?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If no, what additional or separate fields should be included to describe different forms of restriction?

We do not support the publication of a project-level “restricted connection” indicator in its proposed form. Our concern is not that the indicator needs more detail, but that it could disclose commercially sensitive information about the firm or non-firm status of a project’s grid connection.

Members have raised concerns that disclosure could make this information available to potential competitors in the CfD scheme or Capacity Market.

We therefore do not recommend additional project-level restriction fields at this stage. Before introducing an indicator or related fields, Ofgem should assess the commercial sensitivity of the information with affected stakeholders and consider whether users’ needs can be met through aggregated or otherwise non-identifying reporting.

We support clearer and more consistent terminology, but improved transparency should not come at the expense of protecting commercially sensitive project information.

Question 30

Would a standalone geographical reference table, linked to multiple datasets through common identifiers, be beneficial?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, what information should it contain, and which information should instead remain within individual datasets?

We support the creation of a standalone geographical reference table linked through common identifiers.

This approach could improve consistency across datasets, reduce duplication and support interoperability while allowing location information to be maintained centrally rather than replicated across multiple publications.

The reference table could contain information such as:

- location identifiers;
- network hierarchy information;
- substations and network nodes;
- transmission and distribution boundaries;
- geographic coordinates; and
- other common locational reference information.

Dataset-specific information should remain within the relevant datasets where it relates directly to the characteristics, status or operation of a particular project or reinforcement activity.

Any approach adopted should ensure that users can easily navigate between datasets and understand the geographical relationships between projects, network assets and reinforcement works.

Question 31

Should IDNOs ultimately be required to publish equivalent connections datasets using the same schemas and design principles as DNOs?

We support the principle that IDNOs should ultimately publish equivalent connections datasets using common schemas and design principles.

Consistent reporting across all relevant network operators would improve visibility, comparability and interoperability across the wider connections landscape. It would also help ensure that users can access comparable information regardless of the organisation responsible for a connection.

Implementation should be proportionate and take account of differences in size, resources and operational arrangements. However, the long-term objective should be a common framework that provides a consistent user experience across all network operators.

Question 32

Which additional datasets, standards or interoperability improvements should Ofgem prioritise in future phases of the TCD programme, and why?

We encourage Ofgem to continue prioritising interoperability across existing and future datasets.

Particular areas of focus should include:

- stronger linkage between connection queues, reinforcement datasets and strategic network planning outputs;
- common identifiers across all major connections datasets;
- greater alignment of project lifecycle definitions and status categories;
- improved visibility of dependencies between connection projects and reinforcement works; and
- continued improvements to data quality governance arrangements.

Our members have consistently highlighted the importance of being able to follow projects, constraints and reinforcement activities across multiple datasets and publications. Future phases of the programme should continue to support this objective and reduce the need for users to manually reconcile information from different sources.

Question 33

Do you have any other comments relating to the proposals set out in this consultation?

Scottish Renewables and RenewableUK welcome the progress made through the Transforming Connections Data programme and broadly support the direction of travel set out within this consultation.

Many of the proposals reflect issues previously raised by our members, including improving data quality, increasing transparency, strengthening interoperability between datasets, improving visibility of reinforcement activity and supporting more effective decision-making by customers. We therefore support Ofgem's focus on targeted improvements, implementation and standardisation rather than fundamental redesign.

As the programme progresses, maintaining a strong focus on data quality, consistency, interoperability and user accessibility will be critical. Success should be measured not simply by the volume of data published, but by whether customers can access accurate, timely and connected information that genuinely improves understanding of network capacity, reinforcement activity and future connection opportunities.

Ultimately, a coherent and interoperable data ecosystem will help support better decision-making, improve transparency across the connections process and contribute to the more efficient delivery of infrastructure required to meet the UK's energy objectives.