

# SSEN Transmission information

After reviewing the request, we are not in a position to provide any form of quantified or comparative cost-benefit analysis. There are several reasons for this:

- **We do not have visibility of developers' contractor pricing.**

Although we hold our own contractor rates, we do not have access to the prices developers would pay for equivalent works. Without these, it is not possible to compare TO-delivered costs against those that may be incurred if sole-use works were delivered contestably.

- **SSEN-T staff costs associated with contestably delivered assets cannot be defined in advance.**

Even where works are delivered contestably, SSEN-T retains responsibility for specification, technical assurance, documentation review, witnessing and asset adoption. These costs vary significantly depending on the quality and completeness of User-delivered works, and with no connected contestable projects at transmission level, there is no evidence base to model them accurately.

- **The benefit to the developer is not clear.**

Developers do not currently pay for Sole Use works under the existing framework. As such, transferring delivery responsibility to the User does not reduce their cost exposure, and therefore we do not see any quantifiable cost benefit to the developer for undertaking Sole Use works.



# SSEN Transmission Information

- **Sole Use works do not drive connection dates in the SSEN-T area.**  
Connection timings are generally governed by shared-use infrastructure and wider system build-out, not the delivery of Sole Use works. As a result, there is no basis to assert that allowing contestable delivery of Sole Use works would lead to earlier connection dates.
- **Safety, system integrity and operational risks cannot be reduced to a simple cost figure.**  
If contestability were extended into enabling works that interface with shared assets, this would increase risks relating to system integrity, protection coordination and TO liability. These impacts are qualitative and cannot be meaningfully reflected through a cost comparison.
- **Any numbers we could provide would be incomplete and potentially misleading.**  
Without access to developers' contractor pricing, their commercial assumptions, or the inputs underpinning the proposer's model, any figures produced would lack robustness and would not withstand scrutiny.
- **The proposer's assumptions do not reflect transmission-level realities.**  
Assumptions around early delivery, percentage savings and comparisons with distribution-level arrangements do not translate to the complexity, system dependencies and assurance requirements inherent in transmission works.

Given these factors, it is not a case of the analysis being unreliable — it is that we *physically cannot* perform a comparison without access to the relevant developer contractor prices. As a result, there is no analysis we can undertake at the moment.