

The **Transitional Regional Energy Strategic Plan** (tRESP) is the first step in reshaping local energy infrastructure, ahead of nine full RESPs planned for England. NESO aims to publish the final tRESP in January 2026, with full RESPs following in 2027, informed by broader strategic planning tools.

tRESP bridges the current electricity-only planning model and the future all-energy RESP approach. Its outputs will help DNOs develop their ED3 business plans (2028–2033), alongside Ofgem guidance. This consultation invites stakeholder input to shape the final plan. Notably, the Transmission Impact Assessment threshold has increased from 1 MW to 5 MW.

Feedback by 11.59pm on 3 November is invited by NESO, (to be shared with Ofgem and DESNZ) on:

1. Nations and Regions Contexts

Priorities for each area has been identified, partly by collaboration with Technical Working Groups.

2. Pathways and Consistent Planning Assumptions (CPAs)

Electricity Distribution Networks will use identified Pathways and their own data to work out network headroom and inform ED3 funding plans. (Price control is key.)

Post 2035 there are Future Energy Scenario uncertainties for pathways that could be affected by Holistic Transition, Electric Engagement and Hydrogen Evolution. Some types of electricity generation are excluded from Pathways, so too is decarbonisation. There is a concurrent consultation on pathway methodology and design. Demand planning has a consistent (consistent planning assumptions- CPAs) design and considers factors such as location.

The final tRESP in January 2026 will update data.

3. Strategic Investment Need

This will identify major developments not covered by the pathways such as data centres. It will also highlight areas where investment is needed including electricity and gas using intelligence from electricity distribution networks and RESP Forums.

Consultation questions – East of England - East Context

1. Are the Nations and Regions Contexts accessible, clear and easy to interpret? What improvements would you like to see?

Yes, the information is presented clearly and is generally easy to interpret. For example, it's helpful to see that UK Power Networks (UKPN) serves Eastern Power Networks in our region, and that gas distribution is managed by Cadent.

However, the context could be enhanced by including forward-looking elements—particularly an overview of schemes in development. This might include reference to the substantial number of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) planned for the East of England, ideally with links to these projects. Doing so would help users understand potential changes to the energy and infrastructure landscape beyond 2033.

Additionally, the section on Local Governance may soon become outdated. Over the next 12–18 months, the structure and composition of County Councils, Districts, Boroughs, and Unitary Authorities are expected to change due to the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) process. This reform aims to improve efficiency, accountability, and service delivery by consolidating two-tier systems into unitary authorities. Once the new governance arrangements are confirmed, the 'East Context' should be updated to reflect these changes and ensure continued relevance.

2. How well do the Nations and Regions Contexts reflect your understanding of your nation or region?

The Nations and Regions Contexts align well with our understanding of the East of England, particularly in highlighting the higher levels of fuel poverty along coastal areas. This is a well-evidenced and important issue for regional planning.

The inclusion of granular datasets—especially the planned generation capacity broken down by Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOAs)—is particularly valuable. This level of detail has the potential to be useful in providing support for more targeted decision-making and to help stakeholders better understand local energy dynamics.

To further strengthen the Contexts, it may be helpful to include additional layers of socioeconomic data or cross-reference planned infrastructure developments for the region, such as NSIPs, with evidence to demonstrate how these planned infrastructure developments could support and/or improve the region's socioeconomic position. This would provide a more holistic view of regional challenges and opportunities.

3. Do you agree with the elements and topics included in the Nations and Regions Context and is there anything missing that you would have expected to see?

Yes, the Nations and Regions Context appears comprehensive and well-structured, particularly when considered alongside the additions and suggestions outlined above. It covers a broad range of relevant topics and provides a solid foundation for understanding regional energy dynamics.

To further enhance its value, it may be helpful to incorporate forward-looking elements—such as anticipated infrastructure developments, evolving governance structures, and socioeconomic forward looking trends—that could shape the region

beyond the current planning horizon. Including these would ensure the Context remains relevant and responsive to future changes.

4. How do you envisage using the Nations and Regions Context(s)?

The context (**East Context**) is likely to serve as a valuable evidence source for the emerging Local Plan, particularly in shaping topic papers such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Its regional insights and data have the potential to help inform strategic infrastructure priorities, inform or support spatial planning decisions, and ensure alignment with national energy objectives.

By integrating the Context into the Local Plan evidence base, it can also help identify future investment needs, guide policy allocations and development, and strengthen the case for sustainable growth across the region.

5. Do you have any feedback on the data selected for the specific topics included for the Nations and Regions Contexts?

N/A

6. Do you have any feedback on how the data was presented visually?

It would be helpful if the 'storymaps' had page numbering or numbered segments so that key data/ graphics can easily be located.

7. What additional data do you think we should be considering either for tRESP or full RESP?

To strengthen both the tRESP and full RESP, it would be beneficial to incorporate longer-term planning horizons beyond 2033, ideally in 5-year intervals. This would support more strategic forward looking plan making and allow for better alignment with evolving policy, technology, and infrastructure needs and trends.

Additionally, and as mentioned elsewhere in our response, the inclusion of data on NSIPs for electricity—particularly those in the pipeline—would add valuable context. Mapping the location, scale, and anticipated delivery timelines of these projects would help stakeholders anticipate future capacity, network demands, and regional development pressures and/or shifts development opportunities.

8. The purpose of the tRESP Pathways is to drive consistency across DNO forecasting, as part of their business plans for 2028-2033 (ED3). Are the steps we are taking to drive consistency, via the baselining and alignment, clear and proportionate? Are the set of tRESP building blocks and the approach to creating Pathways fit for purpose?

While we currently have insufficient detail to comment fully on the clarity and proportionality of the baselining and alignment steps, the overall ambition to drive consistency across DNO forecasting is welcomed. The tRESP building blocks and approach to creating Pathways appear directionally sound.

Looking ahead, it would be beneficial for future pathway planning to be more closely aligned with the spatial outcomes of devolution and the emerging Spatial Development Strategies and Local Plan areas—particularly following the anticipated Local Government Reorganisation in 2028. Such alignment has the potential to create stronger synergies between energy planning and place-based policy, enabling more effective collaboration, integrated infrastructure delivery, and improved long-term outcomes for communities.

9. Will your organisation use the Pathways? If yes, which of the building blocks and for what purpose?

N/A

10. Pathways will be published for each building block, down to Grid Supply Point feeding area, and for each RESP nation/region. What is your preferred format to receive the Pathways?

We would need this in ESRI format; either in the form of shapefiles (shp) or a File Geodatabase.

In addition, our GIS system can consume the following:

- WMS OGC Web Services
- WMTS OGC Web Services
- WFS OGC Web Services

11. The objective of the tRESP CPAs is to drive consistency across DNO demand forecasting as an input to DNOs' network impact assessment to create their business plans for the ED3 period (2028-2033). Will your organisation use the tRESP CPAs for other purposes? If so, for what purpose? Is the format of the CPA value workbook usable for this purpose?

Our organisation anticipates using the tRESP CPAs not only for understanding DNO demand forecasting, but also as a supporting evidence base for spatial planning and infrastructure delivery—particularly in the development of Local Plans and Infrastructure Delivery Plans. The CPAs have the potential to offer valuable regional insights that can inform energy-related policy, planning and investment decisions.

The format of the CPA value workbook is broadly usable for these purposes. However, its utility could be further improved by aligning it more closely with spatial planning geographies and integrating it with emerging Spatial Development Strategies and Local Government structures post-2028. This would enable more effective cross-sector collaboration and long-term planning.

12. Are the definitions of the CPAs clear, as described in the tRESP methodology and detailed design document and the tRESP CPA value workbook?

The workbook [tRESP Consistent Planning Assumptions Value Workbook V2.01.xlsx](#) would benefit from guidance on how to make most effective usage of it. It is also unclear what assumptions are made for non-average events such as COVID-19.

13. Based on the methodology, do you agree with the values established as tRESP CPAs in the value workbook? If not, are there any additional or alternative data sources which are more appropriate? Answers should refer to specific CPA numbers e.g. EV01 and adhere to these criteria:

- Be based on a reliable source
- Be relevant
- Be up-to-date
- Be location-specific
- Consider changes through time, and
- Consider weather and climate impact.

No comment

14. Do you agree with the scope and granularity of the assumptions in the CPA value workbook, considering the materiality and complexity of implementation of a more detailed or granular approach? If not, can you provide evidence to support the use of a more or less detailed or granular approach? See the value workbook for an overview and further detail of the scope and granularity of the tRESP CPAs

It is helpful that scales are available down to MSOA level

15. Do you feel that the definition and framing of Strategic Investment Need (SI Need) is clear?

Yes agreed.

16. Are the emerging SI Need areas broadly aligned with the approach and framework we have set out, including the use of Strategic Value and Uncertainty as assessment criteria?

Yes, the emerging Strategic Infrastructure (SI) Need areas appear broadly aligned with the proposed approach and framework, including the use of Strategic Value and Uncertainty as assessment criteria. This has the potential to provide a useful foundation for regional and local investment and planning decisions.

However, to enhance long-term relevance, it would be beneficial for the tRESP to extend its horizon beyond 2033 and begin identifying potential infrastructure needs associated with emerging / current trends. In particular, areas with anticipated growth in AI-driven innovation zones, data centres, heat networks, and electric vehicle infrastructure should be holistically considered, as well as their impact on other sectors, for example agriculture/food production and other current/established rural economies . The aforementioned demands are likely to intensify in response to the accelerating shift toward renewable energy and digital technologies.

This is especially important in regions such as the East of England—including New Towns, new garden communities, and the North Essex sub-region—where strategic growth is already being planned, and where tensions already exist between such

planned growth and existing operations such as farming/food production and food security to name a few. Factoring in these future-facing developments would support more resilient and self-sufficient communities and forward-looking infrastructure planning.

17. Does the combination of RESP area narratives, maps and hotspot descriptions provide a clear and helpful picture of where emerging needs are arising? Is the level of detail suitable for your purposes?

The Regional Energy Strategy Plan is helpful, but its short-term timeframe would be insufficiently long to enable it to support planning allocations for development in Essex through local plans or SDS. Accordingly, this will make longer term energy planning more challenging.

18. What level of geographic detail would be most useful in future versions? For example:

- Local authority boundaries
- Project-level details
- Place-based clusters or zones
- GSP (Grid Supply Point) boundaries
- Thematic areas (e.g. heat networks, industrial clusters)
- Lower layer super output area / data zone

All of the above criteria would be useful but particularly relating the structure to local government administrative boundaries and identifiable super output areas. The latter will assist as we move through Local Government Reorganisation, (LGR) which will cause changes to governance boundaries.

19. Do you see a role for these outputs in supporting local planning, infrastructure alignment, investment proposals?

Yes, the data would be very helpful for planning future development, subject to the provision of some longer timescales for energy project information, 2033 would not be distant enough.

20. Are there any locations you would expect to see identified as SI Need that are not currently being assessed? Please highlight these and, where possible, provide supporting information

N/A