Regulators' Alliance for Progressing Infrastructure Development

April 2022

RAPID

Strategic regional water resource solutions guidance for gate two

Environment Agency

dwi

Ofwat

Contents

1. Introduction to the guidance 4

2. Gate Two Assessment 5

2.1 Gate Two Timeline 5

2.2 Submission 6

2.3 Assessment 6

2.4 Queries 12

2.5 Draft Decisions and Representations 12

2.6 Final Decisions 13

2.7 Expectations of Transparency 13

3. Solution design 14

3.1 Background and objectives 14

3.2 Solution, options and sub-options 14

4. Water resource assessment 15

4.1 Utilisation 15

4.2 Water Resource Benefit 15

4.3 Long term opportunities and scalability 16

4.4 Infrastructure Resilience to the Risk of Flooding and Coastal Erosion 17

5. Drinking water quality considerations 17

6. Environmental assessment 18

6.1 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment 18

6.2 Informal Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) 19

6.3 Environmental Appraisal 19

6.4 Other Environmental Considerations. 20

6.5 Carbon 21

7. Programme and planning 22

7.1 Project plan 22

7.2 Planning and consenting route 23

7.3 Key risks and mitigation measures 24

7.4 Proposed gate three activities and outcomes 24

7.5 Procurement, ownership and operation 25

8. Solution costs and benefits 26

8.1 Solution cost estimates 26

8.2 Best Value and solution benefits 27

9. Stakeholder and customer engagement 28

10. Assurance 28

11. New solutions 29

11.1 General principles 29

11.2 Criteria questions 30

11.3 New Solution Timeline 31

12. Ofwat decision process 31

13. Flexibility 31

1. Introduction to the guidance

At PR19 Ofwat announced a £469 million ring-fenced development fund for companies to investigate and develop strategic water resource solutions that benefit customers, protect and enhance the environment and benefit wider society. This funding provides companies with the ability and certainty to accelerate the development of solutions to be 'construction ready' for the 2025-2030 period; it encourages joint working, enables additional analysis where required and provides outputs with greater certainty than would be available without it.

Delivery of these solutions is subject to a formal gated process where decisions are made on delivery penalties and solution funding progression. The details of gate allowances, activities at each gate and delivery incentives are described in more detail in PR19 final determinations: Strategic regional water resource solutions.

The Regulator's Alliance for Progressing Infrastructure Development (RAPID) supports and oversees the development of the solutions that benefit from this funding. RAPID's role in the gated process (working with the partner regulators, the Consumer Council for Water (CCW), Natural England and Natural Resources Wales) is to assess the progress made in development of each solution and to provide advice and recommendations to Ofwat to enable Ofwat to make decisions on continued ring-fenced funding for solution progression.

The purpose of the gated process is to ensure at each gate that:

- companies are progressing strategic water resource solutions that have been allocated funding at PR19 or have subsequently joined the programme;
- costs incurred in doing so are efficient; and
- solutions merit continued investigation and development during the period 2020 to 2025.

The gated process includes customer protection to ensure that funding is returned for non-delivery and if solutions are no longer suitable to progress.

The gated process interacts with the regional planning and statutory company-level water resource management plan (WRMP) development processes. The water resource management planning processes drives companies' decisions regarding which solutions they promote and the choice of solutions in the RAPID programme. The gated process is intended to support companies in progressing investigation and development of solutions in the RAPID programme to a high standard with the aim of solutions being construction ready for the 2025-2030 period and includes decisions about whether companies should continue to receive funding for this purpose. Solutions will require planning and environmental consents before going ahead.

The purpose of this guidance is to describe the gate two process and set out the expectations for solutions at standard gate two. Section 2 explains the gate two assessment process. Sections 3 – 10 set out the evidence to be included within gate two submissions of work carried out on gate two activities. Section 11 sets out the process for promoting new solutions to join the RAPID programme and the criteria for them to join. Section 12 explains the flexibility within the process.

This guidance should be read alongside the All Company Working Group (ACWG) Design Principles, Process and Gate two Interim Guidance, which details overarching Design Principles of the National Infrastructure Commission (Climate, People, Place, Value). Solution owners should address the principles, targets and indicators set out in this document in their gate two submission to meet the expectations of gate two set out in this gate two guidance. Where the Design Principles document suggests flexibility in meeting the gate two indicators by gate two, solution teams should consult with their RAPID engagement leads, if it thought this applies to their solution. Appendix A provides a list of relevant existing guidance, which is referenced throughout the document.

2. Gate Two Assessment

2.1 Gate Two Timeline

Activity	Date
Submissions to RAPID	By 6pm 14 November 2022
Query process	15 November to 16 December 2022
Draft decisions and representation period opens	10am 1 March 2023
Representation period closes	6pm 12 April 2023
Final decisions	10am 7 June 2023

The gated process interacts with the regional planning and statutory company-level water resource management plan (WRMP) development processes and much of the evidence base for gate two will be included in material in consultations on those plans. The water resource management planning process drives the choice of solutions in the RAPID programme.

In a change to the dates published in the Final Determination, the timing of gate two has been moved back by two weeks from 31 October to 14 November. This should allow time for Defra and Welsh Government to complete their security checking process on draft WRMPs so that regional plans and draft WRMPs will be publicly available at the same time as gate two submissions are published. Solution owners can then refer in their submissions to WRMP cost tables, Habitats Regulation Assessments and other information that will be published with regional plans and WRMPs. It also means that interested parties will be able to consider

the evidence in the gate submissions alongside the regional plans and WRMPs and respond to consultations and provide representations on the gate decisions with that wider context.

The subsequent gate milestones have then been set to ensure that RAPID and Ofwat are able to take account of relevant evidence from regional plan and WRMP consultation responses and also to enable stakeholders to respond to consultations on the plans and draft decisions in the gated process.

Draft decisions will be published following close of the consultation period on regional plans and WRMPs and final decisions will be published a short time following companies' publications of their statements of response to allow these to be taken into account in the final decisions.

2.2 Submission

Solution owners should make a submission for each solution. It should be no longer than 60 pages and be structured in line with the template published on the RAPID website using the headings and sub-headings in this guidance document.

Submissions should be published on the solution owners website and submitted to RAPID via the submission portal no later than 6pm 14 November 2022. All information about the solution in the submission and its annexes should be consistent with the relevant regional plan and draft company water resource management plan.

2.3 Assessment

2.3.1 Purpose and basis for the assessment

RAPID will make recommendations to Ofwat based on its assessment of each solution on the following points:

- whether appropriate progress has been made in investigating and developing the solution in terms of the work completed and its quality and if not, what remedial actions are required to get solutions back on track (see further sections 2.3.2 – 2.3.3 below).
- the level of delivery incentive penalty, if appropriate, that should apply in the light of the quality and completeness of the evidence (see further section 2.3.4 below).
- whether expenditure has been allocated to the solution in line with the PR19 final determination and the submission has evidenced that it has been incurred efficiently. We will set out what proportion of expenditure is allowable, where there is evidence that

the expenditure has been allocated incorrectly or has been inefficiently incurred[1] (see further sections 2.3.5 – 2.3.6 below).
- whether the solution (and which of its options) should progress through the gated process and continue to use the development allowance to support this and if so whether there should be any adjustment to its allowance (see further section 2.3.7 below).
- whether there should be any change to solution partnering arrangements; and
- confirmation of subsequent gate activities for the solution.

The assessment is made on the basis of evidence presented in the submission and query responses (see further section 2.4 below). All information that solution owners wish to be taken into account must be referenced in your submission. We may also refer to information within published draft regional plans and WRMPs, but this will be by exception and solution owners should not rely on us doing this.

At gate two, solutions should be developed to a standard suitable for submitting into final regional plans or final WRMPs. This stage of the programme aims to further enhance the funding portfolio based on refined and consistent costs and benefits. This is the key stage at which suboptimal solutions and options are eliminated and viable solutions and options are carried forward to the pre-planning stage.

Assessment and decisions will also be made at the gate regarding:

- whether new or alternative solution and/or options should enter the gated process if proposed by solutions owners (see further section 11);
- what activities are required for the next gate; and
- the penalty incentive mechanism to be applied for subsequent gates.

2.3.2 Quality assessment criteria

The following criteria will be used for the assessment of the whether appropriate progress has been made in investigating and developing the solution and the quality of the work completed on the solution.

[1] Incorrectly allocated expenditure will be treated as core totex and subject to normal sharing arrangements.

No	Assessment criteria	Key considerations	What does good look like?
1	Robustness	• Strength of evidence • Completeness	• Appropriate evidence is presented to support assertions • Non-evidenced assertions are presented as uncertainties • The evidence and submission is complete for its stage • Where evidence is not complete, there is a clear and realistic plan to address gaps
2	Consistency	• Methodologies, guidance and policy • Other relevant plans and solutions	• Consistent with national legislation, policy, guidance and agreed methodologies. (Including Wales specific requirements where solutions are within or affecting Wales) • Consistent with other relevant plans and solutions • Any changes and deviations are well justified and supported with evidence
3	Uncertainty	• Risk management / mitigation plan • Delivery risks	• Appropriate understanding of certainty for stage • The range and impacts of the uncertainties are presented • Plan in place to quantify and manage/mitigate uncertainties

We will assess work done on each activity against the three assessment criteria as detailed in the table above. We will use these criteria to assess whether the submission meets expectations, falls short of expectations in some or many areas, or is unacceptable.

The quality assessment will also take into account the confidence provided by the Board assurance statement.

2.3.3 Submission categories

The submissions will be assessed into the following categories:

Category	Description
Meets expectation	Submissions that document that the expected activities have been completed to an acceptable quality to support the solution owners' recommendation to continue or stop progressing the solution. This category could also include submissions with minor issues but where there is compelling justification and/or explanation. Submitted on time.
Falls short of meeting expectations in some areas	Submissions with incomplete or insufficient evidence to give full confidence that the solution owners' recommendations are robust; where some aspects are incomplete or poor quality. Other aspects may be complete and of sufficient quality. Submitted on time.
Falls short of meeting expectation in many areas	Submissions with significant gaps and quality issues - for example, with gaps in material information to support solution owners' recommendations such that there is only limited confidence that solution owners' recommendations are robust; and/or late submission.
Unacceptable	Submission of such poor quality and/or progress made that it's not possible to assess.

2.3.4 Delivery Incentives

At gate two we will apply up to 30% of each company's total efficient spend (for the gate) as a penalty for submission delay or poor quality deliverables (incorporating completion of gate activities and required certainty of outputs).

The delivery incentives at gate two are the same as they were for gate one applied to the gate two allowances. They consider the submission timing, quality and progress through a two stage assessment. The initial stage, stage A, is a simple test of whether companies have submitted material by the gate submission deadline. This test is binary, companies either pass or fail, with a fail incurring the maximum 30% penalty. The second stage, stage B, focuses on the progress and quality of the submission.

Penalties will apply to the partner that causes the late submission, quality or progress issues. We acknowledge that this may be difficult to ascertain and expect that as part of the joint working agreements between companies, the process for identifying and agreeing the cause of any issues is described. In the event that we consider that it is unclear which party or parties have caused any delay or quality issue for a solution then all partners involved will receive the penalty.

Penalties will be applied through the PR24 reconciliation mechanism, as described in 'PR19 final determinations: Strategic water resource solutions'.

At gate two, we expect all solutions to achieve sufficient alignment in their development to support multi-solution decision making. For this reason, there will be no opportunity to remediate deficiencies identified at the assessment in order to defer penalties.

2.3.5 Efficiency of Expenditure

The activities that need to be carried out in order to investigate and develop a solution to gate two are listed in Annex 2 to the 'PR19 final determinations: Strategic regional water resource solutions'.

Expenditure must relate to activities undertaken to develop and investigate a specific solution. It must not include expenditure on water resource management planning and business planning activities that are baseline company activities.

Solution owners should discuss with RAPID any change in activities planned in advance, including activities that are considered not needed, and those that may be required but were not included in the list of indicative activities for gates two to four. Any agreed change in the activities to be undertaken will be confirmed in writing by RAPID.

The expenditure assessment considers expenditure incurred on the valid gate activities and outputs and considers costs against the allowance. Companies should complete the Efficiency of Expenditure template for each solution detailing incurred costs for each gate activity.

Activities should be allocated to the categories of Programme and Project Management; Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design; Option Benefits Development and Appraisal; Environmental Assessment; Data Collection, Sampling, and Pilot Trials; Procurement Strategy; Stakeholder Engagement; Legal, and Other. Further guidance for activities that belong in each category is included in the template.

Incurred costs for the gate activity should be presented in the 2017-18 price base and provided aligned to the agreed gate activities within each category listed above. These costs should be further broken down if any cost line is greater than £0.5 million in value.

The assessment takes into account the evidence of cost benchmarking presented as part of the submission as well as relevance, timeliness, completeness and quality. Any inefficient spend on valid gate activities will be returned to customers. Expenditure is allowed up to the agreed maximum allowance. Incorrectly allocated expenditure will be treated as core totex and subject to normal sharing arrangements.

Submissions should indicate any activities that were included in the forecast expenditure to gate two included in gate one submissions that were not carried out. Submissions should also include forecast expenditure to gate three in line with the appropriate gate activities as outlined in Annex 2 to the 'PR19 final determinations: Strategic regional water resource solutions' using the same template.

2.3.6 Early gate three spend

The PR19 final determination allows solution owners to spend gate three allowances during the assessment and decision period for gate two, in line with their submission recommendations for progression of the solution. In some cases, solution owners may need to undertake some gate three activities during the gate two period before submissions are made. In principle this is acceptable and should be discussed with RAPID before expenditure is incurred. Such expenditure should be clearly delineated as gate three spend when completing the efficiency of expenditure annex.

In order to keep investigation and development of a solution on track to be construction ready in the 2025-30 period, particularly if this is required early in the period, some solution owners may need to procure work for gate three activities before submissions are made.

This should be discussed in advance with RAPID. RAPID will consider requests of this nature on a case basis, taking account of the position of the solution in the published draft regional plans and bearing in mind that RAPID funding is additional to base funding provided to deliver WRMP19 and develop WRM24. Contracts should include break options so that if the solution does not progress beyond gate two, wasted spend can be avoided.

2.3.7 Solution progression

We expect solution owners to make recommendations for which solution(s) and option(s) should progress through a gate and continue to receive funding for their investigation and development.

These recommendations should be made on the basis of the outcome of solution owners' investigations and assessments to date both as part of the gated process and the solution's status in the regional plan and draft WRMPs. Clear reasons should be given for recommendations with supporting evidence clearly identified.

The focus at gate two is to ensure progress of solutions that are aligned to any available strategic plans for water resources management (including plans in draft) and meet criteria that test the need for accelerated development and regulatory oversight and support. In assessing the solution owner's recommendation to progress or not progress in the gated process we will consider the following:

- Is the solution in a preferred or alternative pathway in relevant regional plan or WRMP (where applicable) to be construction ready in 2025-30?
- Do regulators have any significant concerns with the solution's inclusion or non-inclusion in a WRMP or regional plan with any aspects that may impact its selection, to a level that they have (or intend to) represent on it when consulted?
- Is there value in accelerating the solution's development to be "construction ready" in 2025-30?
- Does the solution need continued enhancement funding for investigations and development to progress?
- Does the solution need the continued regulatory support and oversight provided by the Ofwat gated process and RAPID?
- Does the solution provide a similar or better cost / water resource benefit ratio compared to other solutions?
- Does the solution have the potential to provide similar or better value (environmental, social and economic value – aligned with the Water Resources Planning Guideline) compared to other solutions?
- Does a regulator or regulators have "showstopper" type concerns that have not been addressed through the strategic planning processes taking into account proposed mitigation?

We are expecting timing and activities for gate three onwards to diverge between solutions depending on whether they are in preferred or alternative pathways and when within the 2025-30 period they need to be "construction ready".

Solutions on preferred pathways should proceed to develop planning and consent applications and procurement. Solutions on alternative pathways should continue with evidence investigations and any other gated activities which enable the solution owners to switch to delivering these solutions, in line with trigger points and decision points in their regional plan or WRMP as appropriate.

The funding allowance for solutions in alternative pathways will be reduced accordingly and solution owners should set out proposals for this in their gate two submissions.

When compiling their submissions the solution owners should link their recommendation for progression with the information in section 7 (programme and planning).

2.4 Queries

There will be a short, quick response query process based on the approach used for the price review where solution owners will have two working days to respond to any query we raise. Throughout the remainder of the assessment period RAPID may raise queries, but the solutions owners will agree the response time with RAPID on receipt of the query.

Where solution submissions do not contain sufficient evidence to be scored a three (good) for quality or to clearly answer progression criteria, a query may be raised to investigate the area further.

Solution owners should aim to include all information required for assessment in their submissions and should not plan to supplement their original submission with additional material during this process. We will carry out our assessment on the basis of the submission made and answers received to our queries.

Queries will be sent to the nominated lead contact for each submission and answers to queries should be submitted via the submission portal in line with deadlines. Query responses should be published on the solution owners' websites no later than draft decisions are published.

2.5 Draft Decisions and Representations

RAPID, working with the partner regulators and with Natural Resources Wales, Natural England and CCW, undertakes the assessment of submissions and makes recommendations to Ofwat for each of the solutions assessed. Ofwat then considers these recommendations and publishes its draft decisions for representations.

Representations, including relevant evidence, on the draft decisions are invited from solution owners and all interested parties and should be submitted to RAPID at RAPID@ofwat.gov.uk

We encourage stakeholders to also provide feedback on specific solutions directly to the water companies through their consultations on WRMPs and to regional groups through the regional plan consultation process, which started in January 2022.

2.6 Final Decisions

At the end of the representation period RAPID reviews all representations and makes further recommendations to Ofwat. Ofwat will consider the representations received and RAPID's recommendations before reaching a final decision, which it will publish on the website along with the representations.

2.7 Expectations of Transparency

Solution owners are expected to publish their submissions including submission template, cover letter if it includes information forming part of the submission and annexes / appendices, at the same time as submitting them to RAPID. Query responses should be published by the date on which Ofwat publishes its draft decisions.

The submission template and cover letter should be unredacted (other than in respect of personal information). Information may be redacted from annexes / appendices, but we expect companies to provide its stakeholders and RAPID with strong, robust reasons for why it has been redacted. These reasons should be specific to the information concerned. They should also be consistent with exceptions available under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, taking into account the presumption in favour of disclosure and the inherent public interest in transparency and making as much information about the solutions available to customers and stakeholders as possible. We expect companies to keep the extent of redaction to a minimum.

Where redactions are made, an explanation as to the nature of the information redacted and the reason why information has been redacted should be provided to stakeholders. This will ideally be within the relevant document, alongside the redaction, for example as a footnote or as a replacement for the text redacted. Companies should also consider whether an accompanying note would assist stakeholders in better understanding the reasons for redactions.

When solution owners publish their gate submission, they should include all costs information unless it is information that has been redacted in WRMP24 tables in line with the instructions on completing those tables.

We expect that, at all times, companies will seek to be transparent with customers and stakeholders and will respond to any requests for further information in accordance with their obligations under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

RAPID is subject to both the Environmental Information Regulations and the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and will need to consider any requests for information in accordance with our obligations. If we receive a request for information, we will consult with solution owners at the time of the request and will take full account of their views, but we cannot give an assurance that we can maintain confidentiality in all circumstances.

3. Solution design

Key concept design information developed to a standard suitable for submitting in final regional plans or final water resource management plans should be provided.

3.1 Background and objectives

The submission should outline what requirements and objectives this solution is aiming to address, including requirements and objectives set out by the Environment Agency for England in the National Framework for Water Resources, published in 2020, the Water Strategy for Wales and regional and company plan(s). Proposals that affect Wales will have regard to the interests of Wales, in particular sustainable management of its natural resources and Welsh legislation and policies especially the guiding principles.

3.2 Solution, options and sub-options

The submission should provide descriptions about the solution, options and sub-option elements, and evidence of what has been considered. This should include:

- Solution description – what does it do.
- Evidence that a broad range of solution options have been considered with justification for why sub-optimal options have been eliminated and viable options selected to be carried forward including consideration of sub-option elements (key assets) interaction (both intra-regional and inter-regional) and scalability.
- Configuration of solution options and sub-option elements including a description of how the solution/ options/sub-option elements will be operated.
- A description of the key assets to be constructed as part of the solution including relevant diagrams/schematics.
- Evidence of, and any assumptions relating to Interaction within the solution, as well as between other proposed water resource solutions, in terms of system connectivity / impacts and mutual inclusivity/exclusivity

- Scalability within the solution, as well as between other proposed water resource solutions, in terms of dependency and phasing

4. Water resource assessment

At gate two we expect key information on anticipated utilisation and water resource benefits to be provided in the submission.

4.1 Utilisation

Information on utilisation should include the following:

- Quantitative presentation of anticipated operational utilisation rates determined from company and/ or regional modelling.
- Utilisation rates for dry year annual average operation, for events such as 1:500yr droughts, peak demand or as part of emergency response, in addition to standby, or normal-year operation.
- Where uncertainty exists in utilisation rates, a range of potential utilisation rates presented, evidenced with modelled calculations and description of scenarios considered.
- Third party options explored to increase utilisation and value from solution supply.
- Where multiple users (public water supply or third party) form part of the utilisation of the solution, the submission should set out how the solution owners have begun to consider prioritisation rules and commercial models (the detail of which may be presented in section 7).
- Gate three planned activities specify work to refine utilisation figures and remove uncertainty or assumptions where required (the detail of which may be presented in section 6.4).

4.2 Water Resource Benefit

Updated water resource benefit assessment, including to other water resources, potential conjunctive use benefit, and consistent with information provided to regional groups to support high-level assessment of regional water resource benefit;

- Updated water resource benefit assessment including potential conjunctive use benefit, consistent with information provided to regional groups to support high-level assessment of regional water resource benefit.
- Submission presents the water resource benefit of the solution, as a deployable output.
- Where only a yield is given, a clear and specific reason is detailed, for example the solution is a transfer that does not concern the area where the benefit is experienced.

- Where solution presents a yield, the submission signposts to solutions which receive the benefit of the yield, and the additional deployable output made possible as a result of receiving the yield.
- If the solution concerns offsetting a change or redirection of supply, deployable output is presented to ensure the water resource benefit is sufficient to maintain consumer supply;
- Deployable output is presented for the dry year annual average and critical periods, for events such as the 1:500 year drought.
- The methods and calculations are well evidenced, for example with modelling that utilises appropriate inflow sequences to test relevant drought events; up-to-date demand forecasts; and includes environmental and operational constrictions to the water resource benefit, and constraints from other users of the resource.
- The Level of Service against which the water resource benefit is calculated is explained.
- The submission demonstrates where the water resource benefit is received, and by whom. The water resource benefit is contextualised (and its need justified) through the impact is has on the forecast supply-demand balance of the benefiting area.

4.3 Long term opportunities and scalability

The scope and potential for wider resilience benefits is dependent on solution type, some solutions having much greater potential in this area than others. Evidence should be presented in the gate two submission that wider resilience benefits of each solution have been reassessed from gate one and refined following the regional modelling outputs, thoroughly exploring best value approaches.

Where wider benefits could be provided to third parties, proposals should be submitted demonstrating how those parties could contribute a fair share of the costs according to their own responsibilities and the benefits they realise.

Consideration of long-term opportunities and scalability of the solutions should be evidenced. Possible enhancements could include, but are not limited to:

- Operational supply resilience
- Climate change adaptation
- Supporting the resilience of the natural environment
- Flood resilience benefits
- Water quality benefits
- Enabling capacity increases in future

Evidence should be presented to show that scalability is being planned for in advance to provide the opportunity to increase the capacity or water resource benefit of the solution in the future. Consideration should be given to incorporating critical components that would be difficult to upgrade at a later date into the design from the outset. For example, it may be good value to include extra land assembly for additional pumping stations or modules of a

water treatment work. Similarly, if it is likely that a crossing of a sensitive site or complex engineering is required, for example if crossing a river, it may be prudent to dual pipe in this area so that such crossings do not need to be done twice. Evidence should be presented on the cost differential of including scalability. Solution owners should identify where the scalability costs move from marginal (and therefore good value) to significant cost increases which could outweigh the benefits. This trigger point should be clearly outlined in the solution cost tables – see section 8.1.

4.4 Infrastructure Resilience to the Risk of Flooding and Coastal Erosion

All infrastructure associated with the solutions must be designed to be resilient to flooding over the life of its design and delivered in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework / National Policy Statement for England, not being sited in an area at unacceptable risk or flooding or coastal erosion if the design has not taken sufficient account of the risk and suitable mitigation measures provided to deal with those risks. In Wales the Water Strategy sets out its expectations.

We expect companies to assess and identify where infrastructure associated with the solutions can be designed to optimise and deliver wider flood risk management benefits, either as stand-alone or in partnership with other organisations including other Risk Management Authorities (RMAs). This could include for example, designing infrastructure to attenuate flood waters or working with other RMAs to deliver collaborative infrastructure plans.

Designs should consider the safe operation and management of assets, in particular design implications to manage emergency drawdown for reservoir solutions, ensuring receiving infrastructure can cope and that any increased risk to receptors is understood and mitigated. Partnership funding arrangements for the life of the project, alongside wider considerations on environmental enhancement opportunities should also be evaluated.

Evidence on how the solutions owners have considered flood resilience and flood risk opportunities in its design should be presented in a concise written narrative included in the submission. This should include a high level assessment of the risk assets such as reservoirs pose which will be refined for later gates. The narrative should be structured such that it addresses opportunities and any constraints/risks, alongside proposed partnering opportunities for funding over the life of the project. An annex, not exceeding two pages in length, can be provided and published alongside if required.

5. Drinking water quality considerations

An updated assessment of drinking water quality considerations and potential risks to drinking water quality and supply issues/resilience should be provided. This should include:

- A plan for future work to develop Drinking Water Safety Plans.
- Details of proposed mitigation for any emerging contaminants identified.
- Evidence of stakeholder and consumer engagement, paying particular attention to consumers and stakeholders who will receive water from a different or blended source.
- A plan for continued engagement and any required mitigation provided.
- Details of any specific concerns from company drinking water quality teams and how they will be addressed.
- Details of any specific concerns from the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) and how these will be addressed.
- Consideration of the requirements of Regulation 31
- Consideration of any applicable The Network and Information Systems (NIS) Regulations 2018 or Security and Emergency Measures Direction (SEMD) requirements.
- Consideration of the Environment Agency (EA) document DWPAs-challenges-for-the-water-environment.odt (live.com)

You should ensure alignment with DWI guidance including, Resilience of water supplies in Water Resource Planning - Guidance Note (dwi.gov.uk) and its Supplementary notes on long term planning.

6. Environmental assessment

An updated environmental feasibility statement that includes potential risks, barriers and mitigation measures should be provided. The statement should be informed by the following:

6.1 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment

You must assess all your options to ensure they comply with and support the achievement of Water Framework Directive Regulation (WFD Regs) requirements and objectives set out in the River Basin Management Plans. This specifically means:

- Screening: Updated water body risk assessment.
- Options assessment: An assessment of options in relation to WFD objectives, allowing a comparison of the options and identification of those options are uncertain/unlikely to meet WFD objectives.
- Consideration of mitigation measures and monitoring, implementation of monitoring to reduce uncertainty of impacts and support identification of potential mitigation in relation to options within solutions that are uncertain/or are unlikely to be able to meet WFD objectives. Where options within solutions that could not meet objectives are taken forward, justification should be given to allow a clear audit trail.

- Regulation 19[2]: If applicable, gather evidence to meet Regulation 19 criteria.
- Addressing uncertainties: Provide a plan to gather further evidence for gate three. Report initial evidence at gate two.

6.2 Informal Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)

Although a full HRA for a solution is not required until a planning and/or permit application (or its equivalent, for example a Development Consent Order (DCO)) is submitted, it is strongly recommended that the principles of a HRA are followed to reduce the risk of non-compliance at the decision-making stage.

Therefore, we recommend the following:

- Updated informal Stage 1 screening – if relevant new information is available, any projects previously screened out should be reviewed and brought back in as necessary. Then taken to an informal stage 2 appropriate assessment.
- Preparation of informal Stage 2: An informal appropriate assessment should be commenced with data available and associated informal site integrity test. Any gaps in evidence should have clear future plans showing how and when this evidence will be available in advance of any full formal HRA feeding into a planning submission.
- If required and if possible, with evidence available: Begin to plan for informal stage 3 document. If on development of the informal appropriate assessment, it appears that risks remain from uncertainty in the assessment or actual risk to the integrity of the site, an informal assessment of Alternative Solutions (stage 3) could be commenced. If sufficient evidence is available to suggest no alternatives, then consideration could be given to commencing developing plans for a case for reasons of overriding public interest and compensatory measures (informal stage 4).

6.3 Environmental Appraisal

Strategic Environmental Assessment is implemented at the strategic scale and applies to plans and programmes. For many of the solutions, where they are more project based, an SEA may not be required. The solutions feed into the WRMPs and Regional Plans, which are both undergoing SEAs, and as such the solutions are more appropriately assessed for SEA purposes as part of these plans.

The solution owners should ensure that environmental assessment information is fed into the Regional Plans and WRMPs and are correctly represented. Justification should be given as to the preferred option within the solution taken forward. The SEA requirements of the solution should be discussed as part of your ongoing engagement with the environmental regulators

[2] The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2017

and with the SEA statutory consultees. Legal advice should be sought by the water company to determine the need for a statutory SEA.

At gate two, the submission should be supported by an annexed initial environment appraisal report that addresses the following:

- An update of the gate one work where relevant
- The environmental appraisal work undertaken to date – likely to be at a strategic scale.
- Baseline and analysis – this might include results of monitoring, modelling, environmental surveys, etc.
- Options assessment, with sufficient detail to allow comparison of options within the solution and identify potential effects (positive and negative) and opportunities.
- Assessment of the effects of the solution, an evaluation of their significance and any cumulative or in-combination effects.
- Clear justification as to options within the solution discounted, those taken forward, and the preferred option selected. Where the preferred option is identified, potential environmental effects and opportunities should be discussed.
- The appraisal work should include consideration of resilience (e.g. climate change,)
- A description of the connection to other assessments (e.g. biodiversity net gain, WFD, natural capital, carbon) and demonstrate how they have been considered within this initial appraisal work.
- Development of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
- Any future monitoring requirements of the identified environmental effects and efficacy of any included mitigation measures.
- A plan to address uncertainties and data gaps.

6.4 Other Environmental Considerations.

Biodiversity net gain (England only): This should support the net gain actions in the Government's 25 year Environment plan and aim to meet the likely future requirements as per the Environment Act.

Ecosystem resilience and Wellbeing (Wales only): Where the solution affects Wales you should consider your duties under the Environment (Wales) Act section 6 & & and the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act. This includes following the principles of Sustainable Management of Natural Resources (SMNR), contributing to the priorities within the Natural Resources Policy, carbon reduction, enhance biodiversity (and in so doing promote the resilience of ecosystems) and contribute to the wellbeing goals. The requirement of Welsh legislation is set out within the Water Resources Planning Guidance and Env/Society Supplementary Guidance Note for Wales.

Natural capital Assessment (NCA): A NCA should be completed/updated as the solution level and used to support identification of best value solutions. The NCA should be consistent with

WRMP24 guidelines supplementary guidance on Regional and WRMPs (including any differences in assessment requirements for Wales).

Methodologies should be consistent with any relevant legislation, guidance and follow best practice. This includes, where relevant, WRMP24, All Company Working Group guidance and the Environment Agency Invasive Non-native Species risk assessment tool.

6.5 Carbon

Solution development to gate two should follow the Water Resources Planning Guidelines for WRMP24 section 8.3.2 which states expectations for accounting for and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In Wales, expectations are set out in section 3 of the guiding principles for WRMPs.

The most up to date carbon costs and values as per government guidance should be used. The following additional guidance should be considered as per the Water Resources Planning Guidelines for WRMP24 section 8.3.2.

- UKWIR (2012) Framework for accounting for embodied carbon in water industry assets (12/CL/01/15)
- For carbon costs associated with the projected emissions you should use the latest government guidance on the cost of carbon. In particular you should consider the Green Book Supplementary Guidance
- The Carbon Accounting (Wales) Regulations 2018
- Environmental reporting guidelines: including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance
- PAS 2080: Carbon management in infrastructure
- HM Treasury infrastructure carbon review
- Towards a science-based approach to climate neutrality in the corporate sector
- ACWG Cost Consistency Methodology (August 2020), section 5
- ACWG Carbon Ambition
- Water UK's Net Zero 2030 Routemap
- Respective company and/or regional commitments
- Emissions factors for materials and activities taken from ICE CESMM price book and other recognised databases (such as Ecoinvent)
- Operational carbon from annual quantities and UKWIR carbon assessment workbook (v14)UKWIR framework for whole life carbon reducing both operational and embedded emissions in tandem.

Ofwat published its net zero principles position paper on 6th January 2022. Solutions should be designed in line with these principles. In particular companies need to prioritise the reduction of GHG emissions before the use of offsets, as set out in the GHG Management

Hierarchy[3] and that a whole life approach to carbon assessment is taken ensuring a focus on reducing both operational and embedded emissions in tandem.

Gate two submissions should clearly present the following:

- Assessments of the whole life carbon cost of the solution. Estimations of carbon costs and absolute operational and embodied carbon of the solution should be presented (in tCO2e) for all variations of solution options. Thorough consideration and discussion should be presented as to how whole life carbon has been reduced within the design. Discussion should be included on how carbon has been considered in the best value planning approaches, metrics and decision making and (operational and embedded carbon emissions are expected to be part of best value assessment and due consideration is expected to the six main greenhouse gases) show how solution designers are using relevant policies, frameworks and approaches to drive down carbon emissions within the solution design.

- A description of how solutions are embracing innovative designs and opportunities to generate or be powered by renewable energy and/or sequester carbon and explore joint opportunities with other sectors. Evidence may be sought as to whether a focus on carbon reduction has been able to drive down solution costs. The level of uncertainty associated with the solution carbon assessments will be expected to reduce as solutions are refined through the gated process. Assessment outlining key emission areas and considering opportunities to reduce emissions. We expect the submission to demonstrate consideration of Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions. This would include an explanation of how materials have been selected and whether the lowest carbon options have been considered as part of solution design (if lowest carbon options not taken forward, why not). We expect water companies to use their influence to help shape the supply chain where low carbon materials may not be readily available. Outline whether a role for monitoring and reporting on project emissions during and post project completion is envisaged.

7. Programme and planning

7.1 Project plan

A clear project-level plan that sets out the key solution-specific milestones to delivery and includes key activities and outputs that need to be undertaken and achieved prior to each subsequent gate should be provided. It should contain sufficient detail to support

[3] The GHG Management Hierarchy, as detailed by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2020 version), is a framework organisations can use to guide the scoping and strategic planning of their energy and carbon management activities.

assessment of progress in relation to delivery incentives (ie, clarity around important milestones and interdependencies) and include:

- The date when solution is required (based on company and regional plans, as appropriate), and any updates if this changes.
- The phasing of key activities and decisions.
- The assumptions and dependencies within the programme.
- Information about pre-construction activities (such as scoping, detailed design, development consent order (DCO) and direct procurement for customers (DPC)).
- The planned construction start date within the 2025-30 period.
- The earliest possible deployable output date (assuming planning started today) – which might be significantly earlier than the required date.
- An assessment of progress against the project plan that indicates whether or not it is on track. Reasons should be provided for any missed milestones and impacts on the overall programme caused by delays.
- An estimate of overall project delivery timescales for subsequent gates.
- Missing information – outline any information that is missing from the project plan and how this will be addressed before gate three.

7.2 Planning and consenting route

A land and planning strategy for the solution should be provided. This should cover:

- The preferred planning route for the solution and the key planning steps, including justification where applying for a section 35 direction in England where appropriate and the impact on the programme schedule.
- The strategy for obtaining other regulatory consents needed for construction and operation. This should include identification of consents needed and indicative application timings in relation to applications for planning and other consents. For likely DCO applications, consideration of which consents could be included within a DCO.
- The land lifecycle, including strategy and plan for effectively delivering it and explaining how the approach will support the effective and efficient delivery of planning consent, land acquisition, and delivery of the programme.
- How solution owners will ensure they will put in place adequate systems and resources, and that there are effective and efficient processes and governance arrangements for delivering the planning and land acquisition process.
- Initial thinking on the customer journey for all those who will be affected by the project and how solution owners will ensure a good experience for them.
- Risks and issues relating to land and planning and explaining how the strategy supports the management/mitigation of the risks.

In addition, please provide an update on work done to date to support the proposed land and planning process, including any pre-planning activity such as land referencing or field surveys.

7.3 Key risks and mitigation measures

An assessment of key risks to the solution's planned progress to completion (including requirements at gates) and an assessment of risks to costs and realisation of the benefits of the solution should be provided. This should include consideration of potential regulatory barriers to the solution's progress. The risk assessment should include proposed mitigation measures. It should present original risk scores and residual risk scores following mitigation. It must also be consistent with information presented in quarterly dashboards.

7.4 Proposed gate three activities and outcomes

As noted in section 2.3.7 above, we are expecting the timing and activities for gate three onwards to diverge between solutions depending on whether they are in preferred or alternative pathways and when within the 2025-30 period they need to be "construction ready".

Solutions on preferred pathways should proceed to develop planning and consent applications and procurement. Solutions on alternative pathways should continue with evidence investigations and any other gated activities which enable the solution owners to switch to delivering these solutions, in line with trigger points and decision points in their regional plan or WRMP as appropriate. The funding allowance for solutions in alternative pathways will be reduced accordingly and solution owners should set out proposals for this in their gate two submissions.

Solution owners should propose dates for gate three onwards aligned with the solution project plan. Those solutions which are required to be construction ready earlier should propose an earlier gate three date. We expect this to be no earlier than summer 2023. Those planned for later in the 2025-30 period should propose later gate dates.

By gate three, solution owners should have narrowed down their solution to a firm single, potentially scalable, option including location as included in final regional plans and WRMPs. This means that pre-planning application consultation should have been completed. We also expect companies to have developed a digital twin to test their design. The starting point for gate three activity proposals should be the list of activities included in the PR19 final determinations water resource solutions appendix.

Solution owners should set out proposals for gate three activities and outcomes, depending on whether they are on preferred or alternative pathways, penalty scale, assessment criteria and contributions. This should include explicit consideration of solution delay impacts.

7.5 Procurement, ownership and operation

At gate two, an updated procurement strategy should be provided. This should include:

- An updated assessment of how suitable the solution is (or whether parts of the solution may be appropriate) to be delivered by Direct Procurement for Customers (DPC);
- An assessment of which DPC tender models (e.g. early/late/split) are appropriate;
- An explanation of the likely preferred procurement route, the underlying rationale for the approach and how it aligns with the solution's programme plan; and
- An explanation of any alternative procurement strategies and delivery models that have been considered.

The assessment of suitability for DPC should set out the company's detailed assessment against the eligibility criteria for DPC established at PR19:

- Size: the project (or parts thereof) total in excess of £100m totex.
- Discrete: in line with Ofwat's guidance at PR19 companies should consider the technical discreteness of the project, including consideration where parts of the project can be separable from the whole and delivered via DPC
- Value for money: companies should follow Ofwat's prescribed standard assumptions

When assessing eligibility, consider whether the whole solution is suitable for DPC; where it is not the assessment should consider whether parts of the solution may be suitable. The procurement strategy should also assess whether the "licensing model" (e.g. as per the Thames Tideway Tunnel) may be more suitable for the solution and whether the solution may qualify for the approach under existing legislation.

The assessment of the approach to procurement should include:

- justification for the proposed DPC tender model (i.e. Early/Late/Very Late/Split tender models).
- a high-level consideration of the different procurement routes available under the Utility Contract Regulations that may be appropriate for the project including whether separating the procurement of the main work contracts from the procurement of finance (as seen on the Thames Tideway Tunnel project) may be appropriate and offer benefits.
- a detailed procurement plan, with an explanation of how it supports the overall plan, setting out the critical path including highlighting any dependencies and how risk of delay may be mitigated, and showing dates for DPC control points.
- an assessment of risks & issues associated with the preferred delivery route.an updated explanation of the preferred model of ownership and commercial arrangements between parties and the underlying rationale for the approach including:
    - what the operating arrangements are likely to be and how they may impact the commercial model;

  - potential options for the high-level commercial arrangements between the parties; and
- a summary of any market engagement carried out to date and a high-level plan of future market engagement.

8. Solution costs and benefits

8.1 Solution cost estimates

At gate two solution owners should present key cost information, building on information provided at gate one with reduced uncertainty in costs and benefits. This should include:

- Overall costs of construction and operation for each option.
- Detail of capital expenditure
- Detail of operating expenditure - include an indication of design life of the asset and any significant maintenance liabilities during operational life.
- Full comparison of net present cost for all options
- Optimism bias
- Assumptions and exclusions
- An indication as to whether solution costs are in line with relevant methodologies agreed with regulators and relevant green book guidance.
- Comparison of solution's costs with alternatives (as tested in regional or national modelling, with consideration of inter-regional and systems impacts)
- Description of where solution cost scalability moves from marginally more expensive to substantially more expensive (tipping points)

Solution owners should complete and provide the template developed by the All Company Working Group, consistent with the cost profiles information included within the WRMP24 Table 5[4], as an annex. Cost profile information includes capex, opex, financing cost, optimism bias, costed risk, discount rate for all feasible and preferred options and for options over £100 million also fixed and variable opex and capex unit costs.

When solution owners publish their gate submission, they should include all costs information unless it is information that has been redacted in WRMP24 tables in line with the instructions to complete those tables. These instructions provide for publication of water resource planning tables to help regulators, water company customers and other organisations understand and appraise the plan. They provide that the only information that should be redacted is information that the Secretary of State or Welsh Ministers have determined to be commercially confidential under section 37B(2) of the Water Industry Act

[4] Water Resources Planning Tables (WRMP24) - Ofwat

1991 and information where its publication would be contrary to the interests of national security.

8.2 Best Value and solution benefits

The aim of the WRMP and regional planning process is to develop and present a best value plan both in the short and long term and to select the best value programme of solutions, including strategic and non-strategic options. As explained in the introduction to this guidance and section 2.1, the choice of whether a solution should be implemented is not made within the RAPID gated process. This decision is taken within the regional plan and WRMP process.

The RAPID process draws on the assessments in the regional and company plans regarding best value considerations. Therefore, the gate two submissions should include a summary of the best value considerations relevant to each solution included in all the individual company WRMPs and regional plans where the solution appears. This should include the consideration of financial cost and how it will achieve an outcome that increases the overall benefit to customers, the wider environment and overall society.

The WRMP24 guidance describes how companies and regions should compile a best value plan.

The guidance encourages companies and regions to consider a wide range of metrics, risks and values, which should be supported by robust data, analysis and customer and stakeholder support. Solution development for gate two should follow the WRMP24 best value guidance (Water resources planning guideline - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)and should be aligned with the Public Value principals from Ofwat, published in July 2021 Public value in the water sector: a supporting set of principles.

Gate two submissions should clearly present a summary of the following:

- Which best value metrics have been applied to the solution within regional plans and individual company WRMPs. Any differences should be identified and explained.
- A summary of the best value metric evaluation outcomes including:
    - weights and scoring applied
    - non-monetised and monetised best value benefits (where possible) consistent with WRMP24 Table 5 for the solution within each company WRMP and regional plan where the solution appears
    - any significant differences in best value assessment evaluation outcomes for the solution between plans should be identified and explained.
- Evidence that approaches used for scoring and weighting metrics are consistent with those used within associated WRMPs and regional plans.
- An explanation of how the solution features within each WRMP and regional plan that it is included in. The explanation should clearly identify whether it appears in preferred or alternative pathways and the timing of its selection.

9. Stakeholder and customer engagement

At gate two, an update on stakeholder engagement should be provided to identify any issues that need further investigation. Stakeholder engagement should consider both customers and regions affected by the solutions. Solution owners should engage with partner regulators as well as all identified stakeholders. The gate two submission should include the following:

- An overview of engagement undertaken, completeness of stakeholder representation and key findings.
- A high-level summary of stakeholders' views and how they have been reflected in the work undertaken.
- Details of customer preference studies including how they have been reflected in the work undertaken, and conclusions reached.
- Details of the engagement with customers directly affected by the solution, such as those living or working nearby.
- Evidence of engagement with CCW.
- A description of the steps that have been taken by solution owners to ensure a high degree of transparency for customers and stakeholders.
- A description of how stakeholder concerns raised in representations at gate one have been addressed at gate two or will be addressed at future gates.
- Any outstanding work or work to be undertaken before the next gate.

10. Assurance

At gate two, an assurance statement should be provided from the Board of each solution owner, in its own words, that addresses the following points:

- it supports the recommendations for solution progression made in this submission and the recommendations for which options with the solution should be progressed;
- it is satisfied that progress on solution is commensurate with the solution being "construction-ready" for 2025-2030;
- it is satisfied that the work carried out to date is of sufficient scope, detail and quality as would be expected of a large infrastructure scheme of this nature at this stage; and
- it is satisfied that expenditure has been incurred on activities that are appropriate for gate two and is efficient.

Assurance statements should be signed by the Board or on behalf of the Board. Where an assurance statement is signed on behalf of the Board it should be clear that the person signing the statement has delegated authority to sign on behalf of the Board.

The assurance statement(s) should clearly set out the evidence, information and external and/or internal assurance that the Board has considered in providing assurance. This should be explained separately for each of the four points of the statement.

Joint solutions will require supporting statements from all partners' Boards.

11. New solutions

New solutions that have the potential to play a significant role in long-term resilience and can benefit more than one company or sector should be identified through the regional plan and the WRMP process. Many of these will then be progressed through the regional planning and WRMP process. It is not expected that all future water resources solutions will follow the RAPID strategic water resource solutions structured development process.

RAPID welcomes proposals from water companies for any new strategic solutions that will help to increase the resilience of the public water supply in England and Wales. Reducing the abstraction pressures on chalk streams and rivers, making best use of water resources in the north and solutions that will provide a benefit to Wales are just some of the issues RAPID would like to see explored.

Those proposing new solutions should engage early with regulators before significant work is undertaken on a new proposal. This engagement should include discussions to scope out what investigations, monitoring and evidence are required before submission at gates. This is important as the later a solution enters the gated process the greater the level of evidence required will be (in line with the indicative gate activities specified in the final determination).

Engagement should include the Environment Agency, Natural Resources Wales (if appropriate), the Drinking Water Inspectorate, Natural England and Ofwat. However, you may also need to engage with other regulators such as Historic England, Cawdr, the Forestry Commission or Ofgem for example.

Where a new solution impacts on another company's water resource position or options or on another sector, we expect the solution to be submitted as a joint proposal. Where this is not the case, the proposer should explain how feedback from engagement has been taken into account.

11.1 General principles

- RAPID will allow solution owners to submit evidence to justify inclusion of new solutions in the process at each gate, up to gate three (October 2023). The earlier the solutions enter

the RAPID programme, the easier it will be for a new solution to be incorporated and more benefits gained from its acceleration.

- The development allowance can be used, with Ofwat agreement, on alternative proposed solutions. New solutions can be identified by companies which already have a solution in the portfolio but also by those that are currently not funded through this programme.
- We expect that gate activity deliverables up to the point of substitution will be available for the transferring-in solution to allow Ofwat to make a decision about whether this is a suitable use of funds.
- The development allowance for strategic regional water resources solutions is set to the maximum of £469 million for 2020-25. Therefore, any solution and/or partner substitutions and potential additions will be considered within this limit.
- Any work completed before a solution enters the programme will be covered out of companies' base costs and will not be part of the Ofwat end of period reconciliation process.

11.2 Criteria questions

New solutions should be submitted in the standard submission template for the relevant gate. In addition, RAPID requires a separate supporting note containing information to answer the following questions:

- Is there value in accelerating the solution's development to be 'construction ready' for the 2025-2030 period?
- Does the solution need additional enhancement funding for investigations and development?
- Does the solution need the additional regulatory support and oversight provided by the Ofwat gated process and RAPID?
- Does the solution provide a similar or better cost / water resource benefit ratio compared to current solutions?
- Does the solution have the potential to provide similar or better value (environmental, social and economic value – aligned with the Water Resources Planning Guideline) compared to current solutions?

11.3 New Solution Timeline

When	What's required	Lead responsibility
As early as possible but at least 4 months prior to the gate	Conversation with RAPID to highlight any proposed new solution(s) that are likely to be presented at the upcoming gate.	Water companies (and region if appropriate)
3 months prior to the gate	Basic written summary of the solution (similar level of information required for a feasible scheme in a WRMP using the solution overview format and including answers to the questions above).	Water companies (and region if appropriate)
2 months prior to the gate	Written confirmation that the solution will be submitted at the gate. Further discussion with RAPID on the proposed solution (based on information submitted) and confirmation of next steps.	Water companies (and region if appropriate)
Gate	Submit information using standard templates meeting requirements for that gate. Submit supporting note explaining how the solution meets the new solution criteria.	Water companies
Gate	Follow gate process and recommendation criteria	RAPID and Ofwat
Close of gate process	Confirm solution acceptability and funding decision (for PR24). Letter identifying any additional information required prior to next gate.	Ofwat

12. Ofwat decision process

The decision about whether a solution should be added to the programme will be made by Ofwat (alongside the other decisions that Ofwat will make at the gate) taking into account RAPID's recommendation. The evidence the solution owners provide will be tested against the appropriate gate requirements and the criteria questions set out above.

The reconciliation mechanism enables the reallocation of funding for changes in solutions or solution partners, up to gate three. This reconciliation includes the potential to reallocate funding to solutions and solution partners that were not identified at the time of the final determination.

13. Flexibility

The gated process is intended to ensure that strategic water resource solutions progress at pace and make an efficient use of the development funding; it is not intended to create additional requirements. To maintain the focus on acceleration and efficiency RAPID is open to flexibility in the timing of assessments and decisions. This could include, for example,

staggering the standard gate submission dates or making some decisions outside of gate assessment windows – for example, dealing with showstoppers that emerge long before the gate submission or decisions to drop options within a solution which have a financial impact on gate allowances. RAPID will consider suggestions put forward by solution owners on a case-by-case basis. Any assessment would follow the same process as has been outlined in this guidance.

Appendix A – References

25 Year Environment Plan - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

A Framework for Accounting for Embodied Carbon in Water Industry Assets (ukwir.org)

All Company Working Group (ACWG) Design Principles, Process and Gate two Interim Guidance, which sets out activities required to develop solution's design in line with this document's expectations for gate two

ACWG cost template

The Carbon Accounting (Wales) Regulations 2018 (legislation.gov.uk)

Carbon management in infrastructure (bsigroup.com)

Carbon valuation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

DWI Regulation 31

The Network and Information Systems (NIS) Regulations 2018

DWPAs-challenges-for-the-water-environment.odt (live.com)

DWI guidance

Environmental Reporting Guidelines (publishing.service.gov.uk)

Efficiency of Expenditure template

Green Book supplementary guidance: valuation of energy use and greenhouse gas emissions for appraisal - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Habitats regulations assessments: protecting a European site

Infrastructure Carbon Review (publishing.service.gov.uk)

Meeting our future water needs: a national framework for water resources

Net zero principles position paper - Ofwat

PR19 final determinations: Strategic regional water resource solutions

Price review process - Drinking Water Inspectorate (dwi.gov.uk)

River basin management plans: 2015

Draft river basin management plans: 2021

Standard gate two submission template

Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Towards-a-science-based-approach-to-climate-neutrality-in-the-corporate-sector-Draft-for-comments.pdf (sciencebasedtargets.org)

Water Strategy for Wales

Water resources planning guideline - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)[5]

Water Resources Planning Tables (WRMP24) - Ofwat

Water UK – Net Zero 2030 Routemap

[5] *The .gov website will be updated with the December 2021 version by the in EA January 2021. Contact RAPID for PDF version.*

Ofwat
Centre City Tower
7 Hill Street
Birmingham B5 4UA

Phone: 0121 644 7500
Fax: 0121 644 7533

© Crown copyright 2022

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This document is also available from our website at www.ofwat.gov.uk.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to mailbox@ofwat.gov.uk.

OGL