

RIIO-ED2 Draft Determinations Consultation Question Master List

Overview

6. Adjusting allowances for uncertainty

- Q1. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new funding mechanism for PoLR activities?
- Q2. What are your views on our two proposed options, and do you agree with our preferred option of a DRS?
- Q3. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a re-opener to deal with recommendations from the Storm Arwen review, our proposed trigger and re-opener window?
- Q4. Do you agree with our proposal to maintain the RIIO-ED1 High Value Project mechanism and focus it on non-load related HVPs in RIIO-ED2?
- Q5. Do you agree with our proposal to remove the RIIO-ED1 smart meter volume driver?
- Q6. Do you agree with our proposed approach for a common materiality threshold being applied to RIIO-ED2?

9. Approach to the Totex and Business Plan Incentive Mechanisms

- Q7. Do you agree with our view that all the DNOs have passed Stage 1 of the BPI?
- Q8. Do you agree with our overall approach regarding treatment of CVP proposals?

10. Increasing competition

- Q9. Do you agree with our proposed position on early and late competition?

11. RIIO-ED2 in the round, post appeals review and pre-action correspondence

- Q10. Do you have any views on the proposed scope of the FDQ process and pre-action correspondence, including on the proposed timing for sending such to Ofgem?

12. Access and Forward-looking Charges Significant Code Review

Q11. Do you agree with our proposal to not introduce a specific uncertainty mechanism to manage the impact of the Access SCR (and address it through the LRE mechanisms instead)? Please explain why.

Core Methodology

2. Embedding the consumer voice in RIIO-ED2

Core-Q1. Do you agree with our proposals for the enduring role of the CEG?

Core-Q2. Do you see value in the CEGs working together to deliver more coordinated and comparative reporting on some of the DNOs' Business Plan commitments?

3. Networks for Net Zero

Core-Q3. Do you agree with our proposal to adjust allowances to £2.68bn to account for the concerns highlighted by our assessment?

Core-Q4. Do you agree with our proposed secondary reinforcement volume driver and LV services volume driver and the associated controls?

Core-Q5. Do you agree with our proposed LRE re-opener?

Core-Q6. Do you agree with our proposed approach to the Net Zero re-opener?

Core-Q7. Do you agree with our proposed approach to the value of the SIF?

Core-Q8. Do you agree with our proposed approach to weighting SSMD criteria and benchmarking RIIO-ED2 NIA requests against RIIO-ED1?

Core-Q9. Do you agree with our proposed approach to setting NIA allowances?

Core-Q10. Do you agree with our proposal to allow DNOs to carry over any unspent NIA funds from the final year of RIIO-ED1 into the first year of RIIO-ED2?

Core-Q11. Do you agree with our proposed approach for the Annual Environmental Report ODI-R?

Core-Q12. What are your views on the proposed mid-period review on DNO environmental performance and their progress to targets?

Core-Q13. Do you agree with our consultation position for the DNOs' EAP proposals in RIIO-ED2 as set out in this document? (Further detail included in Appendix 1 of this document)

Core-Q14. Do you agree with our proposal to withdraw the Environmental Scorecard ODI-F for RIIO-ED2?

Core-Q15. Do you agree with our proposed approach to design of the Environmental Re-opener?

Core-Q16. Do you agree with our proposal for addressing PCB contamination in PMTs through a volume driver in RIIO-ED2?

4. Supporting a smarter, more flexible, digitally enabled energy system

Core-Q17. Do you agree with our proposal for implementing a Digitalisation Licence Obligation?

Core-Q18. Do you agree with our proposal to have staggered publications of Digitalisation Strategies between RIIO-ED2 and RIIO-2 licensees?

Core-Q19. Do you agree with our proposed Digitalisation re-opener?

Core-Q20. Do you agree with the proposed enhanced reporting framework associated with IT/OT Data and Digitalisation spend and DSAP investment proposals?

Core-Q21. Do you agree with our proposal to adopt TBM as part of the RIGs/RRP?

Core-Q22. Do you agree with our intention to modernise the regulatory reporting process?

Core-Q23. Do you agree with the proposed timeline for implementation of this modernisation?

Core-Q24. Do you agree with our proposed design of the DSO incentive?

Core-Q25. What are your views on the outturn performance metrics and RRE we are proposing to include in the DSO incentive? If you do not support their inclusion, please outline which alternative outturn performance metric(s) or RRE you think should be included in the framework instead.

Core-Q26. Do you agree with our proposal for the DSO re-opener?

Core-Q27. Do you agree with our proposal to introduce a new whole system strategic planning Licence Obligation?

Core-Q28. What are your views on the digital tools that could be used to support this?

5. Meet the needs of consumers and network users

Core-Q29. Do you agree with our proposed target and thresholds for the deadband, maximum reward and penalty?

Core-Q30. Do you agree with our proposed approach to working with DNOs to implement Strom Arwen actions related to customer satisfaction?

Core-Q31. Do you agree with our proposed target and maximum penalty score?

Core-Q32. Do you agree with our proposal to remove the activities proposed from DNOs' baseline allowances?

- Core-Q33. Do you agree with our proposals for the Consumer Vulnerability ODI-F?
- Core-Q34. Do you agree with the performance metrics we are proposing to include in the incentive and the approach to setting targets and associated deadbands, performance caps and penalty collars? If not, please explain why and give details of your preferred alternative.
- Core-Q35. Do you agree with our proposal for the Annual Vulnerability Report ODI-R?
- Core-Q36. Do you agree with the proposed content of the annual report? If not, please explain why and give details of your preferred alternative.
- Core-Q37. Do you agree with setting the maximum reward and penalty limit at +/- 50% of the target?
- Core-Q38. Do you agree with setting a deadband of +/-20% of the target?
- Core-Q39. Do you agree with our proposed design of the Major Connections incentive?
- Core-Q40. Do you agree with our proposed approach to target setting and applying the penalty?
- Core-Q41. Do you agree with our proposal to require reputational reporting of timeliness metrics for all RMS?
- Core-Q42. Do you agree with our proposal to launch a wider review of the Connections GSoP (that is, beyond updating the payment amounts for inflation and incorporating standards for DG customers)?
- Core-Q43. Do you have any views on what else could be done to help speed up connections to the distribution network and or develop a standard for the overall (ie, end to end) time to connect?

6. Maintain a safe, resilient and reliable network

- Core-Q44. Do you have evidence that customers would be willing to face an increase in their bills to also receive an increase in their reliability, including that they understand the actual cost and how this translates into average power cuts?
- Core-Q45. Do you have evidence of the cost of reliability improvements and the impact that lowering the revenue cap will have on them being achieved?
- Core-Q46. What are your views on moving to an asymmetric cap and collar?
- Core-Q47. Are there alternatives to reducing the revenue cap that you think would better balance increases in reliability and the cost to consumers than reducing the revenue cap?
- Core-Q48. Do you agree with how we have characterised the operation of the current CML methodology and our reasons for changing to setting targets in line with our CI methodology?

Core-Q49. Do you agree with our rationale for retaining our RIIO-ED1 position on QoS funding? Can you provide any evidence that an alternative approach would not result in double rewarding alongside the IIS?

Core-Q50. Do you have any examples of situations where fault-related interruptions could be genuinely “exceptional” and how these could be separately identified from those that occur during planned works?

Core-Q51. Do you agree with our assessment of the OEE thresholds and the financial impact on each DNO?

Core-Q52. Do you agree with our proposal not to have an end-of-period adjustment mechanism? If not, what criteria should we use to determine whether a DNO has used its allowance for WSC, without it creating uncertainty?

Core-Q53. Are there any other areas or metrics that we should include in our governance framework?

Core-Q54. Do you agree with our proposed approach on NARM?

Core-Q55. Do you agree with our proposal to pass through SW 1-in-20 costs as a variant totex allowance rather than a fixed allowance in RIIO-ED2?

Core-Q56. Do you agree with our proposal to not set a cap for the amount that DNOs can adjust their allowance by, in the event they experience a SW 1-in-20 storm?

Core-Q57. Do you agree with our proposed approach to the physical site security re-opener?

Core-Q58. Do you agree with our proposed approach to the ESR re-opener?

Core-Q59. Do you agree with our approach to fund DNO telecoms resilience activities through baseline allowances?

Core-Q60. Do you agree with our proposal to assess the cyber resilience IT and OT plans against our BPG and RIIO-2 re-opener guidance?

Core-Q61. Do you agree with our proposed re-opener windows for cyber resilience OT and IT?

Core-Q62. Do you agree with our proposal to apply a UIOLI allowance to cyber resilience OT to manage the uncertainty around costs?

7. Delivering at lowest cost to energy consumers

Core-Q63. Do you agree with our proposed approach to pre-modelling normalisations and adjustments?

Core-Q64. Do you agree with our approach to totex benchmarking?

Core-Q65. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for primary reinforcement?

Core-Q66. Do you agree with the application of a volume adjustment based on the industry average ratio of forecast capacity added relative to the forecast demand growth

above firm capacity? If not, what do you consider to be a better approach to assessing the efficiency of a DNO's proposed workload for primary network reinforcement?

Core-Q67. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for secondary reinforcement?

Core-Q68. Do you agree with the level of disaggregation and period of data used to calculate the unit costs listed in the table above for transformer reinforcement, circuit reinforcement and proactive service reinforcement?

Core-Q69. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for fault level reinforcement?

Core-Q70. Do you agree with our proposed adjustments to account for outlier volumes data for ENWL and SSES?

Core-Q71. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for connections?

Core-Q72. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for NTTCC expenditure?

Core-Q73. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach on asset replacement?

Core-Q74. Do you agree with our assessment approach to refurbishment?

Core-Q75. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for asset replacement driven civil works?

Core-Q76. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Condition Based Civil Works?

Core-Q77. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for diversions?

Core-Q78. Do you agree with our proposed approach for Rail Diversions?

Core-Q79. Do you agree with our proposed approach to assessing Non-Operational, Operational and Business Support IT&T costs?

Core-Q80. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Legal and Safety?

Core-Q81. Do you agree with our approach to assessing Overhead Line Clearance costs?

Core-Q82. Do you agree with our proposed approach to assessing ESR costs?

Core-Q83. Do you agree with our proposed approach to assessing QoS and NoSR costs?

Core-Q84. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Physical Security?

Core-Q85. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Flood Mitigation?

Core-Q86. Do you agree with the proposed approach to assessing Rising and Lateral Mains costs?

- Core-Q87. Do you agree with our approach to assessing WSCs?
- Core-Q88. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Losses?
- Core-Q89. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for environmental reporting?
- Core-Q90. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for PCBs?
- Core-Q91. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Property?
- Core-Q92. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for STEPM?
- Core-Q93. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Vehicles and Transport?
- Core-Q94. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for HVPs?
- Core-Q95. Do you see any merit in setting a HVP threshold for RIIO-ED2, and if so should it be based on the RIIO-ED1 threshold?
- Core-Q96. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for faults and ONIs?
- Core-Q97. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Tree Cutting?
- Core-Q98. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Severe Weather 1-in-20 Events?
- Core-Q99. Do you agree with our proposed approach to assessing Inspections and Repair & Maintenance costs?
- Core-Q100. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for NOCs other?
- Core-Q101. Do you agree with our proposed assessment approach for Smart Metering Rollout?
- Core-Q102. Do you agree with our approach to assessing CAI costs?
- Core-Q103. Do you agree with the proposed assessment approach for Business Support costs?
- Core-Q104. Do you agree with our approach to assessing streetworks costs?
- Core-Q105. Do you agree with our proposal to carry out a demand driven post-modelling adjustment?
- Core-Q106. Do you agree with our proposal to not carry out any Quality of Service based adjustments?
- Core-Q107. Do you agree with our approach to combining our totex and disaggregated benchmarking models?
- Core-Q108. Do you agree with our approach to setting and applying the efficiency challenge using a glide path between the 75th and 85th percentile over a 3-year period?
- Core-Q109. Do you agree with our proposed RPEs allowances? Please specifically consider our proposed notional cost structure, assessment of materiality, and choice of indices in your answer.
- Core-Q110. Do you agree with our proposed approach to setting the ongoing efficiency challenge and the level of challenge applied?

Core-Q111. Do you agree with our proposed disaggregation methodology?

Finance Annex

Consultation question on allowed return on debt

FQ1. Do you agree with our approach to estimating efficient debt costs and setting allowances for debt costs?

Step 1 - Consultation question on risk-free rate and equity indexation

FQ2. Do you have any views on the model to implement equity indexation that is published alongside this document, (the 'WACC Allowance Model - RIIO-ED2 30th April 2022 update Alternative Wedge')?

FQ3. In light of the upcoming change to the definition of RPI in 2030, should the RPI-CPIH inflation wedge be based on: a) a single year (as shown in the WACC allowance model when: cell D2 is "year 5 forecast" and cell B5 is "01/04/2022"); or b) should it be based on 20 years of inflation forecasts (as shown in the WACC allowance model when: cell D2 is "20 year geometric" and cell B5 is "01/04/2031")?

Step 1 - Consultation questions on TMR

FQ4. Is there evidence that suggests we should change our approach to TMR for RIIO-ED2?

FQ5. Can stakeholders confirm their view on the trade-off between: the objectivity of using outturn averages (even though the results may be materially higher or lower in future price controls than current TMR expectations); versus the benefits of putting more weight on current expectations (noting the evidence from cross-checks and the associated risk of subjectivity)?

FQ6. Do stakeholders agree with our proposal to apply the same TMR for RIIO-ED2 (a mid-point of 6.5% CPIH) as we did for RIIO-GD&T2?

Step 1 - Consultation questions on beta

FQ7. Do you believe that DNOs have a higher or lower level of systematic risk than the GD&T companies during their respective RIIO-2 periods?

FQ8. What are your views on the relative risk comparison shown in Table 10?

FQ9. Do you have any evidence that suggests the beta for GD&T companies has materially changed since RIIO-GD&T2 Final Determinations in December 2020?

Step 2 - implied cost of equity consultation questions

FQ10. Do you agree with our interpretation of the cross-check evidence?

FQ11. Do you agree with our updated MAR and OFTO cross-check techniques, in terms of drawing better inferences for RIIO-ED2?

FQ12. Do you agree with the cross-checks we have used and are there other cross-checks we should consider?

FQ13. Do you consider we should put greater weight on cross-checks or reconsider our CAPM parameters in light of the adjusted cross-check results?

Step 3 - allowed return on equity consultation questions

FQ14. Do you agree that we should not adjust for expected outperformance when setting baseline allowed returns on equity?

FQ15. Do you believe there is new evidence which would support an adjustment downwards (eg expected outperformance) or upwards (eg aiming up) that we have not yet considered?

Inflation and WACC consultation questions

FQ16. Do you think we should adjust our approach to allowed returns (noting our approach to expected inflation for WACC and outturn inflation for RAV as described above) so that outturn inflation does not permit the notional company to generate real equity returns that are materially higher or lower than our cost of equity allowance? What would be the consequences to consumers and DNOs of doing so?

FQ17. If you believe we should make such an adjustment, what is the best method for making it?

FQ18. If you don't believe we should make such an adjustment, how should we ensure that the fairness of the price control is maintained to prevent ex post returns from deviating from ex ante expectations for both consumers and investors?

Consultation questions on financeability

FQ19. Do you agree with our approach to assessing financeability?

FQ20. Do you have any evidence that would enable us to improve our calibration of stress test scenarios?

FQ21. Do you agree with the requirement to provide the Financial Resilience Report within 60 days?

Consultation questions on corporation tax

FQ22. Do you agree with our proposals to make allocation and allowance rates variable values in the RIIO-ED2 PCFM?

FQ23. Do you agree with the proposed additional protections? In particular:

FQ24. Do you have any views on a materiality threshold for the tax reconciliation?

FQ25. Do you think that the "deadband" used in RIIO-ED1 is an appropriate threshold to use? If not, what would be a more appropriate alternative?

FQ26. Do you have any views on our proposals relating to the Tax Trigger and Tax Clawback mechanisms? In particular, do you have any views on a proposed "glide path" for the notional gearing levels used in the tax clawback calculation?

Consultation question on Return Adjustment Mechanisms

FQ27. Do you agree with our proposals for the RAM thresholds and adjustment rates?

Consultation question on indexation of the regulatory asset value (RAV)

FQ28. What are your views on the technical implementation of the switch to CPIH as set out in the attached PCFM?

Consultation question on regulatory depreciation and economic asset lives

FQ29. Do you agree with our proposal to set depreciation policy on RAV additions in the RIIO-ED2 period to 45-years straight line, based on the average economic life of the assets?

Consultation question on capitalisation rates

FQ30. Do you agree with our proposal that we should set different capitalisation rates for ex ante allowances and re-openers and volume drivers?

FQ31. Do you have any evidence that would enable us to improve our estimates of regulatory capitalisation rates?

Consultation question on RAV opening balances

FQ32. Do you have any views on the use of forecast RAV opening balances for the start of RIIO-ED2, which will be trued-up following RIIO-ED1 closeout?

Consultation question on transparency through RIIO-ED2 reporting

FQ33. Do you agree that additional corporate governance reporting described (including on executive director remuneration and dividend policies), will help to improve the

legitimacy and transparency of a company's performance under the price control? If not, please outline your views in relation to the rationale provided for these additional requirements, including consumer protection.

Questions on consolidated reporting and calculation of allowed revenue

FQ34. What are your views on the proposed consolidation of the revenue RRP and PCFM, or applying a fully dynamic concept of allowed revenue?

Questions on licensee self-publication of allowed revenue

FQ35. What are your views on allowing licensees to self-publish the PCFM with their charging statements, rather than relying on an Ofgem publication or direction to determine allowed revenue?

Questions on best vs reasonable endeavours in charge setting

FQ36. What are your views on having a best endeavours obligation for charge setting: "The licensee must, when setting Network Charges, use its best endeavours to ensure that Recovered Revenue equals Allowed Revenue"?

Consultation questions on the appropriate time value of money

FQ37. What are your views on applying a single time value of money to all prior year adjustments, based on nominal WACC?

Question on forecasting

FQ38. What are your views on our proposed approach to using forecasts within RIIO-ED2?

Questions on forecasting penalty mechanism

FQ39. What are your views on the proposed charging penalty mechanism?

FQ40. What are your views on the proposed revenue forecasting penalty mechanism?

Consultation question on incentive lags

FQ41. What are your views on removing lags from incentives?

Consultation question on baselines for ODI incentive rates, caps, and collars

FQ42. What is your view on using RoRE as a general baseline for describing ODI caps, rather than base revenue?

FQ43. What is your view on fixing the potential £m 20/21 value of incentives using one number for all years, based on a forecast of RIIO-ED2 at Final Determinations (an approach similar to RIIO-ED1)?

FQ44. What is your view on the method of calibrating incentive caps in RoRE terms, or the overall proposed incentive caps?

Consultation question on bad debts

FQ45. What are your views on our proposal to remove the Bad Debt terms from the pass-through licence condition?

Consultation question on revenue profiling

FQ46. Should Ofgem allow proposals to re-allocate or re-profile revenue throughout the RIIO-ED2 period and what profiles could be considered in the customers' interest?

ENWL Annex

2. Setting Outputs

ENWL-Q1. What are your views on the company specific parameters we have proposed for the common outputs that we have set out above?

ENWL-Q2. What are your views on our proposals for ENWL's bespoke ODIs?

ENWL-Q3. What are your views on our proposals for ENWL's bespoke price control deliverables?

ENWL-Q4. What are your views on our proposals for ENWL's CVPs?

3. Setting baseline allowance

ENWL-Q5. What are your views on our proposals for the outcome of Stages 3 and 4 of the BPI for ENWL?

4. Adjusting baseline allowances for uncertainty

ENWL-Q6. What are your views on our proposals for ENWL's bespoke UM?

5. Innovation

ENWL-Q7. What are your views on the level of proposed NIA funding for ENWL?

NPg Annex

2. Setting Outputs

NPg-Q1. What are your views on the company specific parameters we have proposed for the common outputs that we have set out above?

NPg-Q2. What are your views on our proposal to reject NPg's bespoke price control deliverable?

NPg-Q3. What are your views on our proposals for NPg's CVPs?

3. Setting baseline allowances

NPg-Q4. What are your views on our proposals for the outcome of Stages 3 and 4 of the BPI for NPg?

5. Innovation

NPg-Q5. What are your views on the level of proposed NIA funding for NPg?

SPEN Annex

2. Setting outputs

SPEN-Q1. What are your views on the values for the company specific parameters we have proposed for the common outputs that we have set out above?

SPEN-Q2. What are your views on our proposals for SPEN's bespoke ODIs?

SPEN-Q3. What are your views on our proposals for SPEN's bespoke PCDs?

SPEN-Q4. What are your views on our proposals for SPEN's CVPs?

3. Setting baseline allowances

SPEN-Q5. What are your views on our proposals for the outcome of Stages 3 and 4 of the BPI for SPEN?

4. Adjusting baseline allowances for uncertainty

SPEN-Q6. What are your views on our proposals for SPEN's bespoke UMs?

5. Innovation

SPEN-Q7. What are your views on the level of proposed NIA funding for SPEN?

SSEN Annex

2. Setting outputs

SSEN-Q1. What are your views on the company specific parameters we have proposed for the common outputs that are set out above?

SSEN-Q2. What are your views on our proposals for SSEN's bespoke ODIs?

SSEN-Q3. What are your views on our proposals to reject SSEN's CVP relating to Embedded Whole Systems Support Services for Local Authorities and its CVP relating to supporting broadband to island communities through DNO assets?

SSEN-Q4. What are your views on our consultation position to accept SSEN's CVP to protect marine biodiversity (life below water)?

SSEN-Q5. What are your views on our consultation position to accept and partially reward SSEN's CVP for personal resilience plans?

SSEN-Q6. What are your views on our proposal for SSEN's 'Energy Efficiency Accelerator for Smarter Networks' and 'Local and community flexibility market stimulation' CVP?

3. Setting baseline allowance

SSEN-Q7. What are your views on our proposals for the outcome of Stages 3 and 4 of the BPI for SSEN?

4. Adjusting baseline allowances for uncertainty

SSEN-Q8. What are your views on our proposals for SSEN's bespoke UMs?

SSEN-Q9. What are your views on our proposal for a re-opener? Do you think this is the most suitable mechanism to mitigate investment decision risks in this area?

SSEN-Q10. What are your views on our proposal for a re-opener to deal with the uncertain costs associated with Shetland? Do you think this is the most suitable mechanism to mitigate investment decision risks in this area?

5. Innovation

SSEN-Q11. What are your views on the level of proposed NIA funding for SSEN?

UKPN Annex

2. Setting Outputs

UKPN-Q1. What are your views on the company specific parameters we have proposed for the common outputs that we have set out above?

UKPN-Q2. What are your views on our proposals for UKPN's bespoke ODIs?

UKPN-Q3. What are your views on our proposal to implement a collaborative streetworks ODI-F as set out above?

UKPN-Q4. What are our views on our proposals for UKPN's bespoke PCDs?

UKPN-Q5. What are your views on our proposal to fund investment to release capacity in off-gas grid areas ahead of need via a PCD as set out above?

UKPN-Q6. Which metrics could be used for holding UKPN to account for delivery of its off-gas grid proposal via a PCD and protecting consumers by clawing back allowances?

UKPN-Q7. What are your views on our proposal for UKPN's CVPs?

3. Setting baseline allowances

UKPN-Q8. What are your views on our proposals for the outcome of Stages 3 and 4 of the BPI for UKPN?

4. Adjusting baseline allowances for uncertainty

UKPN-Q9. What are your views on our proposals for UKPN's bespoke UMs?

5. Innovation

UKPN-Q10. What are your views on the level of proposed NIA funding for UKPN?

WPD Annex

2. Setting Outputs

WPD-Q1. What are your views on the company specific parameters we have proposed for the common outputs that we have set out above?

WPD-Q2. What are your views on our proposals on WPD's bespoke output delivery incentives?

WPD-Q3. What are your views on our proposals for WPD's bespoke price control deliverables?

WPD-Q4. What are your views on our proposals for WPD's CVPs?

3. Setting baseline allowances

WPD-Q5. What are your views on our proposals for the outcome of Stages 3 and 4 of the BPI for WPD?

4. Adjusting baseline allowances for uncertainty

WPD-Q6. What are your views on our proposals on WPD's bespoke UMs?

5. Innovation

WPD-Q7. What are your views on the level of proposed NIA funding for WPD?