

Guidance

Price Control Deliverable Reporting Requirements and Methodology: Version 6

Publication date: 01 April 2026

Contact: RIIO-3 Team

Team: Network Price Controls

Email: RIIO3@ofgem.gov.uk

This document is directed at gas and electricity transmission network companies, electricity distribution network companies and gas distribution network companies (for the purposes of this document ‘network companies’ or ‘licensees’), as well as their stakeholders.

The purpose of this document is to set out requirements in relation to the reports that Gas Distribution (GD), Gas Transmission (GT), Electricity Distribution (ED) and Electricity Transmission (ET) licensees are required to provide in relation to Evaluative Price Control Deliverables (PCDs) and the methodology that the Authority will use when assessing PCDs.

© Crown copyright 2025

The text of this document may be reproduced (excluding logos) under and in accordance with the terms of the Open Government Licence.

Without prejudice to the generality of the terms of the Open Government Licence, the material that is reproduced must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the document title of this document must be specified in that acknowledgement.

This publication is available at www.ofgem.gov.uk. Any enquiries regarding the use and re-use of this information resource should be sent to psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Contents

1. Introduction	4
Background	4
2. PCD principles	5
3. PCD specifications and types	6
4. PCD delivery status	7
5. Adjustments to allowances	8
Mechanistic PCDs	8
Evaluative PCDs	8
6. PCD reporting	10
Background	10
Evaluative PCD reporting requirements	10
7. Process for the assessment of PCD delivery and allowance adjustments	13
Mechanistic PCDs	13
Evaluative PCDs	13
Supplementary Questions	15
Index of Appendices	16
Appendix 1 Definitions	17
Definition of PCD terms	17
Appendix 2 Illustrative scenarios	18
Hypothetical example 1a (Delayed and Partially Delivered)	18
Hypothetical example 1b (Delayed and Partially Delivered With Alternative Specification)	18
Hypothetical example 2 (Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification)	19
Hypothetical example 3 (Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification)	19
Hypothetical example 4 (Partially Delivered)	19
Hypothetical example 5 (Not Delivered)	20
Hypothetical example 6 (Not Delivered)	20
Hypothetical example 7 (new PCD following accepted re-opener application)	20
Appendix 3 Cyber Resilience PCD Reporting Guidance	21
Introduction	21
Template	21
PCD assessment process	22
Appendix 4 Gas Transmission: Supplementary Re-opener Reporting Requirements - Final Option Selection Report (FOSR)	23
Appendix 5 Electricity Transmission: ASTI Pre- construction funding	27
Reporting requirements	27
Assessment Principles	29
Appendix 6 : Gas Distribution: Additional reporting requirements for bespoke Evaluative PCDs	33

1. Introduction

Background

- 1.1 Price Control Deliverables (PCDs) are a key component of the RIIO¹ framework. Under our framework for PCDs, price control funding is linked to the delivery of outputs specified in the licence. This framework provides for the adjustment of the level and timing of allowances in the event the output is not delivered, not delivered to the specification required, or delivered late.
- 1.2 We are publishing this document in line with Special Conditions 9.3 that apply to the Gas Distribution (GD), Gas Transmission (GT) and Electricity Transmission (ET) sectors (effective from 1 April 2026), and in line with Special Condition 9.3 of the Electricity Distribution (ED) sector (effective from 1 April 2023).
- 1.3 This document sets out the following:
 - The types of PCDs we will use to hold network companies to account for delivery of outputs linked to price control funding, namely Evaluative and Mechanistic PCDs;
 - the principles that underpin our use of PCDs;
 - possible outcomes of our assessment of delivery of PCDs; and
 - requirements that the licensee must follow in its reporting on Evaluative PCDs, including
 - (1) information that the licensee is required to provide; and
 - (2) the process and timelines for our assessment of PCD delivery and allowance adjustments.
- 1.4 Certain PCDs may have additional reporting requirements or may require a different approach to assessment of delivery, and adjustments to associated allowances. Where applicable, these are set out in appendices to this document, and/ or in the Regulatory Instructions and Guidance (RIGs). This document should be read in conjunction with its appendices and the RIGs. The reporting requirements set out in this document do not apply to the Network Asset Risk Metric (NARM).
- 1.5 As specifically provided for in Special Condition 9.3, this document, including any appendices, may be added to or modified by the Authority following the consultation process set out in the licence condition.
- 1.6 In this Guidance, we use the terms ‘Ofgem’ and ‘the Authority’ as well as the terms ‘we’, ‘us’ and ‘our’ interchangeably. Ofgem is the Office of the Gas and Electricity Markets. The Authority is the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority and is the governing body of Ofgem, consisting of executive and non-executive members.

¹ For the purposes of this document, RIIO refers to the price controls of the Gas Transportation and Electricity Transmission Licensees, running from 1 April 2026 – 31 March 2031, and the price control of the Electricity Distribution Licensees, running from 1 April 2023 – 31 March 2028.

2. PCD principles

Section summary

This chapter sets out further guidance on the principles that underpin the PCD framework.

2.1 Our PCD framework is based on the following principles. We will have due regard to these principles when implementing our PCD framework during the RIIO period:

- each PCD is defined by the output, as specified in the licence,² that we expect the licensee to deliver, the date by which the output is to be delivered in full, and the price control allowances associated with that PCD;
- price control allowances associated with each PCD are provided on the condition that the licensee will deliver the PCD as specified in the licence by the delivery date. We will not make an adjustment to allowances if this condition is met;
- if the licensee does not deliver the PCD as specified in the licence on time, the Authority may make a downward adjustment to the price control allowance associated with the PCD so that consumers only pay the efficient costs of work that has been delivered. For the avoidance of doubt, the value of such downward adjustments will not exceed the value of allowances associated with the relevant PCD;
- for Evaluative PCDs, licensees may deliver an alternative specification to the one in the relevant licence condition. Ofgem may adjust allowances downward or upwards according to Special Condition 9.3. In cases of downward adjustment, we will adjust allowances downwards to match the efficient cost of delivering the alternative, unless the licensee can demonstrate that:
 - (1) the alternative specification delivers an equivalent or materially better Consumer Outcome compared to the original specification in the licence; and
 - (2) where there are any cost savings compared to the value of allowances associated with the relevant PCD output, the cost savings are attributable to Efficiency or Innovation. The onus is on the licensee to demonstrate any cost savings achieved are due to Efficiency or Innovation.

2.2 The work associated with certain PCDs may be subject to incentive mechanisms. These will be set out in the relevant licence conditions and Price Control Financial Model and will take effect in parallel with, and separate from, the funding adjustments under the PCD framework.

² In relation to certain PCDs the licence specifies the output by reference to a separate confidential document.

3. PCD specifications and types

Section summary

This chapter provides guidance on the types of PCDs that Ofgem uses to hold network companies to account for the output(s) that they are funded to deliver through their totex allowances.

3.1 In general, each PCD in the relevant licence condition is defined by the following information:

- the output(s) a licensee is funded to deliver³
- the delivery date of the output(s)⁴
- the totex allowances associated with the output(s)
- how we will determine any adjustments to associated totex allowances.

3.2 We have created two types of PCDs, Mechanistic and Evaluative:

- Mechanistic PCDs are set in cases where work is defined by volumes or numbers of units of deliverables, or activities that are typically repeatable and we can set allowances by reference to the unit costs. The output is typically defined by reference to a volume or number of units to be delivered. In such cases, the reporting requirements are relatively light and the adjustments to allowances for non-delivery of work is automatic or largely automatic.
- Evaluative PCDs are set in cases where there is some flexibility in the output to be delivered, either in terms of the scope of works, costs, the specifications delivered, or the timing of delivery. The output is typically defined by reference to the specification of work to be delivered. For Evaluative PCDs, there are more detailed reporting requirements on licensees, and our approach allows for a proportionate ex-post assessment of PCD delivery in accordance with the methodology specified in the licence and this document to determine whether an adjustment to allowances is necessary to protect consumers.

³ In relation to certain PCDs the licence specifies the output by reference to a separate confidential document.

⁴ Some PCDs (e.g. Nitrogen sleeves, a Mechanistic PCD in GT) have the allowances and the associated volumes phased across RIIO-3 but no defined delivery date of the outputs in the condition.

4. PCD delivery status

Section summary

This chapter sets out the possible delivery statuses which Ofgem will determine for the PCD outputs that network companies are funded to deliver.

- 4.1 The assessment of delivery status for Mechanistic PCDs is based on units or volumes delivered, based on the metric used to specify the PCD in the licence. It is not possible for a Mechanistic PCD to be delivered to a different specification. Licensees are required to report on the number of units or volumes of each Mechanistic PCD that have been delivered in the relevant Regulatory Year.
- 4.2 Evaluative PCDs may be assigned one or more of the following delivery statuses for reporting and assessment purposes. These terms are defined in the licence.
- Fully Delivered;
 - Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification;
 - Partially Delivered;
 - Partially Delivered With Alternative Specification;
 - Delayed; or
 - Not Delivered.
- 4.3 We expect licensees to set out their view of the delivery status of each Evaluative PCD as part of the relevant Basic PCD Report (see chapter 6 on PCD reporting). We will form our own view of the delivery status once we have completed our assessment of the information provided by the licensee.

5. Adjustments to allowances

Section summary

This chapter provides guidance on our approach to determining the value of any adjustments to totex allowances that Ofgem considers necessary following our assessment of PCD delivery status.

Mechanistic PCDs

- 5.1 For Mechanistic PCDs, where a licensee does not deliver the volumes or numbers of units of the output by the delivery date, as set out in the relevant licence condition, the value of adjustments to allowances will be calculated in accordance with the formula and parameters set out in the relevant licence condition.
- 5.2 The value of adjustments to allowances associated with the relevant PCD output will be calculated based upon the data submitted by licensees as part of the annual Regulatory Reporting Packs (RRPs), which may be subject to validation by us. There are no upward adjustments to associated allowances if the licensee delivers more than the volume or number of units of the output.⁵

Evaluative PCDs

- 5.3 Ofgem will not make adjustments to allowances associated with Evaluative PCDs in the following circumstances:
 - the PCD output is assessed by us as Fully Delivered; or
 - the PCD output is assessed by us as Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification and any underspends achieved by the licensee relative to associated allowances are demonstrated by the licensee to be attributable to Efficiency and/or Innovation.
- 5.4 In all other cases, the Authority will consider making adjustments to the value of allowances associated with the relevant PCD output in accordance with the methodology set out in Special Condition 3.3 of the Electricity Distribution Licence, and Special Conditions 9.3 of the Electricity Transmission, Gas Transmission and Gas Distribution Licence.
- 5.5 Where applicable, further specifics are set out in the relevant appendices to this document.
- 5.6 In all cases, we will determine adjustments to allowances using a transparent approach,⁶ having consulted with licensees and other stakeholders. We will take account of all relevant information provided by licensees and other stakeholders. Specifically, we will consult on the wording of our proposed direction for a period of up to 28 days unless we determine that a longer period is appropriate in accordance with the licence. Our consultation will include:
 - our proposed PCD output delivery status;

⁵ For the avoidance of doubt, this does not cover the Gas Distribution Repex PCDs: Tier 1 Mains Decommissioned PCD, Tier 1 Services PCD and Tier 1 Iron Stubs PCD.

⁶ Subject to requirements for confidentiality.

- the value of any adjustments to allowances associated with the relevant PCD output; and
- the methodology and data used to determine the delivery status and the value of any adjustments to allowances associated with the relevant PCD output.

5.7 If we make an adjustment for any relevant Evaluative PCD allowance that:

- is calculated relative to actual expenditure, and
- adjusts allowances that attract real price effect (RPE) allowances in the PCFM,

the Authority will direct allowances adjustments in such a way that, once the RPE allowances calculated in the Price Control Financial Model are taken into account, the total of the adjusted allowances and RPE allowances summates to the relevant actual costs.

6. PCD reporting

Section summary

This chapter sets out the background on PCD reporting and the Evaluative PCD reporting requirements for licensees.

Background

- 6.1 For all PCDs, licensees are required to submit completed reporting templates and associated commentary as part of the RIIO Regulatory Reporting Packs (RRP) as directed by the relevant Regulatory Instructions and Guidance (RIGs).
- 6.2 For Mechanistic PCDs, the reporting requirements are proportionate and used for the purposes of tracking delivery of PCDs and calculating the value of any adjustments to allowances associated with the relevant PCD output in line with the licence.
- 6.3 For Evaluative PCDs, the reporting should capture high-level information about the status of each PCD on an ongoing basis, including:
 - progress towards delivery of the relevant PCD output;
 - likely date of project completion;
 - any external factors that may impact delivery; and
 - the use of alternative specifications to deliver the PCD output.

Evaluative PCD reporting requirements

- 6.4 The licensee must by 31 July of each Regulatory Year, or such later date directed by the Authority, send to the Authority a Basic PCD Report on each Evaluative PCD for which the delivery date specified in the relevant licence condition was in the previous Regulatory Year. For each Delayed Evaluative PCD, licensees must submit a further Basic PCD Report once delivery has been completed in full or in part. We also expect the licensee to notify the Authority and provide a further Basic PCD Report on a delayed Evaluative PCD by 31 July of the Regulatory Year following:
 - the licensee subsequently deciding not to complete in full or in part the delivery of an Evaluative PCD previously reported Delayed; or
 - the PCD being further delayed beyond the end of the price control period in which the licence specified the output was due to be delivered.
- 6.5 The Basic PCD Report must include the following information:
 - PCD identification (eg Licence Condition, Scheme Name);
 - the licensee's view of the delivery status of the PCD, as outlined in paragraph 4.2;
 - a brief description of the work actually delivered;
 - if the PCD has not been Fully Delivered in the view of the licensee, or if the work delivered does not meet the PCD specification, a brief explanation of the reasons for non-delivery or variation;

- if the delivery of the PCD has been delayed, a brief explanation of the reason for the delay and a timeline for completion;
 - an annual breakdown of actual expenditure incurred, on a gross, net before non price control allocation and net after non price control allocation cost basis; and
 - the indicative value of any potential adjustments to allowances associated with delivery of the PCD output that may be required. The licensee may wish to indicate which methodology of adjustment set out in the licence it believes would be appropriate.
- 6.6 Following our assessment of the Basic PCD Report, we will determine a provisional PCD delivery status and will decide whether to undertake a Full PCD Report Review. Where there is clear evidence and justification that the PCD is Fully Delivered, we will not direct the licensee to submit a Full PCD Report.
- 6.7 Where we have decided to undertake a Full PCD Report Review, we will direct the licensee to submit a Full PCD Report as set out below, which will generally be required by no later than 28 days from the date of the direction. Licensees may request a longer period if that is deemed to be necessary, providing reasons.
- 6.8 The required contents of the Full PCD Report will depend on the individual circumstances of the PCD and its delivery status as determined by us. However, minimum required contents by PCD delivery status are given below in paragraphs 6.9 – 6.12.
- 6.9 In the case of Delayed PCD output delivery, the requirements for the Full PCD Report will include:
- a detailed description of what has been delivered and when, compared to the outputs in the relevant licence condition;
 - a detailed delivery plan setting out the licensee’s plans and timelines for completion of the delivery of the PCD output;
 - the licensee’s explanation of the proportion of the output and Consumer Outcome delivered compared to the requirements of the licence, along with supporting evidence of this;
 - an explanation of the reasons for the delay along with details of steps taken to prevent further delays;
 - expenditure incurred to date, and forecast expenditure; and
 - the licensee’s proposals for any re-profiling of the value of allowances associated with the relevant PCD output.
- 6.10 In the case of Partially Delivered and Partially Delivered With Alternative Specification, the requirements for the Full PCD Report will include:
- a detailed description of the work delivered compared to the requirements of the licence;
 - an explanation for the partial delivery;
 - the licensee’s view of the proportion of output and Consumer Outcome delivered, including supporting evidence and analysis;

- the licensee's view of the efficient cost of delivering the specification that was actually delivered, along with supporting information; and
- the licensee's proposals for any adjustments to allowances.

6.11 In the case of Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification, the requirements for the Full PCD Report will include:

- the licensee's explanation of how the Consumer Outcome delivered by the alternative specification compares in the short and long term with the original output, along with supporting evidence of this;
- the licensee's view of the efficient cost of delivering the alternative specification, along with supporting evidence;
- the licensee's actual incurred expenditure of delivering the alternative specification (if different from the above), along with supporting information;
- where the licensee's actual expenditure is lower than the value of allowances associated with the relevant PCD output, a statement of whether the licensee considers the savings achieved relative to the allowances is due to Efficiency and/or Innovation along with supporting evidence to demonstrate this; and
- where the licensee's actual expenditure is higher than the value of allowances associated with the relevant PCD output, the licensee's explanation of how any overspend was efficiently incurred and a justified estimate of the proportion of increased Consumer Outcome associated with the work delivered, along with supporting evidence to demonstrate this.

6.12 In the case where the output is Not Delivered, the requirements for the Full PCD Report will include:

- a statement explaining the reasons for non-delivery including any supporting evidence;
- the licensee's view of the efficient costs of reasonable works that took place leading up to the cancellation or deferral in the consumer interest along with supporting evidence; and
- the licensee's actual incurred expenditure in undertaking the works (if different from the above).

6.13 Where the licensee has schemes/projects that are covered by PCDs but also by other mechanisms that require additional information, then the Authority may allow the Full PCD Report to be combined with other reporting requirements.

6.14 Some Evaluative PCDs may have additional reporting requirements. Where applicable, these are set out in relevant appendices to this document or the licence.

7. Process for the assessment of PCD delivery and allowance adjustments

Section summary

This chapter sets out the process we expect to follow as part of our PCD assessments.

- 7.1 The aim of the assessment process is to ensure the determination of PCD output delivery status and any adjustments to allowances is efficient, timely, transparent, and proportionate with respect to individual PCDs.

Mechanistic PCDs

- 7.2 For Mechanistic PCDs, our assessment of delivery will be based on data reported by licensees in the relevant tables that form part of the RRP. Below sets out the assessment process for Mechanistic PCDs.

Process for Mechanistic PCDs
1. Submission of relevant tables as part of the RRP.
2. Assessment including supplementary question (SQ) process: Using the data from the RRP, we will calculate the value of the adjustment to allowances (where required) using the relevant formulae as stated in the relevant licence condition. We may issue SQs, where it is necessary to complete the assessment.
3. Updating the allowances in the Price Control Financial Model (PCFM): Allowances are adjusted via the annual review process (referred to as the Annual Iteration Process for RII02). When a PCD adjustment is input into the PCFM, the resulting revenue adjustment is reflected in the following year. This may occur within the RII0 period, or as part of the close-out process in the next period.

Evaluative PCDs

- 7.3 For Evaluative PCDs, our assessments will usually commence upon receipt of the relevant Basic PCD Report. Licensees must submit the report by 31 July following the end of the Regulatory Year in which the PCD was due to be delivered unless otherwise directed by the Authority. For example, if the PCD delivery date is 31 March 2027, the Basic PCD Report is due to be submitted by 31 July 2027, and the assessment process will commence shortly thereafter. Licensees may submit the Basic PCD report earlier than the 31 July of the relevant year.
- 7.4 In some cases, the delivery of a PCD output is a trigger for a re-opener submission or is the re-opener submission. In such cases, the PCD assessment will be undertaken as part of the

re-opener assessment. For those PCD outputs that form part of a re-opener assessment, the timing of assessments and submissions are specified in the relevant licence condition. Where appropriate we have provided additional guidance on reporting requirements in the relevant appendices within this document or the Re-opener Guidance and Application Requirements Document.

7.5 Below sets out the process for Evaluative PCDs. We will seek to complete the assessment process within a period of nine months, so that our decision on allowance adjustments can be reflected in the Annual Iteration Process. However, we recognise that for a variety of reasons this may not always be possible.⁷

Evaluative PCD assessment process
<p>1. Preliminary Review:</p> <p>Following the submission of the Basic PCD Report, we will conduct an initial assessment of whether the delivery of the PCD output complies with the relevant licence condition, using information submitted. Where possible, we will initially determine if the PCD output is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully Delivered;• Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification;• Partially Delivered;• Partially Delivered With Alternative Specification;• Delayed; or• Not Delivered. <p>We may submit supplementary questions to clarify information. If we can determine the delivery status or statuses using the information available to us, the process moves on to steps 4 or 5.</p> <p>We will notify the licensee whether we will undertake a Full PCD Report Review. If a Full PCD Report Review is required, we will initiate discussions with the licensee to determine data requirements and direct the licensee to provide a Full PCD Report, stipulating any specific submission requirements and the date such a report should be provided, which can be no sooner than 28 days from the date of the direction. The licensee may request an extension to the 28-day requirement, providing reasons.</p>
<p>2. Full PCD Report submission:</p> <p>Licensee to submit its Full PCD Report to us by the specified deadline. We may submit supplementary questions to clarify information.</p>
<p>3. Full PCD Review - including supplementary question (SQ) process:</p>

⁷ Where a PCD relates to work associated with a subsequent re-opener due to take place, we will seek to complete the assessment process as soon as is practicable and in-line with requirements of the associated re-opener.

We will carry out a detailed assessment of delivery status and any proposed adjustments to allowances based upon the information from the Full PCD Report, responses to SQs and any other relevant information available to us.

4. Minded-To Decision (optional):

We may consult on a minded-to decision if we consider that to be necessary. Otherwise the process will move immediately to the draft decision (below).

5. Draft Decision:

We will consult on our draft decision. If a direction is considered necessary, we will consult on the wording of our proposed direction under the relevant PCD licence condition for a period of up to 28 days, unless we determine that a longer period is appropriate, in accordance with the licence.

6. Decision:

We will publish our decision following consideration of responses received. If necessary, we will issue a direction under the relevant PCD licence condition.

7. Updating the allowances in the Price Control Financial Model (PCFM):

Adjustments to allowances are reflected via the annual review process (referred to as the Annual Iteration Process for RIIO2). When a PCD adjustment is input in the PCFM, the resulting revenue adjustment is reflected in the following year. This may occur within the RIIO period or as part of the close-out process in the next period.

- 7.6 Adjustments to allowances may be made during or after the RIIO period. In assessing the delivery status of Evaluative PCDs and any associated adjustments to allowances, we will consider all relevant, including the most recently available, information. This may include information submitted by licensees in their Business Plans and associated documents (including responses to supplementary question during the review process).

Supplementary Questions

- 7.7 The supplementary question process is intended for clarification purposes only. Network companies should not expect to use it as a means of submitting additional information that the Basic PCD Report and Full PCD Report should have included.
- 7.8 Licensees will be required to respond to a supplementary question within 5 or 10 working days, depending on the complexity of the query, unless otherwise specified by Ofgem.

Index of Appendices

Appendix	Name of Appendix	Sector	Page No.
1	Definitions	ET, GT, GD, ED	17
2	Illustrative scenarios	ET, GT, GD, ED	18
3	Cyber Resilience PCD Reporting Guidance	ET, GT, GD, ED	21
4	Gas Transmission: Supplementary Re-opener Reporting Requirements - Final Option Selection Report	GT	23
5	Electricity Transmission: ASTI Pre-Construction Funding	ET	27
6	Gas Distribution: Additional reporting requirements for bespoke Evaluative PCDs	GD	33

Appendix 1 Definitions

Definition of PCD terms

A1.1 Additional terms are defined in Special Condition 1.1 of the relevant licence.

Terminology	Definition
Basic PCD Report	means a report the licensee is required to submit in accordance with Special Condition 9.3. and paragraph 6.4 of this document, which includes the information specified in paragraph 6.5 of this document.
Full PCD Report	means a report the licensee may be directed to submit in accordance with Special Condition 9.3 and paragraphs 6.9-6.12 of this document, as applicable to the individual circumstances of the PCD concerned and its delivery status.
Full PCD Report Review	means our assessment of a Full PCD Report.
Mechanistic PCD	means a Price Control Deliverable where the relevant licence condition establishes the adjustment that will be made to allowances in a mechanistic manner, where the output has not been delivered as specified in the licence. ⁸
Evaluative PCD	This term is defined in Special Condition 1.1 of the relevant licence.
Efficiency	This term is defined in Special Condition 1.1 of the relevant licence.
Innovation	This term is defined in Special Condition 1.1 of the relevant licence.
Consumer Outcome	This term is defined in Special Condition 1.1 of the relevant licence.
Cyber Resilience PCD Template	means a report the licensee is required to submit in accordance with Special Condition 3.2 and paragraphs A3.3-A3.6 of this document.

⁸ For NGT, this term is defined in Special Condition 1.1.

Appendix 2 Illustrative scenarios

A2.1 In this appendix we provide illustrative examples of the potential PCDs, delivery statuses, adjustments to the value of allowances associated with the PCDs and possible links to re-openers. These examples are purely illustrative, and Ofgem will determine adjustments to allowances on a case-by-case basis taking account of all relevant information.

Hypothetical example 1a (Delayed and Partially Delivered)

A2.2 Original defined PCD: £200m to deliver 1000MW boundary capability based on newbuild of OHL.

A2.3 At the delivery date, £160m has been spent to deliver 800MW boundary capability based on the solution defined in the licence, licensee demonstrates that it intends to deliver the remaining 200MW boundary capability late by one year.

A2.4 Where we have evidence that the delay in delivering the PCD would have a material impact on the Consumer Outcome, we may decide to re-profile allowances to match the new expected delivery profile.

A2.5 The licensee will provide another Basic PCD Report after the work is complete.

A2.6 One year later, the licensee has delivered the 1000MW boundary capability late, but otherwise as specified in the licence. Where we have evidence that the delay in delivering the PCD has led to a reduction in Consumer Outcome as compared to if the output had been delivered on time, we may decide to adjust allowances down in line with the methodology set out in the licence.

Hypothetical example 1b (Delayed and Partially Delivered With Alternative Specification)

A2.7 Original defined PCD: £6m for installation of various assets expected to release 27MW demand capacity.

A2.8 At the delivery date specified in the licence, in this example 31 March 2027, not all assets have been installed. By 31 July 2027, when the Basic PCD Report is due to be submitted, the licensee is still undertaking the works. As it intends to carry out further installations, it must assign the PCD the status Delayed. The licensee completes the programme of works by 15 August 2027, albeit to a different specification than set out in the licence, releasing 25 MW demand capacity.

A2.9 The licensee provides another Basic PCD Report once the work is complete, assigning the statuses Delayed and Partially Delivered With Alternative Specification. Ofgem will adjust allowances to take account of the fact that only part of the Consumer Outcome in terms of capacity released has been achieved. In this example case, it finds that the delay has not had a material impact on the Consumer Outcome, and will therefore not adjust allowances further.

Hypothetical example 2 (Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification)

- A2.10 Original defined PCD: £200m to deliver 1000MW boundary capability based on newbuild of OHL.
- A2.11 At the delivery date, £160m spent to deliver 1000MW boundary capability based on a different specification than that specified in the PCD licence condition.
- A2.12 If the licensee can demonstrate that the cost savings of £40m is attributable to Efficiency or Innovation, we will not make any adjustments to allowances. Otherwise, we will assess the efficient costs of delivering the alternative specification, using the information and tools available to us. We will then adjust allowances downwards such that the allowance matches the assessed efficient costs.

Hypothetical example 3 (Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification)

- A2.13 Original defined PCD: £200m to deliver 1000MW boundary capability based on newbuild of OHL.
- A2.14 At the delivery date, £210m spent to deliver 1000MW boundary capability based on a different specification than that specified in the PCD licence condition.
- A2.15 If the licensee can demonstrate that the overspend of £10m was efficiently incurred and provides a justified estimate of the proportion of increased Consumer Outcome associated with the work delivered, we may make an upwards adjustment to the overspend of £10m. We will assess the efficient costs of delivering the alternative specification, using the information and tools available to us. We will then adjust allowances upwards such that the allowance matches the assessed efficient costs.

Hypothetical example 4 (Partially Delivered)

- A2.16 Original defined PCD: £5m to install 50 new novel Instrument Transformers (ITs).
- A2.17 At the delivery date, £4m spent to install 46 new novel ITs. Where the licensee has not needed to replace the additional 4 ITs as a result of Efficiency or Innovation (e.g. for this example - site rationalisation), we may follow two paths:
- A2.18 If the licensee can demonstrate that the cost savings of £1m are attributable to Efficiency or Innovation (e.g. justified site rationalisation), and the Consumer Outcome delivered by the programme is equivalent or better than would have been achieved if the licensee had delivered the output as specified in the relevant special condition, we will not make any adjustments to allowances.
- A2.19 Otherwise, we will assess the efficient costs of delivering the 46 ITs, using the information and tools available to us. We will then adjust allowances downwards such that the allowance matches the assessed efficient costs of delivering the 46 ITs.

Hypothetical example 5 (Not Delivered)

- A2.20 Original defined PCD: investment of £4m to deliver 11MVA of capacity, equivalent to 150 ultra-rapid (150kw+) chargers at one Motorway Service Area, as part of a wider £20m programme to deliver 56MVA of capacity across 7 sites.
- A2.21 At the delivery date, none of the capacity has been delivered at the site specified, and £0.1m has been spent on system analysis. The programme was cancelled because the site in question required upgrades to the transmission system instead of the upgrades to the distribution system originally expected.
- A2.22 If the licensee can demonstrate that the expenditure on system analysis was efficient and necessary, we will adjust allowances downwards by £3.9m so that the licensee retains the efficient costs incurred in undertaking those activities.

Hypothetical example 6 (Not Delivered)

- A2.23 Original defined PCD: £200m to deliver 1000MW boundary capability based on new build of OHL.
- A2.24 Construction is cancelled due to innovations in other areas of the network mitigating the need for new investment. £1m spent on desktop studies and system analysis that led to the decision to cancel the project.
- A2.25 If the licensee can demonstrate that the expenditure on desktop studies and system analysis was efficient and necessary, we will adjust allowances downwards by £199m so that the licensee retains the efficient costs incurred in undertaking those activities.

Hypothetical example 7 (new PCD following accepted re-opener application)

- A2.26 The Authority, following consultation, issues a direction on a licensee's re-opener application that includes a decision to provide allowances to establish 10 new transformers with associated infrastructure ahead of need, and to attach an Evaluative PCD to the associated allowances.
- A2.27 The Authority modifies the licence to include the associated outputs and the delivery dates and amends the RIGs to include the relevant reporting requirements. If additional reporting requirements are necessary, the Authority modifies this document in accordance with the procedure set out in the licence to add an Appendix that sets out the additional reporting requirements that apply to the newly created PCD.

Appendix 3 Cyber Resilience PCD Reporting Guidance

Introduction

- A3.1 Network companies are required to submit cyber resilience PCD reports annually, in line with the licence conditions. Reports should be submitted each year on 31 July. The information included in each submitted report should be for the previous reporting year (1 April – 31 March).
- A3.2 Cyber resilience PCD reports should use the Cyber Resilience PCD Template and, due to the relationship with Critical National Infrastructure, be submitted to Ofgem by Secure Information Exchange (SIE). Network operators should contact us at RIIO3cyber@ofgem.gov.uk to request the correct template for the relevant price control, and an SIE link for submission.

Template

- A3.3 Network operators should complete the Cyber Resilience PCD Template for all PCDs. For RIIO-3 and RIIO-2, Information Technology (IT) and Operation Technology (OT) PCDs can be placed together in a single template.
- A3.4 The template has been simplified compared to the previous template intended for automatic ingestion into internal tools. With this in mind, please do not add any rows or columns, make any changes or input information outside of the official structure - if any changes are made to the template, then we will return it for correct completion. Network operators should only fill pink cells on the relevant year tab. Any additional information can be provided as a separate appendix or explained in a bilateral meeting.
- A3.5 **Error! Reference source not found.** Table 1: RAG selection criteria provides criteria for how to grade RAG status for each of the required fields.
- A3.6 Further information on how to complete the PCD reporting template is included in the PCD reporting template excel file.

Table 1: RAG selection criteria

Scope Criteria:	Schedule Criteria:	Finance Criteria:	Completion PCD status criteria:
Green: No deviation on quality or breadth of the application of the capability as per PCD.	Green: No deviation on baseline schedule and overarching PCD delivery dates.	Green: No deviation on cost from allowances per PCD or where a deviation is due to an underspend because cost efficiencies have been found.	Green: No deviations on delivery status by completion date.

Scope Criteria:	Schedule Criteria:	Finance Criteria:	Completion PCD status criteria:
Amber: Any deviations where scope is being delivered to an alternate specification or the scope of the PCD is being partially delivered which could impact the quality or breadth of application.	Amber: Any deviations where additional time is required which could impact the overarching PCD delivery date.	Amber: Slight (up to 10%) deviation i.e. any deviations where additional/reduced cost (i.e. due to additional work/lack of delivery) is required impacting the PCD allowances where mitigations are being executed.	Amber: Any deviation on delivery status by completion date i.e. either Scope or Schedule is 'Amber' or both of them are 'Amber'.
Red: Scope is not being delivered and/or substantial change impacting the original outputs both in terms of quality and breadth of application.	Red: Missed deliverable(s) with the overarching PCD delivery date requiring re-baselining.	Red: Major (>10%) deviation i.e. risk of breaching the allowances regardless of if there are mitigations in place.	Red: Major deviation on delivery status by completion date i.e. either Scope or Schedule is 'Red' or both of them are 'Red'.

PCD assessment process

A3.7 Ofgem will review submitted PCD reports in 2 stages:

Stage 1: Error checking and review

- PCDs will be reviewed to verify if they have been populated correctly.
- Any discrepancies will be highlighted and sent back to the network company, to be corrected within a requested timeframe, or as guidance for the next iteration of PCD reporting.
- An in-depth review of the PCDs will take place.

Stage 2: Engagement

- Feedback will be provided within 3 months of Ofgem receiving licensees PCD report submissions. This feedback will be via bi-lateral engagements.

A3.8 For details on the process followed by Ofgem to review delivery of Evaluative PCDs, including Cyber PCDs, please see section 5 of this document.

Appendix 4 Gas Transmission: Supplementary Re-opener Reporting Requirements - Final Option Selection Report (FOSR)

A4.1 With respect to:

- Special Condition 3.21 Network Capability Re-opener (NC_t); and
- Special Condition 3.23 Network decarbonisation and emissions compliance Re-opener (NDCRE_t).

A4.2 We expect that National Gas will implement new processes to shorten the time it takes to produce FOSR and reopener documents and the Authority will work with National Gas to facilitate this.

A4.3 If the relevant status in each case is Fully Delivered or Fully Delivered With An Alternative Specification, NGT must submit a Final Option Selection Report (FOSR) for Network Capability projects and Network Decarbonisation and Emissions Compliance projects to enable the Authority to make a determination for re-opener applications under the respective licence conditions.

A4.4 A FOSR must be a document suitable for enabling a decision that accurately represents the costs and options available at the point of re-opener submission. The Authority expects that, prior to any formal submission, the licensee will engage with Ofgem to ensure all credible options have been considered and developed to sufficient maturity. The FOSR is arrived at via an iterative process moving through stage gates and progressively narrowing the options considered until the FOSR only presents the counterfactual and credible options that NGT could support implementing.

A4.5 Each FOSR should build upon the existing RIO-GT3 submission material in terms of Engineering Justification Papers (EJP) and Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA), using the most appropriate and relevant data and incorporating any new information. The FOSR and supporting documents for projects must address the items below, alongside any further information provided.

A4.6 All FOSR and supporting documents must be based on the most recent FES data.

A4.7 All CBAs produced must show calculation and flows between cells and sheets to allow supporting evidence to be scrutinised.

A4.8 FOSR submissions should present scope and cost definitions equivalent to at least AACE Class 3. Where this is unachievable, evidence must be provided for any deviation and quantify the resulting uncertainty. Cost variances outside the Class 3 cost estimate range must be reconciled at reopener submission with a clear audit trail. The licensee should strive to demonstrate they are meeting the highest possible cost estimate class.

Network Capability FOSR Specific Guidance - SpC 3.21: Network Capability Re-opener (NC_t)

A4.9 The FOSR for Network Capability should build upon the RIIO-GT3 EJPs and CBA submitted, and is related to the efficiency and effectiveness of compressor stations:

- Must present strategic view of the NTS, considering compressor emissions and optimisation across the whole network, with a focus on whole-life cost.
- The strategic view must have a top down approach, subsequently broken down by zone, region and site, with each compressor at a site individually assessed.
- The optimisation must demonstrate how the network can reduce emissions while maintaining or improving capability and should show how the consumer will benefit from this optimisation.
- The project must consider options that minimise capital costs (including the use of non-capital cost solutions) and improve CBA value while maintaining compliance, operability and capability, with a preference towards low carbon emission drives.
- The range of credible scenarios to be used in the FOSR must be those set out by ISOP in the GNCNR and GOA, or as otherwise agreed with Ofgem/ISOP. Scenarios developed solely by NGT will not be considered sufficient unless explicitly agreed as credible by ISOP.
- The FOSR must consider what time horizon should be considered for the start of operations of any investment i.e. is it most effective to consider only RIIO T3 investments or extend the period considered to investments in subsequent price controls. The analysis must cover the diverging impact of different scenarios and provide conclusions on when future capability investment decisions might be needed taking account of the uncertainty on the path taken to net zero.

A4.10 NGT should consider how the network can be optimised and operated more efficiently in addition to meeting capacity requirements. It should also consider the potential for flexibility requirements for compressor capability / performance from different operating scenarios and if there are no/least regret.

A4.11 The FOSR must include a discussion of the potential operating regimes for each compressor station and individual compressor, under the range of credible future scenarios;

- Clearly set out all options considered, including discounted options and the rationale for discounting.
- Include an analysis of how each compressor and site would operate under different demand, supply, and network configurations, for each ISOP-defined scenarios, including the impact of asymmetric performance and the potential network/emissions advantages this brings.
- Include consideration of asymmetric performance, where unique characteristics or capability of specific compressors or sites may provide network or emissions advantages.
- Provide a clear narrative on how the network could be optimised dynamically across the full range of scenarios, showing how each different operating regime and interventions could deliver lowest emissions and best value, rather than relying on a single static solution.
- Provide a robust site availability model for each option, auditable by a third party. This should be based on likely range of run-hours derived from the Network Capability Model and assess the options against the different pathways, using the most relevant data from ISOP.

- Include a detailed breakdown of capital costs, risk allowance, project management, supported by core engineering documents.
- Use the model recent Network Capability modelling flows through all CBAs, including localised flow predictions and wider system impacts.
- Prioritise units with higher reliability and availability.

Common emissions compliance Requirements - 3.23 Network decarbonisation and emissions compliance Re-opener (NDCREt)

A4.12 The Authority accepts that different elements of this FOSR may need to be presented at different times.

A4.13 We are not expecting there to be a large amount of work relating to emissions compliance relating to the Medium Plant Combustion Directive given the submissions and in-flight work in RIIO-GT2. Any works relating to emissions compliance should be communicated and engaged with Ofgem early. We require, National Gas to explore, as a minimum:

- plans to utilise low NOx retrofit technology;
- options to retrofit a modern engine to the non-compliant units;
- options that build on used or decommissioned slots at compressor sites;
- variations on de-rating and/or applying abatement on the exiting non-compliant units.

A4.14 We expect there to be many large and small options for National Gas to use to reduce carbon emissions. We require National Gas to explore, as a minimum:

- Analyse the main emissions sources (Scope 1 and 2) from all National Gas activity and present potential options to address them, including abatement, retrofit, replacement, and operational changes.
- Provide a £ per CO₂e analysis and cost of carbon evaluation for each intervention, with a clear ranking of options by cost of carbon saved, clearly mapped against alignment with ISOP pathways.
- Clearly state any areas where funding has previously been requested but not granted, with reasons provided, and exclude areas where funding has already been provided through other mechanisms.
- Set out an implementation plan for key interventions including justification for trial locations, delivery timeline, and risk management.
- Include a robust emissions model for each option, auditable by a third party, consistent with the Network Capability Model and the analysis used in response to Network Capability FOSR Specific Guidance - SpC 3.21: Network Capability Re-opener (NC_t).

A4.15 Each FOSR must build upon the existing material for the RIIO-3 submission in terms of EJP and Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA). The FOSR and supporting documents for network capability and compressor project submission must address the items below, alongside any further information provided.

A4.16 Specifically, a FOSR must:

- Assess options against different ISOP pathways and scenarios, using the most up to date and relevant data.
- Provide a detailed breakdown of capital costs, risk allowance, project management, and supporting core engineering documents.
- Use the most recent ISOP and NGT emissions and capability modelling flows through all CBAs, including localised and system-wide impacts.
- Prioritise interventions that deliver the greatest emissions reduction, compliance, and consumer value.

A4.17 The FOSR should also set out all options considered, including discounted options and the rationale for discounting, and provide a narrative on how the proposed interventions will support the strategic decarbonisation of the NTS. This should include any “no/low regrets” actions that enable future repurposing for hydrogen or carbon capture, and discuss the operational flexibility and adaptability of the proposed solutions.

A4.18 We accept that there will be areas of Network Decarbonisation where there are elements of opportunity of Network Decarbonisation due to Asset Health investments. We expect National Gas will highlight any demarcation between spend in areas where there are ‘stacked’ drivers.

Appendix 5 Electricity Transmission: ASTI Pre- construction funding

A5.1 With respect to:

- Special Condition 3.20 Accelerated Strategic Transmission Investment Pre-Construction Funding Re-opener, Price Control Deliverable and Use It Or Lose It Adjustment (APCF_t)
- ASTI Guidance and Submissions Requirements Document, Section 3 ASTI Pre-Construction Funding.

Reporting requirements

- A5.2 The following paragraphs set out details of how the ASTI PCF PCDs will be reported and assessed. In general, the PCD assessment for ASTI PCF PCDs follows the same principles as set out within chapter 6 of this document. The main difference is that because allowances for ASTI PCF PCDs are substitutable across each Transmission Owner's (TO) portfolio of ASTI projects, we need to undertake an assessment of delivery of all PCDs simultaneously rather than consider them each individually, as allowances for one PCD could have been used to deliver a different PCD.
- A5.3 The PCF PCD delivery dates for all ASTI projects subject to Special Condition 3.20 were initially set to 31 March 2026 upon implementation in the electricity TOs' licences. These dates may be modified following a re-opener application, and any new projects added to the ASTI framework may have different PCD delivery dates.
- A5.4 It is possible that all PCD delivery dates in a TO's portfolio of ASTI projects remain as 31 March 2026. If so, the PCD assessment will follow the process set out in Outcome 1 below. Alternatively, it is possible PCD delivery dates for one or more projects are pushed back and set within the following price control period. If this is the case, our PCD assessment will follow the process set out in Outcome 2.
- A5.5 Outcome 1: If all a licensee's evaluative ASTI PCF PCD delivery dates remain as 31 March 2026, the licensee must by 31 July 2026, or such later date directed by the Authority, send to the Authority a Basic PCD Report covering every evaluative ASTI PCF PCD, as per the process outlined in section 6 of this document. In this circumstance we will assess all of the TOs' ASTI PCF PCDs collectively as part of the RIIO-2 close-out procedure. In practice this means one evaluative assessment of delivery across all ASTI PCF outputs followed by a Use-It-Or-Lose-It (UIOLI) adjustment to return any unspent allowances to consumers.
- A5.6 The UIOLI adjustment will be made on a portfolio rather than project by project basis, so it will be the net underspend against a TO's total ASTI PCF allowance that is returned to consumers rather than underspends against each project (which could have been substituted and spent on other projects).
- A5.7 Outcome 2: If PCD delivery dates for one or more projects are pushed back and set within the following price control period, we will make our assessment in two parts:

Guidance Price Control Deliverable Reporting Requirements and Methodology: Version 6

A5.8 Part a) the licensee must by 31 July 2026, or such later date directed by the Authority, send to the Authority a Basic PCD Report covering every evaluative ASTI PCF PCD, as per section 6 in this document. We will then assess all PCDs with delivery dates of 31 March 2026 as part of the RIIO-2 close-out procedure, as per the description under Outcome 1.

A5.9 Part b) For remaining projects where the delivery date for the ASTI PCF PCD is in the next price control period, we will then set efficient ASTI PCF allowances to deliver these outputs as part of the next price control settlement on a project-by-project basis. These total allowances will also be substitutable across each TO’s portfolio of ASTI projects, as per the RIIO-ET2 ASTI PCF allowances. The total allowances in the next price control will also be UIOLI, and after delivering all PCD outputs any remaining allowances will be returned to consumers through the UIOLI mechanism, as set out above. The allowances set for the next price control will also be subject to the re-opener mechanism set out in SpC 3.20. Tables 2 and 3 below set out examples of how this second pot for the subsequent price control may be set up.

A5.10 In the next price control, by 31 July in the regulatory year following the final PCD’s delivery date, or such later date directed by the Authority, the licensee must send to the Authority a Basic PCD Report covering the remaining ASTI PCF PCDs, following the process set out in section 6 of this document. The PCD assessment for outputs delivered in the next price control will be assessed following the same methodologies and principles as those that are assessed as part of RIIO-2 close-out.

Table 2 – Example of PCF PCDs being across price controls where there is an underspend at the end of RIIO2.

Project	Allowance in RIIO2 (£m)	Expenditure in RIIO2 (£m)	PCD Date	PCD Delivered by end of RIIO2?	Allowance (£m) Next price control
Project A	10	14 (+£4m)	31 March 2026	Yes	0
Project B	16	20 (+£4m)	31 March 2026	Yes	0
Project C	12	14 (+£2m)	31 March 2026	Yes	0
Project D	18	8(-£10m)	1 June 2028	No	2.5
Project E	10	5(-£5m)	1 June 2028	No	2.5
Total	66	61 (£5m under)			5

A5.11 Assessment at RIIO2 closeout shows £61m incurred (£5m underspend) has been spent efficiently across projects. Projects D and E’s PCDs have not been delivered and are due two years later in the next price control.

A5.12 A new PCF pot will be created for project D and E to be used during the next price control. The pot is created using the unspent allowance remaining from the RIIO2 pot, although we will consider the final value when setting TOs’ allowances for the next price control. This

pot will remain subject to the same conditions set out in SpC 3.20: flexibility, UIOLI, and the re-opener mechanism.

Table 3 – Example of PCF PCDs being split across price controls where the full allowance is spent by the end of RIIO2, and additional allowances are required in the next price control.

Project	Allowance in RIIO2 (£m)	Expenditure in RIIO2 (£m)	PCD Date	PCD Delivered by end of RIIO2?	Allowance (£m) Next price control
Project A	10	12 (+£2m)	31 March 2026	Yes	0
Project B	16	19 (+£3m)	31 March 2026	Yes	0
Project C	12	10 (-£2m)	31 March 2026	Yes	0
Project D	18	14(-£4m)	1 June 2028	No	tbc
Project E	10	11(+£1m)	1 June 2028	No	tbc
Total	66	66 (equal)			tbc

A5.13 Assessment at RIIO2 closeout shows that the full allowance had been spent efficiently across projects. Projects D and E’s PCDs have not been delivered and are due two years later in the next price control and will require additional funding.

A5.14 A new PCF pot will be created for project D and E to be used during the next price control. This pot will be created for projects D and E when setting TOs’ allowances for the next price control. This pot will remain subject to the same conditions set out in SpC 3.20: flexibility, UIOLI, and the re-opener mechanism.

Assessment Principles

A5.15 We will assess ASTI PCF PCDs collectively across each TO’s portfolio of projects, albeit this may be in two-stages if ASTI PCF PCD outputs are delivered over two price controls, as set out above under Reporting Requirements.

A5.16 Although substitutable, ASTI PCF PCD allowances specified in the licence are allocated to the individual projects in a TO’s portfolio for the purposes of assessing the PCD. This project-specific value (“Associated PCF Allowance £m” in Table 4 and Table 5 below) represents the maximum downwards adjustment that Ofgem may make per project for any PCDs that are not Fully Delivered. Efficiently incurred expenditure across the portfolio of ASTI projects and the materiality of the UIOLI adjustment will be important considerations before making any allowance adjustment following our PCD assessment.

A5.17 For the avoidance of doubt, the allowance allocated against ASTI PCF PCD does not restrict how TOs may spend across their portfolio of projects, it is only a means of attributing funding to an output for the purposes of assessing PCDs.

A5.18 Before making any allowance adjustment in the event of an ASTI PCF PCD output not being Fully Delivered, we will consider efficient expenditure across the TO’s full portfolio of

Guidance Price Control Deliverable Reporting Requirements and Methodology: Version 6

projects as allowances on a project not Fully Delivered could have been substituted and spent efficiently on a different project.

A5.19 Where a TO Fully Delivers all the ASTI PCF PCD outputs, there will be no ex-post efficiency assessment of the costs incurred delivering the outputs. In this circumstance any underspend against allowances would be returned to consumers through a UIOLI adjustment.

Table 4: Example PCD assessment 1 (overspend)

Project	PCD delivered?	Associated PCF Allowance £m	PCF Spent on project £m	Associated PCF allowance spent on project (%)
A	Yes	3.8	4.0	105%
B	Yes	12.5	15.0	120%
C	Yes	11.3	9.0	80%
D	Yes	5.0	10.0	200%
E	No	6.9	8.0	116%
Totals		39.5	46.00	116%
Over / under spend			6.5	16%

A5.20 Table 4 above is an example of how a TO may have delivered its portfolio of projects. In this example there is an overall overspend of £6.5m above the ASTI PCF allowance. Project E's PCD in this example has not been delivered (e.g. because the project was cancelled). Ofgem would assess this TO's portfolio of projects simultaneously and look at spend across the whole portfolio.

A5.21 As the PCD for project E has not been delivered, Ofgem would consider clawing back allowances. The maximum amount Ofgem could claw back in this example is £6.9m (the allowance associated with project E) even though the TO has spent more than this amount.

A5.22 The only allowances clawed back in this example would be those that Ofgem determined were spent inefficiently following the PCD assessment. Assuming the £8m spent on project E had been spent efficiently, or substituted and spent efficiently on a different project in the portfolio, Ofgem would not look to claw back any of this allowance. If this

was the case, in this example there would be no claw-back or UIOLI adjustment, and the £6.5m overspend would be subject to the Totex Incentive Mechanism (TIM).⁹

Table 5: Example PCD assessment 2 (underspend)

Project	PCD delivered?	Associated PCF Allowance £m	PCF Spent on project £m	Associated PCF allowance spent on project (%)
A	Yes	3.8	4.0	107%
B	Yes	12.5	15.0	120%
C	Yes	11.3	9.0	80%
D	Yes	5.0	10.0	200%
E	No	6.9	1.0	15%
Totals		39.5	39.0	99%
Over / under spend			-0.5	-1%

A5.23 Table 5 above is another example of how a TO may have delivered its portfolio of projects. In this example there is an overall underspend of £0.5m below the ASTI PCF allowance. Project E’s PCD in this example has not been delivered (e.g. because the project was cancelled).

A5.24 Ofgem would assess this TO’s portfolio of projects simultaneously and look at spend across the whole portfolio.

A5.25 As the PCD for project E has not been delivered, Ofgem would consider clawing back allowances. The maximum amount Ofgem could claw back in this example is £6.9m (the allowance associated with project E); this maximum clawback could only occur if Ofgem determined the £1m spent on project E was spent inefficiently, and if Ofgem determined that the remaining allowance (£5.6m) had been spent inefficiently elsewhere across the portfolio of projects.

A5.26 Assuming the £1m spent on project E had been spent efficiently, and the remaining £5.6m had been spent efficiently elsewhere, Ofgem would not look to claw back any of this allowance. If this was the case, in this example there would be no clawback, and the overall underspend across the portfolio of £0.5m would be returned to consumers via a UIOLI adjustment.

⁹ Assumes £6.63m is lower than the TO’s Materiality Threshold; any overspend above the Materiality Threshold could be recovered through the Re-opener mechanism set out in Special Condition 3.40.

Appendix 6 : Gas Distribution: Additional reporting requirements for bespoke Evaluative PCDs

- A6.1 For Gas Distribution Networks, where there are bespoke Evaluative PCDs, there are additional requirements for reporting as set out in our Final Determination document.
- A6.2 The requirement is to provide an engineering report confirming the completion of each section of the project, in addition to the annual reporting through the RRP.
- A6.3 This allows us to monitor the progress of the PCD delivery, as the Basic PCD Report for Evaluative PCDs outlined in part 6 of this document is only required once the delivery date has passed. In addition, the RRP tables do not provide a sufficient level of detail e.g. the specific sections of pipe replaced.
- A6.4 The PCDs which this requirement relates to are:

Distribution Network	PCD name
Cadent	London medium pressure PCD
Cadent	FWACV Compliance PCD
Cadent	Grays Medium Pressure PCD
Cadent	Tinsley Viaduct Diversion PCD
SGN	South London Mains PCD
SGN	Full site and system rebuilds PCD
Cadent	Mandated Category 3 Security PCD
WWU	Pipeline Replacement PCD