

RAPID Gate Three Strategic Resource Option – Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Supporting Annex 1A: RAPID Gate Three Guidance (version 3, January 2024) – Location of requirements

July 2024

2. Solution Design

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	Solution design information should be developed to a standard suitable for pre-application planning consultation as per planning policy in England and/or Wales as appropriate.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	Solution owners should have narrowed down their solution to a firm single, potentially scalable, option including clearly defined locations as included in final regional plans and WRMPs (draft plans if final plans are not available).	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	Solutions should be developed in line with Stage 3 of the RIBA plan of works, and ACWG Design Principles, approaching but not necessarily reaching the extent of RIBA Stage 3 outline design for a planning or DCO application. The extent of progress made at Gate Three towards reaching RIBA Stage 3 design should be commensurate with achieving that level of design by the date by which the solution is timetabled to submit its planning/DCO applications. Solutions are not expected at Gate Three to have made planning applications, which is noted as an outcome of RIBA Stage 3, or to have made applications for DCOs.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	Solutions should be undertaking the pre-application stage of the NSIP process or sought pre-application planning advice from relevant local planning authorities	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	Solutions should have considered all applicable requirements from The Network and Information Systems (NIS) Regulations 20188 and the Security and Emergency Measures (Water and Sewerage Undertakers and Water Supply Licensees) Direction 2022(SEMD). Security and Emergency Measures Direction (SEMD) requirements.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	We remind companies that we expect to see that security requirements for new assets and systems have been fully considered and are kept under regular review during the preferred solution design, construction and operational phases of the project, and we will in any event not consider this criteria to be met unless suitable basic protective security measures are provided for all new assets and systems.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	DWI have been transferred the function to undertake the operational Competent Authority (CA) duties to regulate OESs on behalf of Secretary of State (for England) and the Welsh Government (for Wales). <i>All NIS incidents need to be reported to DWI at DWI.NIS@defra.gov.uk.</i>	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1
General	Suitable and effective engagement concerning the asset and system dependencies from and to other companies and/or stakeholders	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.1

	(DWI, EA and Canal & River Trust, Natural Resources Wales) should be undertaken and maintained, with advice and guidance sought from the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI) and National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) as appropriate.	
2.1 Background and Objectives	The submission should outline what requirements and objectives this solution is aiming to address, including requirements and objectives set out by the Environment Agency for England in the National Framework for Water Resources, published in 2020 and the Water Strategy for Wales.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.2
2.1 Background and Objectives	The submission should demonstrate alignment with regional and company plan(s), explaining clearly how the regional and company planning process has informed the development of the solution, and how the solution is reflected in the final plans.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.2
2.1 Background and Objectives	Proposals that affect Wales will have regard to the interests of Wales, in particular sustainable management of its natural resources and Welsh legislation and policies including the guiding principles	n/a
2.2 The preferred solution option	The submission should provide design information about the preferred option for the solution and evidence justifying its selection with respect to the range of options considered in previous gates.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	Solution description, updated from Gate Two where necessary.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	Rationale and evidence for selection of the preferred solution option, and scalable elements where justifiable, in reference to the range of options considered.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	Configuration of the preferred solution option and its elements including a description of how the solution and its elements will be operated and how that operating strategy has influenced design.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	A description of the site selection process, and routing where relevant, for the preferred solution option, how multi-disciplinary input has been integrated into the process and noting any outstanding risks or constraints and how these will be addressed.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	Site specific vision and design principles.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	A description of the key assets to be constructed as part of the preferred solution including relevant diagrams/schematics and site general arrangement design drawings and maps, consistent with any pre-application submissions. This may include process diagrams, or completing RAPID-issued cost data tables, as requested.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3

2.2 The preferred solution option	Evidence of, and any assumptions relating to interactions within the solution, as well as between other proposed water resource solutions, in terms of system connectivity / impacts and mutual inclusivity / exclusivity. This should be described in the context of outcomes of regional groups reconciliation, and any further development on agreements made since.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	Scalability within the preferred solution option, as well as between other proposed water resource solutions, in terms of dependency and phasing.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4
2.2 The preferred solution option	Plan and programme of work on how and when you will develop a digital twin, with an explanation of how it will integrate into the company's existing digital twins and how testing through this process will influence design, construction and operation.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2 The preferred solution option	Recommendations and output from an independent design review where proportionate, and how these have been taken into account.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2.1 Utilisation	At Gate Three we expect information on solution utilisation and water resource benefits to be provided in the submission, aligned with information in final published WRMPs (draft plans if final plans are not available). Uncertainties should be thoroughly explored and understood, and actions in place to manage these through the design and operation of the solution.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.3
2.2.1 Utilisation	Quantitative presentation of finalised anticipated operational utilisation rates determined from the final, or most up to date company and / or regional modelling and aligning with regional resource need.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4
2.2.1 Utilisation	Utilisation rates for dry year annual average operation, for events such as 1 in 500 year droughts, peak demand or as part of emergency response, in addition to standby, or normal-year operation.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4
2.2.1 Utilisation	Where uncertainty exists in utilisation rates, utilisation rates should be provided for a range of clearly defined scenarios representing the uncertainties. Further work should be detailed to address uncertainties, or statements made where uncertainties may remain in the long term.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4
2.2.1 Utilisation	Final conclusions around third party options which have been explored to increase utilisation and value from solution supply.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.1 Utilisation	Where multiple users (public water supply or third party) form part of the utilisation of the solution, the submission should set out the preferred prioritisation rules with clear justification for how these have been developed, an indication that users and prioritisation agreements have been considered in the solution's commercial model (the detail of which may be presented in section 7) and a	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6

	strategy and indicative timetable for delivering the necessary agreements.	
2.2.1 Utilisation	A clear description of the risks and assumptions in the utilisation figures presented, their impacts and how these will be managed in the detailed design and operation of the solution.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4
2.2.1 Utilisation	A clear explanation of how asset management plans are being developed to ensure the solution will provide the intended deployable output when required, especially when utilisation may be infrequent such as in severe droughts.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	The water resources benefit should be quantified to a high degree of confidence, with uncertainties explored, quantified and mitigated where feasible. Calculations on water resources benefit should be aligned with linked solutions, regional and company water resources modelling and planning.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	The water resource benefit, aligned and consistent with the need and justification presented in final published company and regional water resource plans (draft plans if final plans are not available).	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	A finalised water resource benefit assessment including conjunctive use benefit where relevant, consistent with information provided to regional groups to support assessment of regional water resource benefit.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	The water resource benefit of the solution, as a deployable output. Where solutions have previously presented a yield, water resource benefit assessments should now incorporate areas supplying and receiving yield to present a deployable output of the solution as a whole.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	Deployable output, presented for the dry year annual average and critical periods, for events such as the 1 in 500 year drought, considering spatial coincidence where relevant.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	If the solution concerns offsetting a change or redirection of supply, deployable output presented to ensure the water resource benefit is sufficient to maintain consumer supply.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	Methods and calculations which are well evidenced, for example with modelling that utilises appropriate inflow sequences to test relevant drought events, up-to date demand forecasts, and includes environmental and operational constrictions to the water resource benefit, and constraints from other users of the resource. Assumptions in the calculation should be clearly stated.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	An assessment of the risks and uncertainty associated with the water resources benefit of the solution, including the likelihood and impact on solution deployable output due to climate change, and how risks and uncertainties will be managed through design and operation of the solution.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5

2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	The Level of Service against which the water resource benefit is calculated and an explanation of the calculation.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	Where the water resource benefit is received, and by whom. The water resource benefit should be contextualised (and its need justified) through the impact it has on the forecast supply-demand balance of the benefiting area.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.2 Water Resource Benefit	An explanation on how outage may be considered for the solution in the context of describing its water resource benefit, in the event this would be calculated any differently or separately to any other of the water companies' assets or projects in the relevant WRMP.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.5
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	Wider benefits include benefits to public water supplies beyond the primary goal of increasing drought resilience, for example enhancing the operational supply resilience, flexibility and adaptability of supply systems. It also includes benefits to third parties such as social and environmental benefits from the solutions, and benefits associated with providing water supplies to other sectors. Some benefits will be realised through adjustments to the asset design, others through the operational aspects.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	At Gate Three it is expected that opportunities to realise wider benefits and benefits to third parties will be being, or have been, explored through stakeholder consultation, including cross-border stakeholder engagement with Wales (see Stakeholder and Customer Engagement section), and integrated into the solution design and proposed modes of operation. Progress on any modifications or enhancements to the solution design to realise these benefits should be clearly set out, together with a justification for their inclusion, and associated costs. Benefits should be aligned with, but not limited to, best value planning metrics (see section 8), noting also the aspects to consider in compiling a best value plan in Section 9 of the Water Resource Planning Guideline.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	<p>Possible benefits could include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment, biodiversity and natural capital benefits (and where solutions affect Wales, enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem resilience, showing a clear link to supporting delivery of Wales's Well-being goals); • Amenity, community, access and recreation benefits including cultural consideration in Wales; • Providing water supplies to other sectors (for example industry and agriculture); • Operational supply resilience, flexibility and adaptability (beyond drought resilience alone); • Climate change adaptation; • Flood resilience benefits; • Water quality benefits; and • Enabling capacity increases in future. 	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6

2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	Where wider benefits are proposed to be provided to third parties, proposals should be submitted demonstrating how those parties propose to contribute a fair share of the costs according to their own responsibilities and the benefits they realise, and evidence of engagement and commitment by those third parties.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	Where options were available for scaling a solution to accommodate future capacity needs, or modify the solution in future to mitigate uncertainties, justification should be presented for the preferred proposed option. This should include an appraisal of the costs and benefits of different scaling options, and their potential timings.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	As part of this justification, the cost differential of including scalability should be provided. Solution owners should identify where the scalability costs move from marginal (and therefore good value) to significant cost increases which could outweigh the benefits. This trigger point should be clearly outlined in the solution cost tables.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	A preferred scaling option should be clearly justified based on assessments undertaken.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	The preferred option should have given consideration to incorporating critical components that would be difficult to upgrade at a later date into the design from the outset, to enable modular build.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	All infrastructure associated with the solutions must be designed to be resilient to flooding over the life of its design and delivered in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework / National Policy Statement for England and Wales, not being sited in an area at unacceptable risk of flooding or coastal erosion if the design has not taken sufficient account of the risk and provided suitable mitigation measures to deal with those risks. For solutions that affect Wales, the Water Strategy for Wales ⁹ sets out expectations in this area.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	Evidence on an initial flood risk assessment is expected. Evidence should be provided on the flood and / or coastal erosion risk for the solution (flooding risk the solution is exposed to, and flooding risk which the solution may cause or exacerbate), and set out a strategy for mitigating risks during the detailed design phase. Gate Three submissions may signpost out to standalone, published, flood risk assessments for further detail where available. In the case of reservoirs, a summary of the potential safety risks and how these will be managed during design and operation should be provided.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	We expect solution owners to assess and identify where infrastructure associated with the solutions can be designed to optimise and deliver wider flood risk management benefits, either as stand-alone or in partnership with other organisations including other Risk Management Authorities (RMAs). This could include for example, designing infrastructure to attenuate flood waters or	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6

	working with other RMAs to deliver collaborative infrastructure plans.	
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	Evidence should be provided on whether or how the solution may be used or adapted to realise wider flood risk management benefits, through design and / or operation, and the steps required to incorporate this in the detailed design and operation of the solution. This should be considered and applied across the entirety of the solution, where the solution may span many spatial areas, and particular consideration to where solutions may affect cross-border areas and Wales.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6
2.2.3 Long Term Opportunities and Scalability	All infrastructure associated with solutions should be designed taking into account the latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP). The Environment Agency, Welsh Government and Natural Resources Wales provide guidance on how to incorporate climate change allowances within flood risk assessments.	Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.6

3. Drinking Water Quality

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	Submissions should provide updated assessments of drinking water quality considerations and potential risks to drinking water quality and supply issues and resilience	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality
General	Well-developed Drinking Water Safety Plans.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.2
General	Details of proposed mitigation for any emerging contaminants identified.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.6
General	Evidence of consultation with stakeholders and consumer engagement, paying particular attention to consumers and stakeholders who will receive water from a different or blended source.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.13 or Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement
General	A plan for continued engagement and any required mitigation provided.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.13 or Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement
General	Details of any specific concerns from company drinking water quality teams and how they will be addressed.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.13 or Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement

General	Details of any specific concerns from the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) and how these will be addressed.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.7
General	In scenarios where there is expected to be a change of source water, that testing has been carried out to ascertain any risks that may come with this change.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.6
General	Deployable output expected from the solution, consistent with the regional plan and WRMP.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.9
General	Where remineralisation is being undertaken prior to mixing with another source of water, that any risks associated with this are captured in the DWSP.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.7
General	Consideration of the requirements of Regulation 31 and tracking of any products required for use.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.10
General	Consideration of the requirements of Regulation 15.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.12
General	Ensure alignment with Resilience of water supplies in Water Resource Planning – Guidance Note (dwi.gov.uk) on long term planning, and The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016 (legislation.gov.uk) for England and The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2018 (legislation.gov.uk) for Wales. This should be considered in the concept design report.	Ch3. Drinking Water Quality Section 3.1

4. Environmental

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	Environmental assessments of the solution should be sufficiently advanced to support DCO or local planning pre-application stages after the gate. Evidence base requirements, risks, and relevant mitigation measures should be thoroughly explored and discussed with environmental regulators.	Ch4. Environmental
4.1 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment	<p>You must be assessing your solution to ensure it complies with and supports the achievement of The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 requirements and objectives as set out in the River Basin Management Plans. This specifically means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence (including monitoring evidence) that the solution will meet WFD objectives; • If necessary, evidence that Regulation 19 test criteria will be met; and • If uncertainties remain in your assessment, you must provide a plan to gather further evidence in a timely manner. 	Ch4. Environmental Section 4.1

<p>4.2 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</p>	<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment should be sufficiently advanced to represent the solution’s position within DCO or local planning pre-application stages and follow the latest HRA guidance. Please note that the source and receiving water bodies, as well as any transfer will need to have compatible HRAs, where applicable. Where HRAs are not applicable to a solution, please confirm this in the submission.</p> <p>Where an HRA may indicate that a solution could have an adverse effect on a European Site or a European Offshore Marine Site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), an outline strategy should be provided for ensuring that there will be no such effect or demonstrating that there are no alternatives and that the solution must be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest. Where mitigation or other measures need to be taken in connection with the effects on a European Site or a European Offshore Marine Site, the outline strategy should set out how these measures are to be implemented and an indicative timetable for implementation. The outline strategy and indicative timetable should be sufficiently developed for RAPID to assess its likely deliverability. We recommend consulting with the Environment Agency, Natural England (England only) and Natural Resources Wales (Wales only) on the strategy.</p>	<p>Ch4. Environmental Section 4.2</p>
<p>4.3 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</p>	<p>For most solutions, a statutory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be required to support planning and permitting applications. The solution owner is expected by Gate Three to know the likely scope of the EIA through informal consultation with environmental regulators but application for a formal EIA scoping opinion does not have to be made by Gate Three.</p> <p>We recommend consulting with Local Planning Authorities, PEDW, or referring to The Planning Inspectorate guidance for DCO applications. The Planning Inspectorate provides Advice Notes¹² on a number of topic areas relating to environmental assessments and the roles of statutory consultees and other advisory bodies. Advice Notes 3 and 713 are specifically related to EIA.</p>	<p>Ch4. Environmental Section 4.3</p>

<p>4.4 National Parks, the Boards and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p>	<p>For solutions that may affect National Parks, The Broads or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the likely effects on those areas should be assessed, having regard to the statutory purposes for which the areas are designated. An outline strategy should be provided summarising the likely effects on these areas and showing how these effects will be addressed, having regard to the statutory purposes for the designations. Where mitigation or other measures need to be taken in connection with the effects on these areas, the outline strategy should set out how these measures are to be implemented and an indicative timetable for implementation. The outline strategy and indicative timetable should be sufficiently developed for RAPID to assess its likely deliverability. We recommend consulting with relevant National Park Authorities, The Broads Authority (where relevant), relevant local authorities and Natural England (England only) or Natural Resources Wales (Wales only) on the strategy.</p> <p>Where a solution is not likely to have an effect on any National Park, The Broads or any Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, please confirm this in the submission.</p>	<p>Ch4. Environmental Section 4.4</p>
<p>4.5 Other Environmental Considerations</p>	<p>Biodiversity net gain (England only): This should support the net gain actions in the Government’s 25 year Environment Plan, meet the requirements of the Environment Act 2021 and any national planning policy requirements set out in the NPPF and/ or National Policy Statement where relevant. <i>It should also satisfy the requirements of any applicable local planning policies.</i></p>	<p>Ch4. Environmental Section 4.5</p>
<p>4.6 Environmental regulators statutory planning consultee roles</p>	<p>The Environment Agency, Natural England and Natural Resources Wales are statutory consultees within the planning system. They will provide bespoke advice on individual projects in accordance with their pre-application advice services</p>	<p>Ch4. Environmental Section 4.6</p>
<p>4.6 Environmental regulators statutory planning consultee roles</p>	<p>The Environment Agency and Natural Resources Wales will provide bespoke advice on Environmental Permitting requirements in accordance with their pre-application services.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>4.6 Environmental regulators statutory planning consultee roles</p>	<p>Advice provided by environmental regulators on environmental assessments used to support the RAPID gated process is given on a ‘without prejudice’ basis to any future advice they provide in fulfilling their statutory planning consultee roles or in determining any other regulatory consent, environmental permitting applications or other licence requirements</p>	<p>Ch4. Environmental Section 4.6</p>

5. Carbon

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	<p>Solution development to Gate Three should continue to build from the Gate Two submissions. In particular, you should continue to follow the Water Resources Planning Guidelines for WRMP24 section 8.3.2 (published on April 2022) which states expectations for accounting for and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In Wales, expectations are set out in section 3 of the guiding principles (published April 2016) for WRMPs.</p>	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.1
General	<p>The following additional guidance should be considered as per the Water Resources Planning Guidelines for WRMP24 section 8.3.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKWIR (2012) Framework for accounting for embodied carbon in water industry assets (12/CL/01/15); • For carbon costs associated with the projected emissions you should use the latest government guidance on the cost of carbon. In particular you should consider the Green Book Supplementary Guidance; • The Carbon Accounting (Wales) Regulations 2018; • Environmental reporting guidelines: including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance; • PAS 2080: Carbon management in infrastructure; • HM Treasury infrastructure carbon review; • Towards a science-based approach to climate neutrality in the corporate sector; • ACWG Cost Consistency Methodology (August 2020), section 5; • ACWG Carbon Ambition; • Water UK's Net Zero 2030 Routemap; • Respective company and/or regional commitments; • Emissions factors for materials and activities taken from ICE CESMM price book and other recognised databases (such as Ecoinvent); • Operational carbon from annual quantities and UKWIR carbon assessment workbook (v16) framework for whole life carbon reducing both operational and embedded emissions in tandem; and • The most up to date carbon costs and values as per government guidance (eg Valuation of greenhouse gas emissions: for policy appraisal and evaluation). This can be a signpost out to existing work undertaken as part of the WRMP24 development activity, unless there has been a material change in the position. 	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.1

General	<p>On 6 January 2022, Ofwat published its net zero principles position paper. Solutions should be designed in line with these principles. In particular companies are encouraged to ensure solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are reflective of national government targets on net zero; • prioritise the reduction of GHG emissions before the use of offsets, doing so in line with the IEMA GHG Management Hierarchy; and • clearly address both operation and embedded emissions. 	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.1
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: Estimations of carbon costs	Annex 5: Carbon
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: The operational and embodied carbon of solutions (in tCO ₂ e). This should be done for all options presented.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.2
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: How whole life carbon reductions have been considered .	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.3
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: How carbon has been considered in the best value planning approaches, metrics and decision making associated with a proposed solution.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.2
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: That operational and embedded carbon emissions have been considered as part of the best value assessment.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.2
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: That due consideration has been given to the seven Kyoto Protocol greenhouse gases.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.1
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: how relevant policies, frameworks and approaches have been used to consider reductions on carbon emissions. how solutions are embracing innovative designs and opportunities to generate or be powered by renewable energy and/or sequester carbon and explore joint opportunities with other sectors	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.1
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: whether a focus on carbon reduction has been able to drive down solution costs ¹⁸ . The key emission areas and what opportunities there are for reducing emissions. We expect the submission to demonstrate consideration of Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.3
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: how materials have been selected and whether the lowest carbon options have been considered as part of solution design. It should be made clear why the lowest carbon solutions are not taken forward.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.3
General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: How water companies will work with the supply chain to deliver lower carbon materials where they may not be readily available.	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.3

General	Gate Three submissions should make clear: The role of monitoring and reporting due the life cycle of the solution, particularly with a view to ensure transparency and continual improvement	Ch5. Carbon Section 5.1
---------	--	-------------------------

6. Programme and Planning

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
6.1 Project Plan	<p>A clear project-level plan that sets out the key solution-specific milestones to delivery and includes key activities and outputs that need to be undertaken and achieved prior to each subsequent gate should be provided. It should contain sufficient detail to support assessment of progress in relation to delivery incentives (ie, clarity around important milestones and interdependencies) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The date when the solution is required (based on company and regional plans, as appropriate), and any updates if this changes; • The phasing of key activities and decisions; • Summary of all key risks and mitigation plans; • The assumptions and dependencies within the programme; • Information about construction activities (such as scoping, detailed design, planning route and direct procurement for customers (DPC)); • The planned construction start date within the 2025-30 period; • The earliest possible deployable output date (assuming planning started today) – which might be significantly earlier than the required date; • An assessment of progress against the project plan that indicates whether or not it is on track. Reasons should be provided for any missed milestones and impacts on the overall programme caused by delays; • An estimate of overall project delivery timescales for subsequent gates; and • Missing information – outline any information that is missing from the project plan and how this will be addressed before Gate Four. 	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.1
6.2 Key risks and mitigation measures	<p>An assessment of key risks to the solution’s planned progress to completion (including requirements at gates) and an assessment of risks to costs and realisation of the benefits of the solution should be provided. This should include consideration of potential regulatory barriers to the solution’s progress. The risk assessment should include proposed mitigation measures, which should, where appropriate, have been agreed with relevant regulators and costed in. It should present original risk scores and residual risk scores following mitigation. It must also be consistent with information presented in quarterly dashboards.</p>	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.2
6.3 Proposed Gate Four activities and outcomes	<p>Solution owners should propose dates for Gate Four onwards aligned with the solution project plan. Those solutions which are required to be “construction ready” earlier should propose an earlier</p>	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.3

	Gate Four date. Those planned for later in the 2025-30 period should propose later gate dates.	
6.3 Proposed Gate Four activities and outcomes	By Gate Four, solution owners should have submitted applications for DCO or planning permission for a firm single solution, including location, as included in final regional plans and WRMPs.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.3
6.3 Proposed Gate Four activities and outcomes	We expect companies to have tested their design through a digital twin. Procurement and commercial arrangements should be sufficiently progressed to enable construction to begin at the “construction ready” date. The starting point for Gate Four activity proposals should be the list of activities included in the PR19 final determinations water resource solutions appendix.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.3
6.3 Proposed Gate Four activities and outcomes	Solution owners should set out proposals for Gate Four activities and outcomes, depending on whether they are on preferred or alternative pathways, penalty scale, assessment criteria and contributions. This should include explicit consideration of solution delay impacts.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.3
6.4 Planning and Land	<p>An updated land and planning strategy for the solution should be provided. This should cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation of the preferred planning route for the solution and the key planning steps. Where a section 35 direction is required under the Planning Act 2008, this should have been applied for and received by Gate Three and prior to starting the pre-application stage of the DCO process. If this has not been done, an explanation of the delay (including events outside solution owners’ control), risk mitigation, the timetable for achieving it, and how this fits in the overall programme plan; • Where solutions may have cross-border impacts or capital works, the preferred planning route should consider whether Welsh planning policy or bodies should be included, and consult with Planning and Environment Decisions Wales (PEDW) as appropriate; and • Progress made in pre-application non-statutory and statutory consultations and in preparing applications for a DCO or planning permission including supporting documents. 	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.4
6.4 Planning and Land	The plan for obtaining other regulatory consents needed for construction and operation. This should include a high-level summary of the consents needed (i.e. types of consent) and indicative application timings. For solutions utilising the DCO process, the submission should indicate if there are any consents that must be obtained outside of the DCO, briefly explain how you will gain those consents and indicate how they fit in the overall programme plan.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.4
6.4 Planning and Land	<p>The land lifecycle, including the strategy and plan for effectively delivering it and explaining how the approach will support the effective and efficient delivery of planning consent, acquisition of required land and rights over land, and delivery of the programme. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an explanation of the part, if any, to be played by compulsory purchase as a tool for delivering the required land and rights over land on time and in budget. Where compulsory purchase powers 	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.4

	<p>are to be made available, the legal vehicle for their availability (compulsory purchase order, DCO etc), the statutory compulsory purchase powers that will be relied upon, the circumstances in which the powers will be used to acquire land and rights over land and the timing of their use must be included. You must also outline the steps that you will take to attempt to acquire the necessary land and rights over land by agreement, in advance of any compulsory purchase powers being applied for and used. Recognising that the availability of compulsory purchase can be a useful way of ensuring deliverability of projects and acquisition of land and rights over land at an objectively fair price, if compulsory purchase powers are not to be made available, the justification for their absence must be set out; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation of how the strategy relates to a common methodology (agreed with other water companies and/or other infrastructure promoters) for acquiring land and rights in land on large projects including a common approach to compensation policies. 	
6.4 Planning and Land	Explanation of how you are managing the land and planning process, including providing assurance that you have (or will have) adequate systems and resources and that there are effective and efficient processes and governance arrangements.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.5
6.4 Planning and Land	An explanation of how you are proposing to manage the "journey" for all those who will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the solution, and how solution owners will continue to ensure a good experience for them.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.5 and Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement
6.4 Planning and Land	The key risks and issues relating to land and planning and explaining how the strategy supports the management/mitigation of the risks. This may require the solution owner to provide us with information that is commercially sensitive where it identifies a material risk or issue to the delivery of the solution. In such a situation, this information can be redacted or removed from the published submission documentation, subject to the position on access to information set out in paragraph 1.5 above	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.2
6.4 Planning and Land	The submission should provide an update on work done to date to support the proposed land and planning process, including the outcome of pre-planning application activities, and how this has affected the land and planning strategy for the solution.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.5
6.4 Planning and Land	The submission should provide a breakdown of estimated costs included in the solution cost estimate for acquisition of land rights and compensation and the likely timing of this expenditure; the level of risk around these costs; and explain the basis for the estimates.	Ch6. Programme and Planning Section 6.5 and Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits

7. Procurement and Operation Model

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	<p>Following Gate Two submissions we expect companies to continue to develop the procurement arrangements for the project and present an updated procurement strategy.</p> <p>Where a competitive delivery model such as Direct Procurement for Customer (DPC) or under the Specified Infrastructure Project Regulations (SIPR) was identified at Gate Two as the preferred procurement route, companies are required to follow Ofwat's DPC process. By Gate Three we expect companies to have submitted and had accepted by Ofwat the DPC stage 1 and stage 2 submissions except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where RAPID projects have successfully completed RAPID Gate Two and addressed all relevant actions in relation to procurement, we do not require a separate DPC stage 1 submission to be provided. 	Ch7. Procurement and Operation Section 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4
General	<p>We also do not require the information submitted in the DPC submissions to be resubmitted as part of the gate. Where things have significantly changed between the achievement of the above DPC submissions and the RAPID Gate Three submission, provide a summary of the changes (and their driver); and an overview of the revised commercial structure and risk allocation.</p> <p>In addition, provide the following within the submission initial draft heads of terms for the CAP agreement as well as those between the project partners and where appropriate other third parties.</p>	Ch7. Procurement and Operation Section 7.5
General	<p>Where the solution has previously not been identified as suitable for delivery under DPC or SIPR and it has been agreed by Ofwat that it is not suitable for delivery via DPC or SIPR, please provide an updated procurement strategy for the project setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the preferred procurement route/procedure with rationale for approach; • an explanation of the commercial strategy – including a high-level approach to risk allocation and incentives at a company and contractor level and initial draft heads of terms between the relevant parties (including between the water company partners, any third parties as well as between the company and contractor); • a summary of market engagement exercises that have been undertaken and feedback received showing (amongst other things) market appetite, supply chain availability, and views on proposed commercial arrangements; • an updated detailed procurement timetable, with an explanation of how it supports the overall critical path including highlighting any dependencies and how risk of delay may be mitigated; • an explanation of how the procurement route and commercial strategy will maximise competition and deliver best value for customers; and 	Ch7. Procurement and Operation Section 7.6

- an assessment of risks and issues associated with the preferred delivery route

8. Solution Cost and Benefits

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
8.0 Introduction	<p>At Gate Three, solution owners should present updated key cost information provided at Gate Two for the preferred option with reduced uncertainty in costs and benefits and an explanation of any material change in costs, including where optimism bias has been reduced as costs firm up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall costs of construction and operation for the preferred option and options that have been discarded in order to demonstrate that the preferred option is best value; • Detail of capital expenditure; • Detail of operating expenditure - include an indication of design life of the asset and any significant maintenance liabilities during operational life; • Optimism bias; • Assumptions and exclusions; • Cost of all environmental and water quality mitigations should be included; • An indication as to whether solution costs are in line with relevant methodologies agreed with regulators and relevant green book guidance; • Cross-comparison of updated solution costs as tested in regional or national modelling; and • Clear description of where solution cost scalability moves from marginally more expensive to substantially more expensive (tipping points). 	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.2
8.0 Introduction	<p>Solution owners should complete and provide the template developed by the All Company Working Group (ACWG), consistent with the cost profiles information included within the WRMP24 Table 51920 , as an annex. Cost profile information includes capex, opex, financing cost, optimism bias, costed risk, discount rate, as well as fixed and variable opex and capex unit costs. Solution owners must ensure that the costs of any proposed mitigations to identified risks are included in the reported costs of the solution.</p>	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.2 and Annex 8A: ACWG Template
8.0 Introduction	<p>Solution owners can reflect on costs uncertainty and volatility given changing input prices such as energy, and can discuss these in checkpoints in the run up to Gate Three submission.</p>	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.2

8.0 Introduction	For the each of the cost components contained within the ACWG cost template, solution owners should provide a comparison of the value submitted at Gate Two and the updated value for the preferred solution at Gate Three. Solution owners should also discuss the cost-effectiveness of the preferred option relative to the other options considered at Gate Two.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.1
8.0 Introduction	Solution owners should also fill out the template provided by RAPID requesting solution design and cost information.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.1
8.0 Introduction	When solution owners publish their gate submission, they should include all costs information unless it is information that has been redacted in WRMP24 tables in line with the instructions to complete those tables. These instructions provide for publication of water resource planning tables to help regulators, water company customers and other organisations understand and appraise the plan. They provide that the only information that should be redacted is information that the Secretary of State or Welsh Ministers have determined to be commercially confidential under section 37B(2) of the Water Industry Act 1991 and information where its publication would be contrary to the interests of national security.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.1
8.1 Best Value and Solution Benefits	The aim of the WRMP and regional planning process is to develop and present a best value plan both in the short and long term and to select the best value programme of solutions, including strategic and non-strategic options. As explained in the introduction and solution design sections of this guidance, the choice of whether a solution should be implemented is not made within the RAPID gated process. This decision is taken within the regional plan and WRMP process	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.2
8.1 Best Value and Solution Benefits	The RAPID process draws on the assessments in the regional and company plans regarding best value considerations. Therefore, the Gate Three submissions should include a summary of the best value considerations relevant to the preferred option for each solution included in all the individual company WRMPs and regional plans where the solution appears. This should include the consideration of financial cost and how it will achieve an outcome that increases the overall benefit to customers, the wider environment and overall society. Benefits to consider could include any amenity or recreation value, regional economic impact, multisector benefits, and other societal benefits.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.2
8.1 Best Value and Solution Benefits	A summary of the best value metric evaluation outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Weights and scoring applied; ○ Non-monetised and monetised (where possible) best value benefits consistent with WRMP24 Table 5 for the solution within each company WRMP and regional plan where the solution appears; ○ Any significant differences in best value evaluation outcomes for the solution between plans should be identified and explained; and 	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any changes from the Gate Two submission with respect to the above bullets should be clearly highlighted and explained. 	
8.1 Best Value and Solution Benefits	Which best value metrics have been applied to the solution within regional plans and individual company WRMPs. Any differences should be identified and explained.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.3
8.1 Best Value and Solution Benefits	Evidence that approaches used for scoring and weighting metrics are consistent with those used within associated WRMPs and regional plans.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.3
8.1 Best Value and Solution Benefits	An explanation of how the solution features within each WRMP and regional plan that it is included in. The explanation should clearly identify whether it appears in preferred or alternative pathways and the timing of its selection.	Ch8. Solution Costs and Benefits Section 8.3 and Ch2. Solution Design Section 2.4

9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	By Gate Three submission, solutions should have completed non-statutory consultation, and be undertaking statutory pre-planning consultation for DCO solutions, or planning application and permission. Solution owners should begin engagement with all relevant statutory bodies as early as possible to de-risk solutions and ensure opportunities are not missed.	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.3
General	Gate Three engagement should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pre-planning statutory consultation as outlined in as described in The Planning Inspectorate Advice note 11 and Annexes A-H21; and Plans showing ongoing and continued engagement, that have been shared with public and statutory bodies, including any required enhanced advisory services. 	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.3
General	Gate Three engagement should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customer engagement, particularly on changes of source where relevant; and Engagement with all stakeholders affected by the solution's development. 	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.3 and 9.4
General	Solution submissions should also describe specifically what stakeholder concerns have been raised in representations to date (including representations on the draft decisions at the previous gate) and how they have been addressed at Gate Three or will be addressed at future gates.	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.3

General	Under the Water Industry Act 1991, water suppliers have a statutory duty to supply water used for domestic purposes, including drinking, cooking, food preparation and washing, that is wholesome.	Ch3 Drinking Water Quality Section 3.2
General	Wholesomeness is defined in regulation 4 as water that does not contain concentrations or values of the parameters listed in Schedule 1 of the Regulations that exceed or otherwise do not meet the prescribed concentration or value. Water must also not contain any microorganism, parasite or substance at a concentration that is a potential danger to human health.	Ch3 Drinking Water Quality Section 3.2
General	Changes to a potable water source can lead to changes in the water chemistry impacting on the taste, odour, colour or feel of water supplied to customers, leading to complaints to water companies and/or regulators, customer anxiety and a lack of trust in the company.	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.4
General	Concerns can be allayed by water companies engaging with stakeholders and customers at an early stage, before any changes are made to their supply. This engagement should highlight any potential changes to their supply, clearly explain why this is happening and whether this will be a permanent, intermittent, or temporary change.	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.4
Chapter 3 General	Evidence of consultation with stakeholders and consumer engagement, paying particular attention to consumers and stakeholders who will receive water from a different or blended source.	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3
Chapter 3 General	A plan for continued engagement and any required mitigation provided.	Ch9. Stakeholder and Customer Engagement Section 9.4

10. Board Statement and Assurance

	Detailed content requirements (Questions being asked of the submission)	Location of Info
General	At Gate Three, an assurance statement should be provided from the Board of each solution owner, in its own words.	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	Statements for solutions should confirm that the Board of each solution owner is satisfied that each solution owner has undertaken sufficient assurance and due diligence	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	The board is confident in making the statement: it supports the recommendations for solution progression made in the submission at Gate Three and the recommendations for which option within the solution should be progressed	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2

General	The board is confident in making the statement: it is satisfied that a realistic and achievable programme for the solution is in place, there are no insurmountable obstacles to the delivery of the solution in accordance with that programme and that progress on the solution at Gate Three in accordance with that programme is commensurate with the solution being "construction ready" for 2025-2030	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	The board is confident in making the statement: It is satisfied that all significant risks to the delivery of the solution in accordance with the programme and within current cost projections have been identified and that those risks are managed well	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	The board is confident in making the statement: it is satisfied that the work carried out at Gate Three is of sufficient scope, detail and quality to ensure that applications can be made for development consent orders, planning applications and other necessary statutory consents and permits in accordance with the programme and the work carried out at Gate Three is commensurate with the solution being "construction ready" for 2025-2030	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	The board is confident in making the statement: it is satisfied that expenditure has been incurred only on activities that are appropriate for Gate Three and is efficient and cost effective.	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	All solution owners are assuring the whole submission, not just their respective contributions.	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	Assurance statements should be signed by the Board or on behalf of the Board. Where an assurance statement is signed on behalf of the Board it should be clear that the person signing the statement has delegated authority to sign on behalf of the Board.	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
General	The assurance statement(s) should clearly set out the evidence, information and external and/or internal assurance that the Board has considered in providing assurance. This should be explained separately for each of the five points of the statement. Joint solutions will require supporting statements from all partners' Boards.	Ch10. Board Statement and Assurance Section 10.2
11.1 General Principles	RAPID will allow solution owners to submit evidence to justify inclusion of new solutions in the process at each gate, up to the original date of Gate Three (October 2023). The earlier the solutions enter the RAPID programme, the easier it will be for a new solution to be incorporated and more benefits gained from its acceleration.	Ch11. Conclusions and Recommendations
12 Flexibility	The gated process is intended to ensure that strategic water resource solutions progress at pace and make an efficient use of the development funding; it is not intended to create	RAPID Liaison Lead confirmed no requirement to submit a chapter 11 or 12

additional requirements. To maintain the focus on acceleration and efficiency RAPID is open to flexibility in the timing of assessments and decisions. This could include, for example, making some decisions outside of gate assessment windows such as dealing with showstoppers that emerge long before the gate submission or decisions to drop options within a solution which have a financial impact on gate allowances. RAPID will consider suggestions put forward by solution owners on a case basis. Any assessment would follow the same process as has been outlined in this guidance.