Shared Ownership Consultation Responses

37 Responses were received to the Shared Ownership Consultation.

The following table lists some of the recurring themes and comments which were raised by respondents.

Many of the points raised were around the general structure and tone of the document, requesting greater clarity and guidance to support stakeholders to deliver projects, while retaining a high level of flexibility.

The following table is not an exhaustive list of the comments raised in the responses but highlights recurring themes.

Theme	Comments
Acronyms and jargon	• Limit use of confusing terms, explain all jargon
Case studies	• Inclusion of case studies requested
Clarity "project manager"	• Definition of community 'project manager' vs. developer 'project manager'
Clarity on technologies	• Applicability of principles to various technologies
Clarity over funding structures and possibilities	• Further alternative options to be explored • Presentation to aid understanding • Costs, benefits and risks of each model essential • Recognition of other models • Recognition that must be right model for each situation
Clearer relationship with RUK report	• Clarity over connection between documents
Community take-up	• Recognition that it will often be communities who do not want to accept an offer • Developers must not be penalised for projects which do not proceed for legitimate reasons • Measurement of success questioned
Context	• Consumer bills and energy efficiency • Fuel poverty to be acknowledged
Definitions	• Cost value vs market value – confusing and unclear
Demand for shared ownership from communities unknown	• Recognition that appetite may not always be present and this is a Scottish Government policy.
Developer selling on a consented scheme	• Protection for stakeholders
Encouraging knowledge-sharing	• Developers and communities
Ensure document is accessible and understandable	• Crystal Mark • More basic information required for those not familiar with the topic

Explore definition of community	• Clarity over 'community' and 'community group' and any other local organisations
Explore/make offer/uptake	• Clarity over what will constitute success
Further guidance required	• Process more clearly outlined • Can be initiated by either side – clarity over how a community may begin the process
Further reference to research	
Further support to minimise costs	• Developer and community
Governance and accountability	• Acknowledgement of importance of strong governance and accountability
Greater clarity on good practice	• What is required under good practice, what is 'shared ownership' • Is ownership of physical asset required • Risk of conflating policy with good practice
Greater flexibility	
Greater links to strategy/long-term policy	
How to get the most out of LES support	• Links to process and timescales
Include role and recognition of other stakeholders	• Investment industry must be integrated • DNOs and Ofgem
Inclusion of checklist	• Checklist will support analysis of the options for communities • Standardised elements for all stakeholders • Must not become a tickbox exercise
Inclusivity	
Language throughout	• Prescriptive - "communities must" "should" "expected" etc • Ambiguity in places – should be clarified
Links with FCA compliance	• Recognition of issues and clarity over process
Managing expectations	• Complexity of arrangements
Mapping the process	• Timescales –what can be done when • What is required from who • Challenges and pinch points • How to align stakeholders
Meaning and use of "cost-neutral"	• Explanation of what this term means and when it is/isn't possible • Relationship with community benefit funds explored • Relationship with terms such as "commercially viable" should be explored • Are communities expected to contribute costs through volunteering?
Meaningful engagement	• Further clarity on how developers and communities can

	engage 'meaningfully' and what this means.
More details	• What can communities expect/request? • Structure of community group?
Obligation may be required in future	• Danish model • Why/why not? • How will it be enforced if not mandatory?
Process	• Detail required on how community works through process, how barriers are identified, how trust is built up, how to ensure communities are protected • Not every step always possible – presenting options • How are the principles implemented in real life?
Project manager and community group structure	• Some say PM must be in place, some say too difficult too early etc., group structure some say must be single contact, some say unworkable – flexibility key
Relationship to subsidies	• Timescales and CfD
Relationship with planning	• Projects must be assessed on merits • Clarity for socioeconomic guidance • Clarity on benefits for developers • Neutrality confusing, section needs picked apart • Bribery reference confusing • Clarity over how communities can demonstrate support
Reporting and monitoring	• Clarity, measure of success
Requirement for capacity building support	• Document should recognise issues and propose solutions
Risking missing funding and revenue contracts deadlines	
Role of local authorities	• Recognition of resource-restrictions • Certain responsibilities
SG support welcomed, should be more flexible	• Many welcomed SG support – more detail requested • REIF has additional challenges
Shared equity	• Range of responses championing shared equity or voicing concerns • What are the implications for developers and communities?
Sharing costs	• Practicalities of this should be explored • In what situations is this appropriate
Size of projects	• Comments suggest principles should apply to projects over 500kW; 1MW; 2.5MW and 5MW • Tiered requirements or technology specific requirements
Small scale hydro on private land	• Recognition of timescales and process differences
Stage of project	• Clarity required over applicability of principles to existing projects
Structure of document	• Reviewed for clarity • Narrative needs to be clearer and principles pulled out

	and clarified
Support in developing community action plans	• Where can support be secured for communities
Trust	• Some felt trust was not an issue, some felt trust needs to be built up