

Caroline Roberts  
Licensing and Consents Unit  
Energy Group  
DTI  
Room 170  
1 Victoria Street  
London  
SW1H 0ET

Renewable Energy House  
1 Aztec Row, Berners Road  
London, N1 0PW, UK

T 020 7689 1960  
F 020 7689 1969

info@bwea.com

www.bwea.com  
www.deepgreenpower.org  
www.offshorewindfarms.co.uk

17 February 2003

Dear Caroline

**Future Offshore:  
A Strategic Framework for the Offshore Wind Industry**

**Response of the British Wind Energy Association**

Preface

The British Wind Energy Association (BWEA) welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation on behalf of the wind energy industry in the UK.

BWEA now represents 236 companies in the wind and marine renewables energy sectors (see Appendix).

The Association represented developers in the lease negotiations for the so-called 'First Round' and initiated the stakeholder dialogue process that preceded it. BWEA has since published *Health and Safety Guidelines for the Wind Industry* to include the emerging offshore sector, and *Best Practice Guidelines on Consultation for Offshore Wind Energy Developments* in partnership with several organisations, including DTI and the Crown Estate.

BWEA has a dedicated staff member with responsibility for Offshore Renewables.



In this formal response to the consultation, BWEA has largely limited itself to the key issues raised and responds to them in sequence. BWEA is in continuing dialogue with Government and with the Crown Estate on specific aspects of the prospects for future development offshore and these are not necessarily included in this document.

The Association and its members remain committed to the active process of ongoing stakeholder dialogue that has proved beneficial to all parties in both the establishment of the 'First Round' and the evolution of this consultation. BWEA is keen to see that any issues which may emerge from the responses to the consultation continue to be resolved in as open a manner as possible.

The membership of the Association has extensive skills and expertise in the detail of wind project development and again, BWEA remains committed to providing expert comment in any forum that may be helpful in harnessing this abundant resource.

Although clearly primarily focused on wind energy interests BWEA also anticipates the needs of the other emerging marine renewable technologies: BWEA believes that much of their success will come as a direct consequence of the growth of offshore wind.

## Response

### **Issue 1. New Legislation**

*Comments are invited on the urgency with which new legislation is needed to allow developments outside territorial waters.*

New legislation beyond 12 nautical miles (nm) is required for two purposes; to establish a legal regime and to create a streamlined consents process. BWEA will address the latter in Issue 17.

**Need for a legal regime.** The Government could be acting *ultra vires* if it permitted development (other than oil & gas) on the UKCS outside 12nm. This is potentially a serious problem because third parties could then challenge the legality of such developments. The absence of an appropriate legal regime effectively rules out any development outside 12nm.

BWEA believes that the absence of a timetable within which an EEZ/REPZ and appropriate primary legislation will be introduced represents a serious constraint on the future development of offshore wind.

**Vesting of EEZ Rights.** The Consultation infers that the current legislative framework does not give a clear steer on whether EEZ/REPZ rights should be vested in 'Her Majesty' (i.e. Crown Estate) or some 'other appropriate body'. As the offshore wind industry grows and the scale of projects increases, BWEA sees similarities with the North Sea oil & gas experience. Since oil & gas powers are vested with the Secretary of State and exercised by the DTI, BWEA believes that there are strong reasons for adopting similar practices with regard to the EEZ/REPZ.

Some members have expressed a preference for rights to be vested in the DTI. BWEA recognises the strong support of, and leading role played, by the Crown Estate in establishing 'Round One' and also that the DTI have considerable experience in the oil and gas sector. What matters is that a clear and simple route is found. BWEA believes that the abilities and responsibilities of both bodies need to be clarified between themselves and agreed and formalized as a matter of urgency.

## **Issue 2. Allocation of rights**

*Views are invited on how best the allocation process can be tailored to optimise the development potential within the context of strategic environmental assessment.*

Regarding process, BWEA believes that the following arrangements represent the best route.

**Desk Study.** Once a developer has determined that a site has development potential they might prepare and submit to the appropriate body an initial assessment (the Desk Study). BWEA suggests that the form of the Desk Study should not be overly prescriptive as this may stifle innovation and impose costs. A low cost route should remain available; however, an applicant pursuing such a route must be aware that they may run the risk of losing out to a rival who has a better/more comprehensive application. By way of assisting in the process BWEA has included some initial thoughts on what such a study may contain:

- a) estimated installed capacity upon completion of the wind farm
- b) proposed grid connection points, alternatives and constraints
- c) wind assessment modelling
- d) environmental scoping and assessment report
- e) project economic assessment
- f) project risk assessment
- g) minimum Work Programme (WP)
- h) financial and technical credibility of the Developer.

BWEA notes that developers, during the Desk Study phase of their site survey, occasionally need to carry out invasive site analysis such as boreholes and CPT surveys. Legislation or at least clarification of their rights to do this would be helpful.

**Agreement for Lease.** BWEA proposes that evaluation of the Desk Study will lead to a decision on whether or not to award an Agreement for Lease (AFL) to the applicant. The AFL should include an option, exercisable by the developer to whom it is awarded, to sign a Development Lease (Lease) subject to receipt of all requisite consents and the developer agreeing to develop. BWEA believes that the inclusion of this option within the AFL is of crucial importance as it gives the developer the degree of security that they (and their financiers) need in order to proceed with the project.

**Development Programme.** BWEA believes that the period of the AFL should be sufficient to allow the developer an amount of time (see Issue 9) in which to carry out a detailed Feasibility Study on the site.

The Feasibility Study will incorporate the Work Programme and any other development activities envisaged; this could include, but not necessarily be limited to,

- a) wind and wave measurement
- b) detailed seismic and geotechnical investigation
- c) detailed grid connection survey with a grid connection agreement
- d) full Environmental Impact Assessment
- e) routing information for all cables (within the wind farm as well as to shore)
- f) detailed estimate of eventual wind farm extent and capacity
- g) conceptual wind farm design
- h) consents (FEPA, CPA, Section 36 & 37 etc as appropriate).

**Development Lease/Lease.** If project sanction and all consents are achieved during the AFL period, the AFL will, as a matter of course, be converted into a lease. This right is an important aspect for financing.

It is worth noting that BWEA believes that the period of the Lease should be sufficient to allow the developer an adequate period of time in which to recoup the capital invested and risks taken in the development of the project (see Issue 9).

**Outwith 12nm – Exploration licence.** The Consultation highlights the fact that exploration and appraisal of sites should be allowed to begin without delay.

BWEA welcomes this statement but recognizes that exploration of sites beyond 12nm is unlikely to happen without developers in these areas having exclusivity as well as a high degree of certainty that these exploration rights will be turned into an AFL or Lease once the appropriate legislation is in place.

BWEA therefore proposes the following process for areas beyond 12nm:

**Desk Study.** Developers interested in exploring an area outside 12nm might submit an initial Desk Study for areas in which they are interested in carrying out detailed survey work. The components of this study may be largely as per those proposed earlier for areas within 12nm.

**Award of Exploration Licence.** BWEA proposes that DTI/CE may assess the submitted DS and decide whether or not to award an EL, on the basis of criteria similar to those BWEA proposed employing within 12nm.

**Terms of the Exploration Licence.** BWEA hopes that the EL will allow the developer exclusive rights to explore the area in question; if there is no exclusivity then BWEA feels that a developer will not be likely to make a serious commitment.

BWEA believes that it is important that a developer should have the right to convert the Exploration Licence into an Agreement for Lease once the appropriate legislation is in place for areas beyond 12nm. Without the ability to effect such a conversion BWEA notes that it is unlikely that developers will be prepared to carry out substantive exploration activities. Once the EL has been converted to an AFL then it may be appropriate for the process whereby the Developer will be able to convert that to a Development Lease being as outlined in *Development Lease/Lease* above.

BWEA's views on the appropriate term for the Exploration Licence are contained in Issue 8.

**Lease flexibility.** Assuming that the lease will be for a 50 year term (Issue 9) and that 'Future Offshore' projects will be significantly larger than was the case in 'Round One', then there must also be a realisation that in certain instances in the future sites will not be built in one year but in phases over several years that may not even be consecutive. There may also be one or more repowerings over the life of the lease.

For these reasons there needs to be sufficient flexibility in the lease to allow for a variety of financing arrangements; subletting, the transfer of operating assets during the life of the wind farm and creditor step-in, among other eventualities.

**Evaluation of Desk Study, Work Programme and Exploration Licence.** BWEA hopes that the appropriate body will assess the Desk Study, WP and EL based on the experience that they have gained from assessing North Sea oil & gas bids. However, BWEA notes that CE has requested guidance as to ways in which they can better evaluate companies, consortia and their development proposals. BWEA believes such assessment can be best achieved in multi-lateral meetings where the range of options can be tested for viability.

A key purpose of 'Round One' was to demonstrate, as fast as reasonably possible, that offshore wind was feasible. Given the time constraints and the requirements of the Capital Grants process, BWEA notes that the most successful companies so far have been those with significant balance sheet strength. As an industry we have also learned from Round One that offshore wind is best suited to multi-MW developments that are significantly larger than those allowed in Round One.

As a result of these factors BWEA believes that the difficulties faced by certain companies in Round One have, as often as not, been more a reflection of the constraints of the process than of the abilities of the developers. BWEA therefore believes that it is in the interests of the widest possible growth of the industry that assumptions of performance based solely on the outcome thus far of 'Round One' may not be the most applicable in Future Offshore.

BWEA would suggest a qualitative assessment is conducted to assess potential applications. This should include a weighted assessment of depth and breadth of applicants' experience, comprehensiveness of work already completed, level of work committed to in the work programme, financial modelling and economic robustness of project, installed capacity, likelihood of success, ability to benefit the offshore industry and conformity with SEA recommendations.

BWEA believes that success in 'Future Offshore' will be assisted if DTI/CE adopts a more flexible approach in assessing bids and endeavours to minimize any artificial restrictions placed on the size, location, geographical extent etc of any offshore developments. BWEA also believes that DTI/CE should avoid any constraints on the type of consortia or vehicle that bid for sites, noting that in any rapidly evolving market cutting edge technology may have a very short life cycle.

BWEA is of the view that developers must have the ability to choose the solution that seems most appropriate; they will then have to present their case to DTI/CE who must then assess and decide accordingly.

### **Issue 3. Blocks**

*Views are invited on whether developers should have freedom to propose the exact size and shape of block they wanted, subject to criteria applied in the selection process, or whether developers should be invited to bid for one or more blocks. Comments are also invited on the appropriate block size if the latter option is adopted.*

BWEA feels that developers should have the ability to propose the size and shape of the blocks that they would like to develop; they will then have to justify these decisions when bidding. Aside from this fundamental principle BWEA has no strong view over the block system that is employed.

**Issue 4. Lease offer by regions**

*Comments are invited on the proposal to offer leases in fixed, geographically defined regions following strategic environmental assessment.*

BWEA does not agree with the proposal to limit the offshore wind industry to areas that have already been covered by the SEA until there is a committed and ongoing programme for the SEA to cover other potential development areas. Pre-determination of sites implies discrimination against other sites. BWEA notes the negative impact that such discrimination may have on the industry and regional economic development while the benefits of the SEA are being determined.

**Issue 5. Development limited to three regions**

*Comments are invited on the proposal to limit development to three strategic areas in the fashion described and on the proposed boundaries of the strategic areas.*

BWEA does not agree with the proposal that development should be limited to the three areas proposed. However if the SEA is to be limited to these three areas then BWEA would prefer the boundaries of those areas to be indicative rather than exact.

BWEA will be pleased to work with all parties in helping to define and prioritise the ongoing SEA programme.

**Issue 6. Frequency of rounds**

*Views are invited on the frequency of rounds and the proposal to invite bids for all the strategic areas in the next round.*

BWEA feels that the proposed 3-year period between rounds is unnecessarily long and recommends an annual round, covering the UKCS, with the round timing as indicated in Issue 20.

**Issue 7. Decommissioning**

*Views are welcome on how the financial requirements for decommissioning can best be met in the interests of both the industry and environment.*

BWEA notes that market activity over the last few years or so indicates that the Net Asset Value decommissioning requirement employed in 'Round One' may no longer be the best way to address decommissioning liabilities. BWEA recommends that the approach to this issue be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the various innovative financial instruments that developers are currently exploring. Any process may also wish to consider the extensive experience gained in offshore oil and gas.

### **Issue 8. Retention of rights to develop**

*Views are invited on the proposal that companies should retain the sole right to develop in an area which they have investigated for a period of three years after the completion of the lease under which such investigation was carried out.*

As regards the Exploration Licence for developments outside 12nm BWEA feels that the term should be sufficient to give developers adequate time to carry out their work programmes. It would therefore seem logical to make the term equivalent to that of the Agreement for Lease.

BWEA feels that it will also be important for developers to have the option to extend the EL term beyond the maximum 42 month period, if appropriate legislation enabling the development of sites beyond 12nm has not been enacted within this time frame.

### **Issue 9. Lease term and site inactivity**

*Comments are invited on the proposal that the Agreement for Lease should specify a timetable for site investigation and the development lease, a timetable for subsequent development, with break points in the absence of sufficient action.*

**Agreement for Lease.** BWEA hopes that the Agreement for Lease will give the developer a period of 30 months in which to collect all data and to produce the Feasibility Study and EIA. BWEA believes that 30 months is appropriate as it allows for a reasonable window within which developers can undertake bird studies and deploy vessels for masts/boreholes.

In addition to the above period BWEA would expect that the AFL will grant the Developer an additional 12 month period, at the end of the 30 month study period, to carry out any additional studies as needed to obtain any further consents. BWEA expects that as a general rule the AFL will not be extended beyond 42 months; nonetheless BWEA would hope that there will be a provision that allows a developer to seek an extension on reasonable grounds (for instance a delay caused by a legal challenge from an objector or administrative delays in obtaining the requisite consents or *force majeure*).

**Lease.** To reflect the capital intensive nature of offshore wind energy, the high risks involved with developing this new technology and the relatively low financial returns currently available from it, BWEA believes that the Lease should be for a minimum period of 50 years as this will give both developers and network providers a clear investment signal for supplying the infrastructure needed to build large MW projects.

**Site inactivity.** BWEA is keen to ensure that no developer occupies a site without intending to undertake a work programme. There is significant experience from the oil and gas sector that BWEA would be happy to explore as part of an ongoing discussion to ensure that 'squatting' is avoided in an affordable way.

#### **Issue 10. Development area vs. area investigated**

*Views are invited on the rules which would give the right amount of flexibility in the specification of the area for development in relation to the area which has been under investigation.*

BWEA does not consider that it would be appropriate to set arbitrary targets for the ratio of seabed developed to the area which has been under investigation. Instead BWEA suggests that DTI/CE should assess how realistic such bids are given the developers' track record, financial resources, experience, etc.

#### **Issue 11. Access to information**

*Comments are invited on the proposals for information sharing and publication.*

BWEA recognizes that data sharing and transparency are key aspects of moving forward with offshore wind. BWEA proposes that data collected during the site assessment process will be owned by the entities that collected it for a 10 year period.

Notwithstanding the above, BWEA proposes that data collected during site assessment be submitted to Government and that it should be free to use such data in the compilation of the SEA. BWEA would encourage the sharing of the 'front end' of such data through an instrument such as *Windbase*, although asserts that 'raw data' should be held in confidence by the Government during the above mentioned 10 year period. Data owners should not be held accountable for any actions taken by a third party as a result of data that they have obtained through the above channels.

Given the importance of data management, the industry will need clarification on the ownership and control of *Windbase*.

**Issue 12. Offshore technologies other than wind**

*Views are invited on whether separate provision will be needed for other offshore technologies and if so on what timescale.*

BWEA is anxious to ensure that whatever process is put in place for the future development of the UK offshore should be open, fair and applicable to all types of offshore generation technologies (wind, wave and tidal) for projects throughout the UKCS.

**Issue 13. Risk levels of offshore wind farms**

*Views are invited on the value to developers and other stakeholders of the publication of guidance on acceptable levels of risk from offshore wind farms.*

BWEA believes that rigid application of the precautionary principle could be counter-productive to the aims of achieving viable alternatives to high-environmental impact industries.

General guidance, reached in consultation with statutory consultees and the industry, on which risks are acceptable and which are not, would help developers focus on areas with lower expected impact on the environment and focus studies on areas where there may be genuine risks. Potential risks, on which there is currently no clear guidance, should be identified and monitored on early wind farms in order to quantify and better understand those risks.

**Issue 14. Strategic Environmental Assessment**

*Comments are invited on the Government's proposal with regard to the SEA.*

BWEA believes that the basic SEA concept offers the offshore industry the opportunity to develop in a more logical, coherent and integrated fashion. It also provides the opportunity to do so in closer cooperation with the public, environmental groups and other interested parties. Given the current timetable for development of Round Two sites and the commitment that developers will make to extensive Future Offshore field work, we strongly hope that DTI will exhibit a matching level of commitment to the SEA process. With regard to this point BWEA gratefully recognizes the commitment shown by DTI and statutory and non-statutory bodies, to completing Phase 1 of the SEA in a timely fashion.

Beyond Phase 1, BWEA proposes that, in order to address some of the issues raised in Phase 1, the Government seeks to announce, in a timely fashion, details of the funding that it will make available for Phase 2 and beyond.

The SEA should recognise that the offshore wind industry has evolved into its current form partly because of its relatively low environmental impact. BWEA trusts, therefore, that any proposals that emerge from the SEA are cognisant of this as well as of the limitations of the SEA in its early stages.

BWEA notes the valuable role of COWRIE in carrying out generic research into the interactions between offshore wind and the environment. However BWEA is keen to ensure that there is no duplication or gaps between COWRIE and the SEA and would welcome clarification of the roles of these bodies.

### **Issue 15. Navigation, Fisheries & Safety Zones**

*Views would be welcome on the legislative changes suggested to extinguish public rights of navigation and possibly also fishing, and to create exclusion zones around wind farms.*

**Safety Zones.** BWEA feels that in the interests of safety there is a strong case to be made for excluding vessels from areas during construction and subsequent non-routine maintenance operations. In certain cases it may also be appropriate to restrict anchoring and trawling during the operation of the wind farm.

It would seem logical to codify this such that in future the developer has the statutory right to exclude navigation during construction and non-routine maintenance. BWEA would hope that such provision will be given in primary legislation that will allow for the creation of Safety Zones.

**Fisheries.** The fishing industries should be consulted by DTI/CE/DEFRA to agree methods of dealing with the issues of navigation and fishing in the immediate vicinity of the wind farm and any associated cabling.

**Separation zones.** Since the energy contained in the wind is reduced downwind of a wind farm, BWEA feels that it would be helpful if every developer had the right to declare a Separation Zone, with a minimum width of 5km, which extends seawards from the outermost turbines in any wind farm array. Within this zone we envisage that no wind turbines may be built unless with the permission of the incumbent developer.

### **Issue 16. Planning**

*Comments would be welcome on the proposed clarification of the role of local planning authorities.*

BWEA supports the view that LPAs should be statutory consultees but should not have the power to force public inquiry. BWEA believes that the Secretary of State is the most appropriate person to assess applications for offshore wind farms.

In those instances where it is not clear which LPA should be consulted by the Secretary of State, BWEA favours the approach taken in the Electricity Works Regulations 2000 whereby the Secretary of State has discretion over which LPA, or other authority, is the most appropriate consultee.

**Issue 17. Consents**

*Views would be welcome on the proposal to further streamline the administration of the consents process by establishing one main point of contact for managing progress.*

BWEA's understanding is that it was intended that the MCEU would be a single point of contact for gaining consents. BWEA recognizes that it has experienced teething problems and would welcome work to address these.

BWEA believes that the new legislation discussed in Issue 1 could equally address the desirability of simplifying the current consents regime within territorial waters by applying to all navigable waters under UK control.

The objective should be to provide for a single consent for the construction, operation, maintenance and (within limits imposed by EIA) the replacement of all the physical elements required for a wind farm. If this principle is accepted, legislation will need to:

- authorise the construction, maintenance, replacement (subject to the above), and operation of wind turbines and associated equipment (i.e. offshore substations, cables and any other equipment which may become necessary as the industry goes further offshore)
- allow for the creation of safety zones
- provide for decommissioning
- make applications under FEPA and CPA
- replicate such functions of the Electricity Act 1989 as may be necessary with regard to the connection of wind farms to the onshore grid
- possibly address the issue of sea defences
- reserve powers to the appropriate Secretary of State to approve detailed plans
- allow for limits of deviation of the authorised works
- implement the EIA Directives outside the territorial waters
- implement the Habitats and the Wild Birds Directive 1979 outside territorial waters
- incorporate so many of the provisions of UNCLOS as required
- implement so much of the OSPAR Convention as required
- specify whether the DTI or Crown Estate will be responsible for the granting of rights to exploit the wind energy resource.
- possibly address future SEA rounds.

**Issue 18. Offshore Transmission. Licensing**

*Comments are invited on the conclusion that there should be no extension to the licences of the transmission and distribution companies.*

BWEA believes that there should be an extension to the licences of the transmission companies. This would be effected only in those areas of high development potential where a strategic investment programme could

facilitate such development on a more accelerated timetable. It needs to be recognised that the particular conditions of this offshore environment would require a fundamental examination of transmission network operators licence conditions. Although having the licences of the transmission companies extended offshore would allow the cost of constructing offshore grid assets to be recovered from all UK network users and hence, from the developers' perspective, to be minimised, it may be necessary to discuss other means of making the financial costs more reflective.

At this early stage in the evolution of the industry BWEA feels that there is no clear universal solution for the provision of offshore transmission and distribution assets. For this reason BWEA feels that developers should have maximum flexibility to develop transmission and distribution assets as they see fit. By allowing developers the right to pursue private options (i.e. non NGT or DNO) they may be able to develop cheaper, faster and more flexible methods than would otherwise be available.

Resolution of grid-related issues is of the greatest urgency.

### **Issue 19. Offshore Transmission. Regulation**

*Comments are invited on:*

- a) the extent to which general competition law can and should be relied on;*  
*and*
- b) whether a new regime should be established which requires cable owners to make available to the market any spare capacity and, if so, on what principles it should be based.*

Given that the Competition Act and EC competition law do not include specific provisions regarding access to offshore electricity cables, BWEA recognises the advantages to be gained from establishing a new regulatory regime tailored specifically to the needs of marine generation.

BWEA notes that investors in offshore transmission assets will be wary of committing themselves financially until such time as competition and fair access matters have been clearly and satisfactorily resolved. Whatever practice is adopted, BWEA believes that cable owners should be able to make a reasonable return on investment made in cabling and that due regard should also be given to their own plans for the cable.

### **Issue 20. Timetable**

*Views are invited on the proposed processes and timetables for the next round and the Strategic Environmental Assessment.*

BWEA recognises that as a result of the expectations placed on the offshore wind industry to move ahead as fast as possible with developing sites in order to meet Government targets for renewables, the industry is already challenging the time frame within which Phase 1 of the SEA can reasonably be completed. Further, BWEA recognises that once Phase 1 is completed it is very important that there should be an adequate consultation period for the SEA document. BWEA also recognises that it would not be reasonable to issue an invitation to bid for sites until the SEA consultation is complete.

For these reasons BWEA accepts that it would not be reasonable or desirable for DTI/CE to issue an invitation for bids until April 2003, the date proposed in the Future Offshore Consultation. Further, BWEA accepts that the announcement of Round Two successful bids will be, again as in the proposed timetable, in August of this year.

### **Other issues**

BWEA is involved in separate correspondence regarding Grid and Transmission issues.

Although comments on the Crown Estate rent are not specifically invited, BWEA notes that the matter is raised. Given that monies paid to the CE significantly affect project economics BWEA is keen to comment.

It has to be recognised that the CE shall incur costs and that it is only reasonable for them not to be financially disadvantaged by supporting offshore wind. However offshore wind is a relatively new technology and is not currently as well developed commercially as other technologies. The terms proposed should recognise this issue and take account of the current international market environment.

Consideration should be given to a reduced rental payment other than the £0.88/MWh proposed.

On these and all other matters connected with the development of future offshore, the Association remains committed to active dialogue.



Nick Goodall  
Chief Executive

## Appendix

(BWEA membership at February 2003)

A2Sea A/S	Conoco Global Power U.K. Ltd	GE Wind Energy
ABB New Ventures GmbH	Cornwall Light and Power Co Ltd	Global Marine Systems Ltd - Energy Services
ABP mer	Corus	GPA Partnership
AEA Technology Environment	Coupe Foundry Ltd	GreenPower
Aegis Rubber Engineering	CREST	GREP A/S
AEI Cables Ltd	CTC Marine Projects	Halcrow Group Ltd
Aeon Wind Power Limited	Cumbria Wind Farms Ltd	Halliburton KBR
Afon Toolmakers & Engineers Limited	Cwmni Gwynt Teg Cyf	Hammond Suddards Edge
Agrilek Limited	D.N.V.Consulting	Heath Lambert Group
Airtricity Development Ltd	Dansteel Ltd	Hedley Purvis
Albro Planning & Environmental	Data Systems & Solutions Ltd	Heriot-Watt University
Allen & Overy	DeWind UK Operations	Hibernian Wind Power
All-Energy Opportunities	DLA (Partnership)	HR Wallingford
Alstom T & D Ltd	DM Energy	Hyder Consulting Limited
Ambient Energy Ltd	Dowding & Mills Engineering Services	Hydro Soil Services
Amec Wind	DP Energy Ltd	Hydrosearch
Andaray Engineering Ltd	DSB Offshore Limited	Impax Capital Corporation
Andrew Wilkes & Associates Ltd	Dulas Ltd	Inframan Ltd
Anglesey Wind & Energy Ltd	E4environment Limited	Investec Bank (UK) Limited
ATCO Power Generation Ltd	EA Gibson Shipbrokers Ltd	IPA Energy Consulting
B9 Energy (O&M) Ltd	Eclipse Energy	IPSA Power Ltd
Babtie Group Limited	Eco2 Limited	IT Power Ltd
Baroc Energy Ltd	Ecoenergy UK PVT Ltd	J P Kenny
Baywind Energy Co-operative Ltd	EcoGen Ltd	John Brown Hydrocarbons Ltd
Bendalls Engineering	Econnect Ltd	John Mowlem & Company plc
Bircham Dyson Bell	EcoTech Centre	Keliston Engineering Ltd
Bomel Limited	Ecowind	Landscape Design Associates
Bond Pearce Solicitors	Edmund Nuttall Limited	LM Glasfiber A/S
Bonus Energy A/S	eeegr, East of England Energy Group	London Offshore Consultants Ltd
Bosch Rexroth Ltd	EHN	London Power Company
British Energy plc	Elequip Projects Limited	MacRoberts Solicitors
Broadview Capital	ELSAM A/S	Marlec Engineering Co Ltd
Brodies W.S., Solicitors	EMU Ltd	Martineau Johnson
Brooks Ltd, Compact Orbital Gears	Energiekontor (UK) Ltd	Masons
Brown McFarlane Ltd	Energy for Sustainable Development	Mayflower Energy Ltd
Cambrian Engineering (Cymru) Ltd	Energy Workshop, The	McCarthy Tetrault
Casella Stanger Ltd	ENERTRAG UK Ltd	McGrigor Donald
Centre for Economic Renewable Power Delivery	Engineering Technology Applications	McNicholas Construction Services Ltd
Centre for Sustainable Energy	Enskilda Securities	Mersey Docks & Harbour Company
Charles W. Taylor & Sons Ltd	Entec UK Ltd	Met Office
Chris Blandford Associates	Enviros Aspinwall	Metoc plc
Clarke Energy Ltd	Ernst & Young	Miller Insurance Group
Clean Energy Company Limited	Eurus Energy UK Limited	Mistral Invest
CLRC, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory	Fairfield Mabey Ltd	Morgan Cole
CNS Subsea Ltd	Falck Renewables Limited	Nabarro Nathanson
Collett Transport Ltd	Farm Energy Ltd	NaREC
	Force 9 Energy Ltd	National Energy Foundation
	Fortis Bank	National Grid Company
	Fugro Limited	National Wind Power Ltd
	Garrad Hassan & Partners Ltd	Natural Power Consultants Ltd
		NEG Micon UK Ltd

Nordex UK Ltd	RMB Engineering Services	Total Energie Developpement S.A.
Norsk Hydro Energy	Royal & SunAlliance	Tractebel Energy Engineering
North British Wind Power Limited	RSK Environment Limited	Trinity House
North Energy Associates Ltd	Ruston Wheb	Triodos Bank / Triodos
North Rose	Saipem s.a.	Renewable Energy Fund
Nsure Renewables	Scott Wilson Oceans	UMIST
Ocean Power Delivery Ltd	Scottish & Southern Energy plc	Underwater Security
Oceantecs Limited	ScottishPower	Consultants Ltd
Offshore Energy Resources Limited	Screwfast Foundations Limited	unit[e]
Offshore Renewable Energy Alliance Ltd	Seabed Scour Control Systems Ltd	United Utilities Green Energy
Open University	Seacore Ltd	University of Birmingham
Orga Suisse S.a.r.l	Seastructures Ltd	University of Durham
Osborne Clarke	Shell WindEnergy Ltd	University of the West of England
OTM Consulting Ltd	Simmons & Simmons	Vattenfall
PB Power Ltd	SLP Energy Ltd	Vestas - Danish Wind
Pirelli Energy Cables Ltd	Sonsub Limited	Technology A/S
PMSS Ltd	SP Dataserve Ltd	Warwick Energy Limited
Posford Haskoning Ltd	Statkraft SF	Watson, Farley & Williams
Powergen Renewables	Stephenson Halliday	Wavegen
Proven Engineering Products Ltd	Stewart Group Limited	West Coast Energy Ltd
QinetiQ Ltd	Strategic Alliance Services	Western Windpower
Qufab Construction	Terence O'Rourke	Wichita Co. Ltd
R.D.C. Ltd	Tetro Energy Limited	Wind Hydrogen Limited
Redfield Consulting Limited	Thales Geosolutions (North Sea) Ltd	Wind Prospect Ltd
Renew North	Theodore Goddard	Windelectric Ltd
Renewable Energy Systems Ltd	Titan Environmental Surveys Ltd	Windjen Power Limited
Renewables North West	Titan Maritime (UK) Ltd	Windspeed Ltd
REpower Systems AG	TLT Solicitors	Wisenergy
ReSoft Ltd	TMEEnvironmental Power	WKN Offshore Tech. Gmb
RJ McLeod (Contractors) Ltd	Toby Manning Limited	Wragge & Co
		Wrigleys Solicitors
		Yorkshire Windpower Ltd
		Your Energy Ltd