

Appendix 1: Pros and cons of CDC’s contractual involvement in the WSCC concession contract for the installation of Electric Vehicle Charge Points.

Positive impact:	Negative impact:
<p>CDC land would become part of a wider network of West Sussex electric vehicle charge points with common identity, tariffs and access arrangements (app and bank card and RFID cards).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC would cede control to the contractor such that service-design would be as specified by the contract and board members (which CDC might not be a member of). • CDC would host two network providers with different charging tariffs (the existing network and the WSCC contract EVCPs). • Delivery of the network won’t begin until 2022. • CDC would lose flexibility over use of land. The initial contract term is seven years with an option to extend by a further three years. In reality it is possible that it might prove difficult to remove successful charging locations thereafter as the emphasis in WSCC’s contract is on provision of EVCPs for households who do not have access to off-street parking. For such households access to off-street parking is unlikely to change.
<p>CDC would increase its EVCP service offer at no capital or revenue cost to Council Tax payers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC would cede control of land for between seven and ten years. This concession form of contract has not been supported at CDC in the past and could be a risk given the potential for consideration of car parks and other land holdings in future years. • CDC would be unlikely to see any significant revenue from such a contract and as such misses out on potential income from running a larger network. • CDC cannot remove charge points from its land in the event that it wishes to do so. • WSCC contract EVCPs take up space in public car parks that would otherwise generate parking income • CDC’s current EVCP tariff design was to offer the EVCP service at zero-cost to the council i.e. it would be a revenue neutral service. As such a fixed fee (30p) is charged to recoup service, maintenance, back-office and money handling fees

	<p>and electricity is charged at parity (18p/kW) with the cost that CDC pays for it. The WSCC contract intends an up-lift on electricity price to assist WSCC in administering the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a 'late' joiner of the contract CDC may not be able to be a board member for the contract design, monitoring and management.
<p>CDC would not have to be significantly involved in managing the installation of the EVCPs or the operational aspects of the service so saving officer time. Where resource is short this is an attractive proposition.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reality this benefit is likely to be elusive as CDC will need to identify where on its land it 'wants' EVCPs, how many to install and officers will have to diligently oversee the installations such that CDC manages its land through this transition.
<p>Environmental and economic benefits are shared across the county.</p>	<p>None additional to above identified.</p>
<p>The network will include rapid (50kW) charge points which enable rapid battery charging and which do not currently feature in CDC's offer.</p>	<p>Whilst this is an important benefit it does not support significant dwell time and related economic activity. CDC's emphasis has been on destination charging. Rapid charging is, in part expected to be provided at petrol station forecourts. The market for electric vehicle charging is far from mature and likely to continue to evolve as take-up of the technology increases.</p>
<p>The contract can be promoted to parishes, community facilities and not-for-profit organisations so facilitating them to install EVCPs at zero cost.</p>	<p>CDC could promote the contract to relevant organisations without CDC joining the contract itself (although this might undermine the leadership that CDC has shown thus far in delivering an EVCP network).</p>