

## DIRECTLY MANAGED MOORINGS: PRICING AND VACANCY ALLOCATION PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

You may respond to the consultation in whichever way you wish. If it is easier for you, please use this form and append any further comments. To do this electronically simply download the form in word format from [www.britishwaterways.co.uk/mooringconsultation08](http://www.britishwaterways.co.uk/mooringconsultation08), add your further comments and email it to [consultation@britishwaterways.co.uk](mailto:consultation@britishwaterways.co.uk)

The closing date for responses is **20 August 2008**.

Paper copies should be posted to:

The Consultation Team, British Waterways, 64 Clarendon Road, Watford WD17 1DA.

If you have any **questions** about the consultation, please contact us:

E: [consultationquestions@britishwaterways.co.uk](mailto:consultationquestions@britishwaterways.co.uk) T: 01923 201120 F: 01923 201300

### Q1 Options for allocating mooring vacancies (please read chapters 5 and 6 first)

IWAC understands that BW has a duty to set market prices and that all of the options listed in chapters 5 and 6 are essentially operational matters for BW. As such, IWAC offers no formal view or recommendations on the scores BW has arrived at.

However it is also UK Government policy, as detailed in its document 'Waterways for Tomorrow', to "encourage navigation authorities to increase access to the waterways for the young, disabled and disadvantaged".

Hence we believe the evaluation table from chapter 6.6 is missing a crucial column, "Enables Equal Access for All?", in addition to the original four - the scoring options should look like:

	How Transparent?	Operating costs	How acceptable?	How good a measure of market price?	Enables Equal Access for All?	Total score
	1= not transparent 10 = transparent	1 = high cost 10 = low cost;	1 = poor 10 = good	1 = poor 10 = good	1 = poor 10 = good	
1. Waiting lists						
2. Tender trial						
3. Modified tendering						
4. Open auction						
5. Fixed price with lottery						

IWAC's second proposal is that the factors should be weighted to give due importance to those issues which are most significant. In IWAC's view, and based on Government guidance, the two factors which are of particular significance are market price and equal access. IWAC considers that these two factors should be given a weighting of at least twice the weighting given to the other three factors.

Consequently, IWAC believes that the scoring of the five options needs to include a factor relating to equal access for all, as access is as important part of UK Government policy on inland waterways as charging market values.

**Q2 For vacancy allocation options 2, 3, 4 or 5 (i.e. all except waiting lists), for how long do you think the vacancy should be advertised?**

1 week       2 weeks       3 weeks       4 weeks      Other period \_\_\_\_days/weeks

Why do you think this?

IWAC believes 3 weeks provides sufficient time for people to see an advertised vacancy

**Q3 How important do you think it is to make the vacancy allocation system available to non internet users?**

①                      ②                      ③                      ④                      ⑤                      ⑥  
Not important                      X                      Essential                      No view

IWAC believes that equal access to all is an important part of UK Government policy. Whilst not essential, it is important that a vacancy allocation system should cater for non internet users.

**Q4 On the basis of your own personal experience as a BW long term mooring permit holder, how satisfied have you been with BW's pricing decisions in respect of your mooring since 2006?**

*(Please mark the number on the scale that matches your view. Skip this question if you are not, or have not recently been, a BW long term permit holder)*

IWAC offers no comment

**(a) "The prices set were a fair and reasonable estimate of the local 'going rate' for the type of mooring**

①                      ②                      ③                      ④                      ⑤                      ⑥  
Agree                      Disagree                      Don't really know

**(b) If you questioned the pricing decision, how satisfied were you with the reasoning given?**

①                      ②                      ③                      ④                      ⑤                      ⑥  
Satisfied                      Not satisfied                      Did not question the decision

**Q5 What engagement have you personally had with BW's moorings waiting lists and/or the tendering system for allocating vacancies? (please tick all that apply)**

IWAC offers no comment

- I was on a waiting list
- I have briefly visited [www.waterscape.com/BWmooringvacancies](http://www.waterscape.com/BWmooringvacancies)
- I have registered as a postal user
- I have made multiple visits to [www.waterscape.com/BWmooringvacancies](http://www.waterscape.com/BWmooringvacancies)
- I feel I have a good understanding of the tendering system
- I have submitted one or more tenders
- I have secured a mooring through the tender system

**Your name and contact details**

*Please provide email or postal address, depending on how you would prefer to be contacted. Note, we will not be able to acknowledge individual contributions, but will contact you with a copy of the final report when available. Exceptionally, we may contact you if we need to clarify any aspect of your feedback. Unless you specify otherwise, we may quote, but not attribute, your views*

Organisation Name

Contact name:

**Inland Waterways Advisory Council (IWAC)**

**John Manning, Policy Adviser**

Email: [iwac@iwac.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:iwac@iwac.gsi.gov.uk)

Date: **19 August 2008**

Postal address: **City Road Lock, 38 Graham Street,  
London N1 8JX**