

## EXHIBIT D: FORM OF APPLICANT DECLARATION

Item	Guidance	Response
Relevant CMU:	Description of CMU	
Application year:	As specified in the Auction Guidelines as the year of the Prequalification Window	
CMU ID:		
CMU Name:		

### Declarations:

The following confirmations and declarations are made jointly by the “Legal Owner and the Despatch Controller” and, together with the Legal Owner, the “Relevant Parties”) with respect to the above Generating CMU (the “Relevant CMU”) and in relation to the Application to which this declaration relates (the “Relevant Application”).

(a) Each of the Relevant Parties hereby confirms that:

- (i) the Legal Owner is the legal owner of each Generating Unit comprised in the Relevant CMU; and
- (ii) the Despatch Controller has Despatch Control with respect to each Generating Unit comprised in the Relevant CMU.

(b) Each of the Relevant Parties hereby declares that:

- (i) the Despatch Controller is the Applicant for the Relevant CMU in relation to the Relevant Application;
- (ii) in the event that the Relevant CMU becomes a Prequalified CMU for the Capacity Auction to which the Relevant Application relates, the Despatch Controller will be the Bidder for the Relevant CMU in that Capacity Auction; and
- (iii) in the event that the Relevant CMU becomes a Capacity Committed CMU pursuant to the Capacity Auction to which the Relevant Application relates, the Despatch Controller will be the Capacity Provider for the Relevant CMU.

**Commented [PP1]:** As required by Rule 3.2.5 [Existing Generating CMU] and 3.2.9 [Prospective Generating CMU].

In both cases this only applies where the Despatch Controller is not the legal owner (see 3.2.4 and 3.2.8).

**Commented [PP2]:** As previous discussions, should this be ‘CMU ID’ assigned by the Applicant at Application?

Does it need a complementary ‘CMU Name’ to enable cross-checking that CMU ID and CMU Name are consistent?

**Commented [CH3R2]:** I would be happy with the Relevant CMU being changed to Relevant CMU ID and combining it like that. All CMUs will have a CMUID by PQ, so there’s no need (that I can see at least) for this to be kept ambiguous or vague. The description of CMU field causes quite a bit of confusion amongst CPs, so making it a much more specific field would probably help.

**Commented [NH4]:** Can we add rows for Company name for Despatch Controller and Company name for Legal Owner to the table?

**Commented [CA5]:** What is the point of [Party A] and [Party B] items? - Agreed

**Commented [PP6]:** ‘Despatch Controller’ is in 1.2 Definitions

**Please note:** Capitalised terms used herein have the meaning given to them in the Capacity Market Rules 2014 (as amended) unless otherwise indicated.

**Please note:** No second signature is required for sole director companies, see Rule 1.3A

<b>Legal Owner Signature:</b>	
<b>Date: (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	
<b>Print Name:</b>	
<b>Role in which you are signing this Declaration:</b>	

**Commented [NH7]:** Is this required? Only Directors will sign and tables already point out who is signing for Legal Owner and Despatch Controller.

<b>Legal Owner Signature:</b>	
<b>Date: (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	
<b>Print Name:</b>	
<b>Role in which you are signing this Declaration:</b>	

<b>Despatch Controller Signature:</b>	
<b>Date: (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	
<b>Print Name:</b>	
<b>Role in which you are signing this Declaration:</b>	

<b>Despatch Controller Signature:</b>	
<b>Date: (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	
<b>Print Name:</b>	

<b>Role in which you are signing this Declaration:</b>	
--	--

