
Completion of CACoP Quarterly Metrics

Publication date:	29 October 2024
Team:	Industry Codes
Email:	industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2024

The text of this document may be reproduced (excluding logos) under and in accordance with the terms of the [Open Government Licence](#).

Without prejudice to the generality of the terms of the Open Government Licence the material that is reproduced must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the document title of this document must be specified in that acknowledgement.

Any enquiries related to the text of this publication should be sent to Ofgem at:

10 South Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London, E14 4PU.

This publication is available at www.ofgem.gov.uk. Any enquiries regarding the use and re-use of this information resource should be sent to: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Contents

Completion of CACoP Quarterly Metrics	1
1. Introduction.....	3
Context and related publications	3
General feedback.....	3
2. Guidance Information	3
3. Question-by-question Guide.....	4

1. Introduction

Context and related publications

- 1.1 This document provides guidance for Code Administrators and Code Managers on how to submit quarterly data in accordance with Principle 12 of the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP).¹ It will help everyone understand how these metrics are used.
- 1.2 The collection of standardised CACoP Quantitative Metrics started in 2016 to improve transparency and industry visibility. The data is compiled into a quarterly document, which can be found on the Ofgem website.²

General feedback

- 1.3 We welcome feedback on this guidance and ask that you send any comments to industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk.

2. Guidance Information

- 2.1 At the end of each quarter, Ofgem will issue a request for information (RFI) via email from code administrators about code modification-related business.
- 2.2 A spreadsheet template will be provided detailing the specific data required. Code Administrators should complete and return the spreadsheet within fourteen days of the RFI.
- 2.3 The spreadsheet questions relate to modifications or changes to the main code documents. Changes to code subsidiary documents, guidance documents or any other documents associated with the codes should not be included. We request information relating to five different categories of modification proposals:
- Authority Consent – non-urgent
 - Authority Consent – Urgent
 - Self-governance

¹ For the purposes of this Guidance, 'code administrator' is used to refer to both code administrators and code managers. The CACoP document can be found on the CACoP website here: [CACoP Code Administration Code of Practice](#)

² [Code administrators' reporting metrics](#)

-
- Fast Track self-governance
 - Self-governance – Urgent.

2.4 Some of these categories may result in no data being returned.

3. Question-by-question Guide

General

Question 1: How many modifications were raised during the review period in question? Any modifications with alternatives should be counted as one.

3.1 A modification is considered raised when it is submitted using the standard modification template and the code administrator has confirmed that it has been raised, in accordance with the modification process outlined in the relevant code. New proposals should include a recommendation on whether they need self-governance or authority consent.

Question 2: How many modifications were withdrawn during the review period? Any modifications with alternatives should be counted as one.

3.2 Count all withdrawn modification proposals during this period, no matter their stage in the process. Do not include modifications that were reclassified (eg from Authority Consent to self-governance).

Question 3: How many modifications were submitted to the Authority for a decision during the review period? Include the number of alternatives in the second box.

3.3 This question asks for the number of modification proposals sent to the Authority for a decision during the period. Count proposals even if they are 'sent back'. For proposals with alternatives, put '1' in the first column and the number of alternatives in the second column. For example, if two non-urgent proposals are submitted, one with three alternatives, enter '2' in the first column and '3' in the second column.

Question 4: How many final industry decisions on modifications were made during the review period? Include the number of alternatives in the second box.

3.4 This question only concerns final panel or party votes to approve or reject self-governance modifications. It **does not** include earlier "minded-to" decisions. If there are multiple votes on the final modification report (eg approval of the

modification, implementation date, and the implementation method), they should be counted as one vote, even if there are mixed results. Treat alternatives the same way as in Question 3.

Question 5: How many reports were 'sent back' by the Authority during the review period? Include the number of alternatives in the second box.

3.5 This question asks for data on reports 'sent back' by the Authority after submission. The submission and return might happen in different reporting periods. Treat alternatives the same way as in Question 3.

Question 6: How many modifications were implemented during the review period?

3.6 This question asks for the number of modifications in all categories that were implemented during the reporting period. "Implementation" means all industry changes have been completed, and the modification is operational.

Consultation

Question 7: How many consultations closed during the review period for the following types of modification (listed in the spreadsheet template)? Any modifications with alternatives should be counted as one.

3.7 This includes consultations (and impact assessments) started by workgroups for a specific modification proposal and those raised after a panel meeting.

Question 8: How many consultations for non-urgent modifications closed during the review period with a consultation time of less than 15 business days?

3.8 The consultations referred to in this question are those in the "non-urgent" categories of modification proposals listed in Question 7.

Question 9: How many consultations for urgent modifications closed during the review period with a consultation time of less than 5 business days?

3.9 The consultations referred to in this question are those in the "urgent" categories of modification proposals listed in Question 7.

Question 10: How many modifications had their final vote during the review period without legal text available in the final consultation?

- 3.10 The relevant modifications are those listed in Questions 3 and 4 where the final legal text was not available during the closing consultation. **Do not** count alternatives.

Engagement

Question 11: How many new parties acceded to the code during the review period?

- 3.11 This question only needs the number of parties that acceded to the code during the given period.

Question 12: How many participants responded to Authority Consent modification consultations that ended during the review period? This includes any consultation started at any time during the modification cycle.

- 3.12 The calculations for this question should include the Authority consent modifications (both urgent and non-urgent) referred to in the answer to Question 7.

Question 13: How many participants responded to self-governance modification consultations that ended during the review period? This includes any consultation started at any time during the modification cycle.

- 3.13 The calculations for this question should include the self-governance modifications (both urgent and non-urgent) referred to in the answer to Question 7.

Costs

Question 14: How many modifications had their final vote during the review period without an estimate of central system implementation costs being available during the final consultation?

- 3.14 Only consider central system implementation costs, not costs for individual market participants. Focus on the modifications from questions 3 and 4 without including alternatives. If the implementation cost is zero at the final vote, **do not** count them.

Question 15: How many modifications were implemented during the review period where the central system implementation costs were zero?

3.15 The modifications referred to in this question are those listed in Question 6.

Question 16: How many modifications were implemented during the review period where the central system implementation costs were different from what was advised before the final industry vote?

3.16 Consider the modifications referred to in Question 6, where the final costs were available. Include modifications from previous quarters if their final costs have only recently become available.