

5. Reducing Fragmentation and complexity (admin workgroup)							
Issue No.	Description	Date Identified	Last updated	Owner	Next Steps / current views	Deadline	Status
5.1.	Do the current modification rules adhere to the principles set out in the November letter?						
5.1.1.	In what areas does each code work well / not so well?						
5.2.	How does small party, new entrant and consumers representation vary across the codes?						
5.2.1.	What aspects of the arrangements do these parties find to be a particular burden?						
5.2.2.	In which aspects are the codes currently sufficiently transparent or need to improve?						
5.2.2.1	Should websites conform to agreed standards/principles?						
5.2.3.	Do these parties consider that enough assistance is available to them in order to participate?						
5.2.3.1.	If further assistance would be helpful, in what areas?						
5.3.	What role do code administrators play in developing or bringing forward proposals?						
5.3.1.	Should the Panel's ability to raise proposals be limited to housekeeping and governance?						
5.4.	Who should be responsible for the production of legal text?						
5.4.1.	When should legal text be produced?						

5.4.1.1.	Should legal text be consulted upon?						
5.4.2.	Should legal text be flexible: a 'work in progress' until decision is made, i.e. reflecting other changes to baseline?						
5.5.	How long should consultation periods be?						
5.5.1.	Should the Panel have discretion over how long the consultation period is for each proposal?						
5.6.	How should implementation dates be determined?						
5.6.1.	Should implementation dates be tied/determined?						
5.7.	Should there be a fast-track process for housekeeping/ non-contentious modifications?						
5.7.1.	What unnecessary process steps could be removed/made conditional on nature of proposal?						
5.8.	Should current custom and practice be codified?				beneficial where the service provider may change, but may also hinder flexibility.		
5.9.	How can independence of code administrator be assured?			Work strand 4			
5.10.	Who should 'own' proposal during the process?				need for consistent advocate and 'sense check' on developments. Possible feed into 5.2.3		
5.11.	Should proposers have the right to withdraw proposals?						
5.11.1.	If so, up to what point?						

5.11.2.	Should other parties be able to adopt the proposal at that point?				these arrangements currently apply under the UNC		
5.12.	Is the process appropriate for the urgent proposals?				process differs across codes		
5.12.1.	Should all urgent proposals be subject to a minimum period of consultation?				may be best practice, but circumstances may not allow desired time		
5.13.	Should the proposer be able to speak at panel where a recommendation is to be made on their proposal?						
5.14.	How should changes originating from outside of code be dealt with?						
5.14.1.	Should they be allowed simply on the basis of consistency rather than assessing against RO's?						
5.15.	Is the membership of modification groups appropriate?				are they sufficiently 'expert' and/or representative		
5.15.1.	Should there be greater scope for consultancy support for the group?						
5.16.	Should alternative proposals be treated in a standard manner across all codes?						
5.17.	Should greater rationale/detail accompany panel recommendations?						