

Code Administrators Working Group (CAWG) Issues Log

Table of contents:

Do the current modification rules adhere to the principles set out in the November letter?	3
In what areas does each code work well / not so well?	5
How does small party, new entrant and consumer representation vary across the codes?	6
What aspects of the arrangements do small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives find to be a particular burden?.....	7
In which aspects are the codes sufficiently transparent or need to improve?.....	8
Should websites conform to agreed standards/principles?	9
Do small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives consider that enough assistance is available to them in order to participate [in code governance and modification processes]?	10
If further assistance would be helpful [to small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives], in what areas?	11
What role do code administrators play in developing or bringing forward proposals?	12
Should the Panel's ability to raise proposals be limited to housekeeping and governance?	13
Who should be responsible for the production of legal text?	14
When should legal text be produced?	15
Should legal text be consulted on [before a proposal is sent to the Authority]?	16
Should legal text be flexible (i.e. a "work in progress") until a decision to approve or reject is made)?.....	17
How long should consultation period be?	18
Should the Panel have discretion over how long the consultation period is for each proposal?.....	19
How should implementation dates be determined?.....	20
Should there be fast-track process for housekeeping / non-contentious modifications?.	21
What unnecessary process steps could be removed/made conditional on nature of proposal?.....	22
Should current customs and practice be codified?	23
How can the independence of the code administrator be assured?.....	24

Who should 'own' modification proposals during the process?	25
Should proposers have the right to withdraw proposals?	26
If proposers should have the right to withdraw proposals, up to what point should this right exist?	27
If proposers should have the right to withdraw proposals, should other parties be able to adopt the proposal at this point?	28
Are modification processes appropriate for urgent proposals?	29
Should all urgent proposals be subject to a minimum period of consultation?	30
Should proposer be able to speak at a panel where a recommendation is to be made on their proposal?	31
How should changes originating from outside the code [i.e. consequential changes that are "driven" by changes to licences, other codes or legislation] be dealt with?	32
Should consequential changes be assessed simply on the basis of consistency rather than assessing them against the relevant code objectives?	33
Is the membership of modification groups appropriate?	34
Should there be greater scope for consultancy support for modification/working groups?	36
Should alternative proposals be treated in a standard manner across all codes?	37
Should greater rationale/detail accompany panel recommendations?	39

Issue No:	Description:
5.1	<p>Do the current modification rules adhere to the principles set out in the November letter?</p> <p>(Reminder, these principles were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) promote inclusive, accessible and effective consultation; 2) be governed by rules and processes that are transparent and easily understood; 3) be administered in an independent and objective fashion; 4) provide rigorous and high quality analysis of the case for and against proposed changes; 5) be cost effective; 6) contain rules and processes that are sufficiently flexible to circumstances that they will always allow for efficient change management; and 7) be delivered in a manner that results in a proportionate regulatory burden).

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples of current process(es) you think deliver, or inhibit, those seven principles.]		
BSC	As above		
CUSC	As above		
Other codes	As above		

Preference: I prefer the structured and transparent process of the BSC. While some will argue that there are some strict constraints within the process. They could easily be modified or made more efficient if the industry wants them.

BSC consultation are clear, effective and provide rigorous and high quality analysis of the case for and against proposed changes. Process is transparent, structured. Framework contains rules and processes that are sufficiently flexible to circumstances that they will always allow for efficient change management.

It enables more independent judgement compared with other Codes and give smaller parties who do not have the resource to argue their views in person more comfort.

CUSC process is next preferred though I found it less easily understood or structured. Some of the issues need to be resolved such as the no. of alternatives.

Means of implementation:					
Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	

Details:

To encourage smaller parties participation in the gas and electricity industry and reduce barrier to entry, It would be worthwhile that all Codes should consist of the same structure and terminology. To this end, such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.

Issue No:	Description:
5.1.1	In what areas does each code work well / not so well?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples of areas where you think this code demonstrates best / worst practice]		
BSC	As above		
CUSC	As above		
Other codes			

Preference:

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

Issue No:	Description:
5.2	How does small party, new entrant and consumer representation vary across the codes?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Consumer Focus has no voting Panel seats; but can appoint two non-voting representatives. Can raise information provision mods only.		
BSC	Consumer Focus has 2 voting Panel seats, and can raise any kind of mod.		
CUSC	Consumer Focus has 1 voting Panel seat, and can raise any kind of mod.		
Other codes			

Preference:

BSC provides and allows more small parties and consumer focus involvement in decision making. It also gives a more independent approach, ie less partisan. In view of Ofgem's wider statutory duties and in order to give better alignment, the BSC model would be my preference.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.2.1	What aspects of the arrangements do small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives find to be a particular burden?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples of any (governance, rather than market design) problems with this code that you think may inhibit these groups from participation]		
BSC	As above		
CUSC	As above		
Other codes	As above		

Preference:

As a whole, small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives probably find the various different Code governance process and terminology a burden to understand and operate across the Codes. In this case a common process and terminology would be beneficial. A structured (but allowing some flexibility) process would also be useful as it gives a clear and transparent understanding, which means the BSC arrangement is more preferable.

The need to be involved in arguing one's case either as a proposer or affected parties placed significant resource burden. The BSC arrangement allows more help to parties in term of advice and analysis. It also provides more independent objectivity in decision making which give more comfort to smaller parties. However, the BSC entry process and credit provision arrangement are comparatively more complicated and rigorous which also placed significant burden.

Overall, I still prefer the BSC arrangement.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.

Issue No:	Description:
5.2.2	In which aspects are the codes sufficiently transparent or need to improve?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples]		
BSC			
CUSC			
Other codes			

Preference:

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Issue No:	Description:
5.2.2.1	Should websites conform to agreed standards/principles?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Not subject to external agreed standards / principles. Content is "open-to-all" – passwords not needed to access content.		
BSC	Same as UNC.		
CUSC	Same as UNC.		
Other codes	Not subject to external agreed standards / principles. On most code websites content is "open-to-all", though there are issues around constrained access to the DCUSA website.		

Preference:

I don't see any serious problem with any of the websites except that they are not consistent in approach.

The industry would benefit with a common approach or one website for all.

Overall, I find the BSC website better structured considering the complexity and range of subject areas.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.2.3	Do small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives consider that enough assistance is available to them in order to participate [in code governance and modification processes]?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples]		
BSC			
CUSC			
Other codes			

Preference:

Among all the Codes, it seems that only BSC has the resource to assist and advise small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives. I believe BSCCo do a very good job in this aspect.

Such arrangement would encourage better small parties participation.

The alternative would be as suggested by the Brattle Report that small sort of central funding could be provided for this purpose. However, the criteria and management of this would need careful consideration.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.2.3.1	If further assistance would be helpful [to small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives], in what areas?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Informal assistance from code administrator prior to raising mods (i.e. chat through issues).		
BSC	Informal assistance from code administrator prior to raising mods (i.e. chat through issues). Periodic education seminars for new joiners to industry. Range of information sheets and publications on website. Plain English summary of the code maintained (as code requirement?).		
CUSC	Informal assistance available from NG as administrator.		
Other codes			

Preference:

The Code governance review highlighted a few areas, in particular, informal assistance in developing mods and carrying required analysis.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.

Issue No:	Description:
5.3	What role do code administrators play in developing or bringing forward proposals?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	JO has drafted changes to the modification rule in line with governance workstream discussion – Party must then formally raise it. JO can request a consent to modify typo's etc.		
BSC	Asks Panel to raise housekeeping mods as needed. Provides informal support to proposers prior to submission (help with framing the issue etc).		
CUSC	NG can not raise mods as administrator but can and does as a CUSC party.		
Other codes			

Preference:

Mods should only be raised by parties (or their representative in the case of customer focus group) that could be impacted by the change. However, code administrator could provide admin, advice and analysis efforts in developing and progressing a proposal. To this end, I believe the BSC to an extent provide such an arrangement which worked well.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.3.1	Should the Panel's ability to raise proposals be limited to housekeeping and governance?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Panel cannot raise proposal in its own right – requires a 'sponsor'		
BSC	Panel can raise housekeeping mods, plus more material mods in limited circumstances specified within the code (i.e. to cater for changes to Fuel Security Code, the introduction of Euro).		
CUSC	Ambiguous if Panel can raise mods. Power to do so does exist ¹ but unclear in what circumstances it can be exercised.		
Other codes			

Preference:

On the basis that Mods should only be raised by parties (or their representative in the case of customer focus group) that could be impacted by the change. To this end, I believe the BSC to an extent provide such an arrangement which worked well.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.

¹ Paragraph 8.15.1

Issue No:	Description:
5.4	Who should be responsible for the production of legal text?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	The Transporters, who take it in turns.		
BSC	The code administrator, ELEXON.		
CUSC	National Grid.		
Other codes			

<p>Preference:</p> <p>It does not matter who produce the legal text provided it is done and reflected the principles of the agreed mod. In the BSC, the code administrator (via its own legal team/adviser) has done this for presumably efficiency purpose.</p>

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
<p>Details:</p> <p>Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.</p>			

Issue No:	Description:
5.4.1	When should legal text be produced?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	If a GT proposal included from the outset, otherwise at panel or Authority request		
BSC	For housekeeping or self evident proposals, during the Report Phase. For other proposals, during the Assessment Procedure.		
CUSC	Prior to the Company consultation.		
Other codes			

Preference:

In the BSC, legal text has been done when the Panel has to make a recommendation on whether to agree or reject a mod, which is normally during an assessment procedure as the argument for this was that they need to see precisely the exact legal standing of the mod. This potential could be a wasted effort if the mod is subsequently rejected.

I would prefer the legal text to be done as late as possible without jeopardising any misunderstanding. If possible, until after the Authority decision to approve for implementation.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.4.1.1	Should legal text be consulted on [before a proposal is sent to the Authority]?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	This rarely happens. Often legal text is only produced after an FMR is sent to the Authority, at the Authority's request.		
BSC	In principle, this step is not 100% guaranteed ² . But generally legal text is consulted on at least once (in the Report Phase) and often several times (where a mod has gone to a work group).		
CUSC	If a mod goes to WG, the WG usually agree the legal text. It is then consulted upon during the Company (panel) consultation.		
Other codes			

Preference:

Consultation on legal text is fine in principle but how often would a party's lawyer actually review it in practice. I suspect very seldom. Most people involved do not have a legal background but would evaluate the mod as detailed principles, and relied on the administrator or Ofgem's lawyers to effect this. However, as a process, there may need to be some review procedure to ensure the legal text fulfil the requirement of the proposal.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.

² The BSC does provide that the Panel may consult the Authority on whether legal text is needed for a mod, but the Panel has shown no appetite to make such requests, and it is unlikely that the Authority would accede to any such request on any proposal that had a credible chance of being approvable.

Issue No:	Description:
5.4.2	Should legal text be flexible (i.e. a "work in progress") until a decision to approve or reject is made)?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Legal text generally isn't developed during the industry process and is often only provided at the Authority's request after the Panel recommendation. Legal text is effectively flexible up to point of Authority decision.		
BSC	Legal text is flexible up to the point when FMR sent to Authority. After that point it cannot be changed.		
CUSC	Same as BSC		
Other codes	Problems have arisen under DCUSA where changes raised to common area of code, but legal text of each does not recognise the other, even post direction to implement.		

Preference:
<p>See my view in 5.4.1</p> <p>The UNC process in this case is probably more efficient.</p>

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
<p>Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.</p>			

Issue No:	Description:
5.5	How long should consultation period be?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Ordinarily 15 working days, can be varied by the panel.		
BSC	Not prescribed within the code. Working practice varies from a few days to a couple of weeks during Definition or Assessment Procedure, normally about a fortnight during Report Phase.		
CUSC	The WG phase incorporating consultation can be no longer than 4 months – unless extension approved, consultation element usually between 3 and 4 weeks. Company consultation usually 2 weeks.		
Other codes			

Preference:

Consultation period should not be too long that loses the impetus and delay in implementation but should be long enough to allow proper consideration. 2-3 weeks would normally be sufficient unless it is an urgent mod, but should also take into account of what consultation is out there.

I would leave this to the discretion of the Panel to be reasonable with this.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Does not seem to require any particular change.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.5.1	Should the Panel have discretion over how long the consultation period is for each proposal?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Full discretion. Often ties in with concurrent consultations.		
BSC	Full discretion. Usually varies from a few days to a couple of weeks. Complexity, public holidays and the volume of other work the industry and ELEXON has on may influence this duration.		
CUSC	Full discretion subject to a minimum of 10wd for housekeeping amendments.		
Other codes			

Preference:

[Yes, see my view on 5.5](#)

Means of implementation:				
Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification
Details:				

Issue No:	Description:
5.6	How should implementation dates be determined?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Can be day after Authority approval. Systems implementation often divorced from mod process – determined by consensus at UK Link committee after direction to implement issued.		
BSC	Determined by Panel prior to an Authority decision. Panel recommendation is generally based on mod group recommendation, which in turn is influenced by the results of industry impact assessments.		
CUSC	Date recommended by NG and included in consultation. Where respondents disagree with NG recommendation, date determined by the Panel.		
Other codes			

Preference:

Precise date for implementation should take into account of minimum notice period for system development and changes, which is what the BSC arrangement trying to do. A precise date in time also provides parties with the information to budget expenditure. I do not see any problem with this process.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

Issue No:	Description:
5.7	Should there be fast-track process for housekeeping / non-contentious modifications?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Consents process available for housekeeping changes. Does not need to be assessed against code objectives.		
BSC	Raised by Panel on ELEXON request, proceeds directly to Report Phase. Recommendation and Ofgem decision made against code objectives.		
CUSC	Where Panel agree a mod is HK, then mod is posted on NG website for minimum 10 business days. HK report drafted and submitted to Ofgem for decision. Licence drafting under CUSC similar to UNC, so consent process possible, but never used in practice.		
Other codes			

Preference:

There does not need to be a separate process. Why can we not use the same process but miss out or shorten the timescale of some of the steps?

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.

Issue No:	Description:
5.7.1	What unnecessary process steps could be removed/made conditional on nature of proposal?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples of steps in the mod process you think could be optional or removed (please specify which) for this code]		
BSC	As above		
CUSC	As above		
Other codes	As above		

Preference:

I still prefer the structure of the BSC mod process.

Some argued that there is no need for a definition stage under the BSC. The industry went through a mod to consider and decided to keep it. It could be missed out if not applicable but provide a structure for mod development.

Of all the steps, may be the report consultation stage could be removed as it does not served great value apart from potential legal text assessment. Parties do not normally respond or at best reiterate their views of the assessment procedure.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Probably only require mod rules changes.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.8	Should current customs and practice be codified?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with any examples of working practices you think should be codified, or otherwise formalised]		
BSC	As above		
CUSC	As above		
Other codes	As above		

Preference:

Ideally, these should be codified to give clear transparency and understanding. However, one should consider this case by case dependent on efficiency and flexibility.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

Issue No:	Description:
5.9	How can the independence of the code administrator be assured?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Joint Office staff are on secondment from NG, JGA stipulates they should act independently.		
BSC	ELEXON is 100% owned but uncontrolled subsidiary of NG ("at arms length"). Neutral in sense that non-affiliated and not-for-profit, but may be affected by mods insofar as they affect their scope, processes, and credibility.		
CUSC	NG are CUSC party and sole administrator of the CUSC.		
Other codes			

Preference:

In so far as the role of the Code administrator is concerned, their independence is not too important if they do not recommend or influence any mod decisions.

In this case, I found Elexon's role more independent than the others.

To be assured of their minimum impact, the process needs to reflect their role of administrator rather than influencer or decision maker (in providing recommendation) of any changes and have a strict service level in providing any assistance to the industry.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Some would only require mod rules changes and other may require licence modification.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.10	Who should 'own' modification proposals during the process?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	The proposer		
BSC	'Rights, IPRs and moral rights' assigned to code administrator, ELEXON ³ .		
CUSC	Rights, IPRs and moral rights' assigned to all CUSC parties ⁴		
Other codes			

Preference:

There has been a lot of argument for the proposer to own the mod. I do not have a problem with this. But there should be a process where if there is an obvious defect or improvement, just because the proposer does not like the direction of the mod, why it cannot be continued for the benefit of the industry. UNC seems to have a process to that effect but probably needs to be more structured.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Probably only require mod rules changes.

³ BSC F2.1.11

⁴ CUSC 8.15.7

Issue No:	Description:
5.11	Should proposers have the right to withdraw proposals?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Allowed, no time constraint.		
BSC	Allowed, subject to time constraint.		
CUSC	Allowed, no time constraint		
Other codes			

<p>Preference:</p> <p>Yes, no time constraint, but see my view in 5.10</p>

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
<p>Details:</p> <p>Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Probably only require mod rules changes.</p>			

Issue No:	Description:
5.11.1	If proposers should have the right to withdraw proposals, up to what point should this right exist?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Can be withdrawn at any point to submission of FMR to the Authority.		
BSC	Can only be withdrawn up to the point where first presented to Panel ⁵ (for it to consider whether to send to WG or straight to report).		
CUSC	Can be withdrawn at any point.		
Other codes			

<p>Preference:</p> <p>At any point up to submission of FMR to the Authority, but see my view in 5.10</p>

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Probably only require mod rules changes.			

⁵ BSC F2.1.12.

Issue No:	Description:
5.11.2	If proposers should have the right to withdraw proposals, should other parties be able to adopt the proposal at this point?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Allowed.		
BSC	Not allowed.		
CUSC	Allowed. Must do so within 5 BD following withdrawal.		
Other codes			

<p>Preference:</p> <p>Yes, must do so within 5 BD following withdrawal or may be agreement by the mod group. See my view in 5.10</p>

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Probably only require mod rules changes.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.12	Are modification processes appropriate for urgent proposals?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	[Please replace this text with examples of where you think the urgency procedures could be improved]		
BSC			
CUSC			
Other codes			

Preference:

Yes, there still need a process. The BSC has specific process for this and seemed to work well.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			
Such changes would probably best implemented together and coordinated by Ofgem. Probably only require mod rules changes.			

Issue No:	Description:
5.12.1	Should all urgent proposals be subject to a minimum period of consultation?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Urgency timetable is determined by Authority, although fed into by the views of the UNC Panel. No minimum period.		
BSC	Urgency timetable is determined by Authority, although fed into by the views of the BSC Panel.		
CUSC	Urgency timetable is determined by Authority, although fed into by the views of the CUSC Panel.		
Other codes			

<p>Preference:</p> <p>No minimum period, dependent on circumstance. All Codes seem to have a consistent process.</p>

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
<p>Details:</p> <p>No change required.</p>			

Issue No:	Description:
5.13	Should proposer be able to speak at a panel where a recommendation is to be made on their proposal?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	No specific rule – allowed at Panel/Chairs discretion		
BSC	Proposer is allowed to present when mod is raised, but has no guaranteed right to speak when final recommendations are made. Rules appear to allow for the Chair to give permission for floor to speak ⁶ .		
CUSC	As BSC		
Other codes			

Preference:

Panel recommendation should be based on all the work done by the mod group and should not be influenced by any individual party.

I therefore am happy with the current arrangement in BSC and CUSC.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

No change required.

⁶ BSC B4.5.1 http://www.elexon.co.uk/documents/BSC_and_Related_Documents/BSC_-_Live_Version/Section_B_v14.0.pdf

Issue No:	Description:
5.14	How should changes originating from outside the code [i.e. consequential changes that are “driven” by changes to licences, other codes or legislation] be dealt with?

Code	Current Process	Pro’s	Con’s
UNC	Less of an issue as UNC a more holistic code. All material changes must be assessed against relevant objectives and follow normal mods route – changes can be directed by SoS where specific powers to do so.		
BSC	Some major statutory changes may be enacted by Secretary of State (i.e. BETTA). But most changes enacted by normal mods route. Timing varies – sometimes coterminous FMRs and decisions are possible, more often there is a lag as one or more codes “catch up”.		
CUSC	As BSC		
Other codes			

Preference:

Apart from having one governance code, I believe the coordination of different codes worked well in electricity. I don't see any change is required.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

Issue No:	Description:
5.14.1	Should consequential changes be assessed simply on the basis of consistency rather than assessing them against the relevant code objectives?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Depends on nature of changes. Housekeeping can be dealt with under consents route. More material changes assessed against objs.		
BSC	All mods must be assessed against code objectives.		
CUSC	All mods must be assessed against code objectives.		
Other codes			

Preference:
All mods should be assessed against code objectives but should also consider the operability of the industry.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

Issue No:	Description:
5.15	Is the membership of modification groups appropriate?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Panel may approve composition. Must be at least 2 Users and 2 GTs. Proposer has right to appoint one individual. Non code Parties may become member by invitation. In practice, open door policy.		
BSC	Selected by Panel upfront from standing lists of volunteers who are considered to have relevant technical expertise. Must have at least five members. Proposer, NG and ELEXON have automatic membership rights. Others can attend, but cannot vote ⁷ . The code compels members to impartiality – this does not apply to attendees.		
CUSC	Selected by Panel upfront from standing lists of volunteers who are considered to have relevant technical expertise. Must have at least five members. Proposer, NG have automatic membership rights. Others can attend, but cannot vote.		
Other codes			

⁷ Although it should be noted that the code appears to envisage that mod groups could conduct business without the need for formalised voting processes, i.e. F2.4.18 *'[...] if the Group's terms of reference provide for voting [...]'* (which suggests that the need for groups to vote was not considered self-evident when the code went live). In practice, voting does take place to determine recommendations, whether to progress an alternative modification, and to resolve matters where there is no general consensus.

Preference:

I don't see any problem with the current arrangement.

Some have argued the non-voting right of attendees. But to allow all attendees to vote could jeopardise the position of smaller parties if large parties sent a large contingents to the meeting in order to influence the voting.

BSC have a working practice that no party will have more than one member to a particular mod group.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

No change required.

Issue No:	Description:
5.15.1	Should there be greater scope for consultancy support for modification/working groups?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	None provided centrally – if desired, must be funded by the party that wants it.		
BSC	Provided on a case-by-case basis, usually only for high materiality or complex mods. ELEXON would seek Panel authorisation to spend funds.		
CUSC	Does not seem to be anything in the rules to prevent such support being taken on. However do not recall any occasions when such support has been employed. Unclear who would pay.		
Other codes			

Preference:

See 5.2.3

Among all the Codes, it seems that only BSC has the resource to assist and advise small parties, new entrants and consumer representatives. I believe BSCCo do a very good job in this aspect.

Such arrangement would encourage better small parties participation.

The alternative would be as suggested by the Brattle Report that small sort of central funding could be provided for this purpose. However, the criteria and management of this would need careful consideration.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

--

Issue No:	Description:
5.16	Should alternative proposals be treated in a standard manner across all codes?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Uncapped number of alternatives allowed. Do not require majority support to raise. Alts must be raised within defined time-window of 5 days from original going out to consultation		
BSC	Only one alternative allowed – if more competing concepts then further mods must be raised. WG by majority has to consider the alt better than the original if they are to develop it. Alt can be raised at any time whilst still with WG.		
CUSC	Uncapped number of alternatives allowed. Respondents can only raise consultation alternative requests during the WG consultation and WG has complete discretion whether a request is formally taken forward as an alternative – WG chair has an over-riding discretion.		
Other codes			

Preference:

Yes. I prefer the BSC model of only one alternative.

Some may argued that it only creates more related mods. But at least it would be considered properly, clearer and more transparent. With a huge number of alternatives, it would be very difficult for parties to determine the differences.

Means of implementation:

Custom and practice		Mod rules change		Licence modification	
---------------------	--	------------------	--	----------------------	--

Details:

Issue No:	Description:
5.17	Should greater rationale/detail accompany panel recommendations?

Code	Current Process	Pro's	Con's
UNC	Both licence and rules require 'factors which justify' the Panel's recommendation – reference to Relevant Objectives not stipulated.		
BSC	Obligation under rules is specifically upon the Modification Group rather than Panel to justify opinion against relevant objectives ⁸ .		
CUSC	Only details of the outcome of the recommendation vote need to be provided in the FMR. Panel members can submit views as panel members during the consultation. This rarely happens.		
Other codes			

Preference:

I found the rationale and details in BSC Panel recommendation sufficient and preferred comparing with other Codes. It would be very rare that this does not happen.

Means of implementation:			
Custom and practice		Mod rules change	Licence modification
Details:			

⁸ See Clause F 2.6.4