



Code Administration Code of Practice

User feedback form

The Code Administration Code of Practice (CoP)¹ was implemented on 31st December 2010. The aim was to facilitate convergence and transparency in code modification processes. The CoP is formally adopted by the UNC, BSC and CUSC, and has been voluntarily observed by other codes.

In accordance with Principle 4, the CoP is subject to periodical review by users. In this first review, we welcome your feedback on how well the CoP Principles are being achieved in practice and any suggested amendments that you would like to raise for consideration.

Please provide your feedback by completing this form and returning your comments to Ofgem **by Friday 20th January**:

industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk

If you would like any comments to be considered as confidential, please indicate this clearly.

Thank you

Name: Ryan Perry / Steve Ladle

Company: Gemserv, acting as the iGT Representative/iGT UNC Modification Panel Chairman respectively. The Response is supported by iGTs.

Email: igt-unc@gemserv.com

Which industry code(s) are you actively involved with*?

UNC BSC CUSC Other

All comments within this response relate to the iGT UNC

How would you characterise your involvement with the above code(s)?

Code Administrator Panel Member Code Signatory Interested Party

* Please indicate in each of your responses which code your comments relate to.

¹ A copy of the Code Administration Code of Practice can be found at <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Licensing/IndCodes/CGR/Documents1/FinalCoP.pdf>

Please share examples of any areas where you have found the application of the CoP Principles particularly successful. Please include any suggestions of 'best practice'.

- The CoP has promoted greater engagement with Code stakeholders. Specifically with regards to Principle 1(the role of the Code Administrator as a critical friend)
- Re-enforced existing iGT UNC processes

Please share examples of any areas where you have found the application of the CoP Principles particularly *unsuccessful*. Please include any suggestions for improvement.

- Whilst there are now greater communications with Code stakeholders, from an iGT UNC perspective it remains difficult to facilitate the engagement of smaller parties (in particular shippers/users).

How useful do you consider the standardised processes, timetables and documents to be, as set out in the CoP?

- Gemserv contractual KPIs are in place to measure our performance as the iGT UNC Representative – mirrored in terms of administration and communication. In other areas we are confident our processes would sufficiently meet areas such as quality of assessment, critical friend, and implementation costs, albeit the latter is very rarely applicable to the iGT UNC (has not to date been applicable).
- Modification Process – the iGT UNC process is similar to that of the high level common process outlined within the CoP.
- Modification Timelines – Defined within the iGT UNC, but generally follow similar timeframes to those outlined within the CoP depending of the level of modification.
- Templates – Currently based on the historic iGT UNC Model template. Current view of the Panel is that these remain fit for purpose.

Do you consider that the standardised processes, timetables and documents have been successfully implemented in the code(s)?

- As applicable to the iGT UNC – yes.

In respect of Principle 1, which describes the role of Code Administrators as 'critical friends', if you are a code user, how would you evaluate the implementation of this principle in 2011?

- There have been improvements within the iGT UNC, and as a Code Administrator we are now more aware of the need to engage with as many Code parties as possible to ensure all impacted parties have the opportunity to provide their view.

- Still some difficulty as noted about in actually getting small suppliers to have an active involvement in the iGT Shipper Work Group and respond to consultations for example.

Have you identified any additional areas that you feel it would be helpful for the CoP to cover? If so, please describe how you feel this would improve the code administration processes.

- None

Are there any areas of the CoP that you have found to be inconsistent with other code processes? Please identify any specific examples.

- None.

Have you identified any parts of the CoP that you feel should be removed or amended? If so, please explain your reasons for this.

- No.

Do you feel it would be useful at this stage to impose KPI targets on the Code Administrators (whereas currently KPI data is recorded, but no targets are set)?

- Current arrangements would appear suitable at this time, potentially should be reviewed after two years worth of data has been recorded. As the iGT UNC is not mandated to provide this data, a definitive view is not appropriate.

How would you rate your experience of the overall usefulness of the CoP?

- NA

CODE	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Excellent
<i>BSC</i>					
<i>CUSC</i>					
<i>UNC</i>					

Do you have any other comments?

- No