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: Peter Thompson

Company: Representing the customer and the UIA

Email: strand37@nildram.co.uk

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

UNC

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

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'.

In the area of the Joint Office being prepared to consider issues raised by the 'customer' in particularly the Pre Modification phone in meeting prepared and Chaired by Tim Davis

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

While clearly the UNC is a contract between the Shipper and Transporters and the CoP is designed rightly to focus on this, the costs and impact of the wider decisions taken flow through eventually to the customer. Bearing this in mind the balance of importance given to the customer view is not always as great as it could be. Having said that, the availability of customer representation, often self-financed, to the calibre where knowledge is appropriate and input is constructive, is low.

If Ofgem were to consider this and carry out a strategic review of meetings and in so doing create a forum for customer representatives to attend and their corporate views over key issues be accessed; this may better serve the industry.

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

No concerns

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

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?

Having been in attendance where strong views have been held, a fair and even response has been given and discussion used to clarify and deal with misunderstandings.

As a consequence and from my perspective I consider the principle is being applied.

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.

No knowledge on which to base a comment

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

No knowledge on which to base a comment

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 knowledge on which to base a comment

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)?

I am not sure the additional administrative burden caused by introducing a KPI regime would add to the level of care and dedication provided by the UNC Administrator and his team.

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

CODE	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Excellent
BSC					
CUSC					
UNC					*

Do you have any other comments?