

Direct Dial: 0141 331 6007

Email: [Lesley.nugent@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:Lesley.nugent@ofgem.gov.uk)

Date: 5 December 2016

Dear colleague,

**Code administrators’ performance survey questionnaire – responses to consultation**

On 31 March 2016, we published our Code Governance Review (Phase 3) (CGR3) Final Proposals,[[1]](#footnote-1) including our decision that Ofgem should commission[[2]](#footnote-2) an independent third party to undertake a cross-code survey on code administrators’ performance.

Following a competitive tender process we commissioned Future Thinking,[[3]](#footnote-3) an independent research agency, to undertake the survey. On 31 October 2016, we published a consultation on the draft survey questionnaire that Future Thinking had developed.[[4]](#footnote-4)

We received six responses to the consultation, which we have published on our website.[[5]](#footnote-5) Those respondents that commented in general on the questionnaire were supportive of its overall content. In addition, all the respondents made detailed suggestions on individual aspects of the questionnaire. We have considered all of these comments, and, together with Future Thinking, have amended the questionnaire as appropriate. In the appendix to this letter we have summarised the detailed comments received and set out our responses to them.

Future Thinking has now commenced the survey. We hope that if you are contacted by Future Thinking that you will be willing to share your views and participate in the survey. Your involvement should not need a significant amount of your time and is important to help ensure that Ofgem receives feedback around the performance of the code administrators. Future Thinking will ensure that interviews are scheduled at a time that is convenient to you over the coming weeks. All interviews will be completely anonymous, neither Ofgem nor the code administrators will be made aware of who participates in the survey; unless you specifically identify that you would like your comments to be shared with us directly.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact Joy Mhonda at Future Thinking (tel: 020 7843 2171 or email [Joy.Mhonda@futurethinking.com](mailto:Joy.Mhonda@futurethinking.com)).

Yours sincerely,

Lesley Nugent

**Head of Industry Codes and Licensing**

**Appendix**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Responses** | **Our comments** |
| Two respondents asked if there is a need to distinguish between them as Code Administrator and one of their service providers, in the same way as we have done for the Joint Office and Xoserve. | We recognise that under some codes, some parties may interact with a service provider rather than the Code Administrator. Our view is that in these cases such interaction is limited to a particular area or service, which we anticipate should be clearly distinguishable from the role of code administrator (which may not be the case in respect of Xoserve). We therefore do not consider that there is a need to explicitly distinguish these roles within the survey in the way we have done for Xoserve and the Joint Office. We have therefore not amended the survey in this area. |
| One respondent mentioned that code administrators which receive larger funding will be able to offer a larger range of services and provide dedicated attention to the code parties’ needs; therefore, these considerations should be reflected in the questionnaire. | We recognise the concerns that have been raised. Our view is that this is a consideration for the survey results, rather than something that needs to be reflected in the survey itself. We have therefore not amended the survey in this area. |
| Three respondents suggested that the survey length was excessive and that the number of questions and options presented under each question should be reduced. | We have reviewed the statements under a number of the questions, and in respect of some have condensed them down. Based on the interviews Future Thinking has conducted, we do not consider that the number of questions is a concern and therefore have decided to maintain all the questions, as they all look to capture relevant information. |
| Some respondents suggested amending the rating scale used in certain questions to increase consistency within the text and with average surveying standards. | We recognise that using a scale ranging from 1-10 may be too great in the context of this survey. We have therefore amended the scales in the relevant questions to be those of the level of satisfaction and for these to be “very satisfied”, “fairly satisfied”, “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”, “fairly dissatisfied”, “very dissatisfied”. |
| One respondent raised concerns about the correlation between level of engagement of interviewees with the code and rating of service. | We consider it important that the survey recognises the experience of those who have less interactions with codes and have therefore not amended the questionnaire. However, we recognise that it will be important for the results of the survey to distinguish between those that are highly engaged with a code, compared to those who are less engaged. |
| Two respondents requested the insertion of a question on how the interviewees’ perception of the service delivered by each code administrator has varied year-on-year. | As this is the first survey of this type that a third party has conducted on our behalf, we do not consider it appropriate to include such a comparative question. |
| One respondent requested that a question on the usefulness of webinar facilities in meetings be included in the survey. The same respondent suggested that an option on whether webinar facilities are fit for purpose should be added under question 22. | As webinar facilities are not available across all code administrators, we have decided not to include such a question. Moreover, we believe that the other options available under question 22, if asked to interviewees who have affirmed having attended meetings via webinar in question 21, will sufficiently capture the quality of the webinar services provided thus far. |
| Several respondents suggested a number of other questions should be included. | We welcome the suggestions that have been made. However, we consider that the responses to the questions that have been included should provide a good reflection of the performance of the code administrators. Further, we note the alternative comments relating to the length of the survey. |
| Two respondents suggested that the timeframe in Q23 in respect of whether the interviewee had raised a modification should be reduced to one year. | We recognise that a timeframe of two years may not be indicative of current performance and therefore have reduced the timeframe to one year. |
| Respondents noted a number of minor typographical errors and made several non-material drafting and clarification suggestions. | We welcome respondents’ comments, and, where appropriate, have amended the text accordingly. We would also like to clarify that the numbering alongside a number of the responses will be used for coding the responses and does not form part of the survey itself. |

1. <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/code-governance-review-phase-3-final-proposals> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ofgem to commission the independent third party, and in accordance with the current arrangements under the codes, the code administrators will pay for the survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. On 9 September 2016 we published a letter inviting participation in the survey and announcing that we had commissioned Future Thinking. <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2016/09/ofgem_2016_code_administrator_survey_invitation.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/system/files/docs/2016/10/ofgem_2016_code_administrator_survey_questionnaire_consultation.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/code-administrators-performance-survey-questionnaire [↑](#footnote-ref-5)