

**Minutes and Actions Arising from Meeting
Held on 6 February 2009**

Present:

Emma Carr	EC	Chairperson
Bali Virk	BV	Secretary
Carole Hook	CH	National Grid
Tony Dicicco	TD	RWE
Garth Graham	GG	SSE
Barbara Vest	BV	AEP
Peter Bolitho	PB	E.ON

In Attendance:

Mark Feather	MF	Ofgem
--------------	----	-------

1 Apologies for Absence

30. Apologies were received from Dipen Gadhia, David Jones, Robert Longden and Merel Van der Neut Kolfshoten due to teleconferencing issues.

2 Minutes of Last Meeting

31. The minutes of the last meeting were approved subject to minor amendments. The minutes to be published on the National Grid website shortly.

Action: BV

3 Review of Actions

- 32 All outstanding actions from the previous meeting have been completed and the following actions are to be reviewed at the next meeting:

- **11 – Review process for determining implementation dates** – Slides outlining the CUSC provisions and the information to be included in the report template to provide guidance. Action to be carried forward under the review of the new governance process (CAP160).

Action: BVirk

- **13 – Ofgem Corporate Plan** – DG to forward to the Group the Authority's Corporate plan detailing how many decisions Ofgem have made and how long the process has taken.

Action: DG

- **17 – Adequate Information/Analysis to determine implementation dates** – The group considered if we had adequate information/analysis to determine implementation dates. It was agreed that this is dependent on respondents' views which facilitate a complete understanding of the impact on all parties. It was agreed that it would be useful to add additional questions as standard to the consultation relating directly to the impact of implementation. This is to be captured as part of the CAP160 review.

Action: BVirk

- **18 – CUSC Amendment Proposal** – CH to draft a CUSC Amendment Proposal, which would allow the CUSC working group (WG) to develop and propose an implementation date in the event of a WG having been convened, as opposed to National Grid. CH confirmed that a proposal has been drafted and is currently being reviewed by the NG legal team.

Action: CH

- **22 – Review of Report Templates** - The group agreed that in the review of the report templates it would be useful to include guidance to ensure transitional arrangements have been fully considered but a change to the CUSC was not necessary. This to be captured for the CAP160 review.

Action: BVirk

- **26 – Update on Code Administrators Working Group and GSG Support Role** – Group agreed to have an understanding of the current practices in the BSC and UNC and identify best practice. Finding to be present to the GSG in March, with a view to making recommendation to the CUSC Panel regarding the role of Standing Groups.

Action: PB/DB/CH

4 Meeting Discussion - ICGR

33. Mark Feather was invited to the GSG meeting to give a presentation on the ICGR Role of Code Administrators and Major Policy Review. Details of the presentation can be found at [National Grid Presentation](#)
34. The group debated the presentation on Role of Code Administrators (CA) and Small Parties, and Major Policy Review (MPR) and Self Governance.

General comments from the discussion on the MPR and Self-Governance Consultation

35. Concerns were raised over loss of control of proposed modification if it gets captured under a MPR.
36. Process for MPR needs to be specified, E.g. what happens if an issue is raised whilst a review is ongoing?
37. Panel in considering output from MPR, must have right to express their views freely rather than obligation to bring forward certain proposals..
38. Timetable for areas of MPR must be communicated in advance, allowing industry to understand resource requirement to facilitate participation.
39. Filtering - Panel should filter, Authority should indicate areas for MPR in advance with timeframe specified (e.g. in corporate strategy) – subsequently if a modification is proposed which falls within the outlined categories, the panel will filter as MPR. In the event a proposal falls outside of pre-defined MPR but may be considered major, the panel could request guidance – as per CAP147 which was withdrawn and later become CAP148. .

General comments from discussion on the CA Consultation

Independence

40. In principle independence of Code Administrators is a good idea, but in practice it is difficult to balance with cost and expertise.
41. In relation to independence of System Management, there is a need to balance conflict of interest with additional cost/layers of complexity that separation would introduce. Panel role in some ways mitigates against any conflict of interest.
42. May be the right time to split NGET TO and SO obligations in licence – to ensure clarity on what function is being performed (e.g. NGET performs function of CUSC administration in SO capacity).
43. In many respects Ofgem's role should take on function of critical friend.

Small players

44. When amendments are of interest to small parties previous WG numbers support that smaller players participate, for example:
45. CAP148 – 16 Industry participants in WG, 6 small players.
46. CAP167 12 in WG, 5 of which were small players.
47. It is the role of the chair to ensure everyone has the opportunity to express views, and the role of the CA to ensure all views are represented in FMR.
48. Streamlining and improving process will help all parties, not just small players.

7 Next Meeting

53. The next GSG meeting will be held at 10.00am on 19th February at National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA and via teleconference.
54. The aim of this meeting is to discuss and draft the responses to the two ICGR documents (Role of Code Administrators and Small Parties, and Major Policy Review and Self-Governance).
55. Comments on consultation questions to be sent by February 13th to CH.

Action: All