

Competition in Connections (CiC) Code of Practice Panel

Monday 30 November 2015 13:30

Teleconference

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Catherine Falconer (Chair)	(CF)	SSE
Brian Hoy	(BH)	Electricity North West
Paul McGimpsey	(PM)	Scottish Power
Ian Cobley	(IP)	Northern Powergrid
Neil Magrath	(NM)	UK Power Networks
Simon Yeo	(SY)	Western Power Distribution
Gareth Pritchard	(GP)	UCCG
Neil Fitzsimons	(NF)	MCCG
Glyn Jones	(GJ)	MCCG
Graham Smith	(GS)	UCCG
Colin Jamieson	(CJ)	CNA
Mike Cahill	(MC)	Lloyds Register (observer)
Stephen Perry	(SP)	Ofgem (observer)
Mark Askew	(MA)	Energy Networks Association
Alexandra Moore	(AM)	Energy Networks Association

Apologies

David Overman	(DO)	CNA
---------------	------	-----

Welcome

CF welcomed the group and outlined the purpose of the meeting, that they needed to decide whether the modification proposal 0001 Self Determination of PoC by ICPs and 0002 Self-Design Approval Processes should be progressed to working groups. She reiterated how they were following the process outlined in 8.1 of the governance arrangements for the Connections Code of Practice, that they were following the process set out in the diagram. She reiterated that this was to look at a first draft, and would not be an agreement of the final text; this would be decided further down the line.

Competitions Act

CF reminded the group of the need to adhere to the obligations of the Competition Act, and that they were all happy to proceed under this. BH noted that the statement for the Competition Act should be attached to each agenda for working groups.

Modification Proposals

Self determination of PoC by ICPs

SY presented on the intent of the group and to meet the requirements of Code of Practice paragraph 4.12.1. NF asked whether the intent of the modification proposal would remain fixed once the Panel had voted. CF confirmed that it would.

Consequently, NF raised a concern regarding the use of 'i.e.' in the statement of the intent of the proposal, suggesting that this could mean that the original proposal could be open to be adapted at the working group stage. The group agreed that this was an issue and SY said he would change the intent, to ensure that this could not be changed.

The group also raised the issue of voting. As DO and his alternate were unable to attend the Panel meeting, he had been asked to vote on the modification proposals via email. It was decided in future that where Panel members were asked to vote in advance, where the Code Secretariat deems the intent had changed significantly, then the mod proposal will have to go for a re-vote. The votes were recorded as follows:

Name	Decision
Catherine Falconer – SSE	Approve
Brian Hoy - ENWL	Approve
Paul McGimpsey – SP	Approve
Gareth Pritchard – UCCG	Approve
Simon Yeo – WPD	Approve
Colin Jamieson – CNA	Approve
Neil Fitzsimons – MCCG	Approve
Ian Cobley – NPg	Approve
Neil Magrath – UKPN	Approve
Glyn Jones – MCCG	Approve
Graham Smith – UCCG	Approve

The modification proposal was approved subject to the small change to the intent of the modification.

Self Design Approval Process

PM presented his modification to the group, to meet the Code of Practice paragraph 4.17.1. He reflected the previous discussing, saying he would remove the 'i.e.' for the intent.

The votes were recorded as follows:

Name	Decision
Catherine Falconer – SSE	Approve
Brian Hoy - ENWL	Approve
Paul McGimpsey – SP	Approve
Gareth Pritchard – UCCG	Approve
Simon Yeo – WPD	Approve
Colin Jamieson – CNA	Approve
Neil Fitzsimons – MCCG	Approve
Ian Cobley – NPg	Approve
Neil Magrath – UKPN	Approve
Glyn Jones – MCCG	Approve
Graham Smith – UCCG	Approve

The modification proposal was approved to go forward by the Panel, and will now be drafted by a working group.

Working Groups

CF then moved onto a wider discussion on working groups, saying that the group wanted to be moving quickly on establishing groups. CF said that she would like Panel members to nominate representatives for the working groups. An invite to join the working groups will be sent out to a wider audience. CF asked if there had been any nominations for Chairs of the working group. Neil Magrath put himself forward to Chair the Self determination of PoC by ICPs and Ian Cobley put himself forward to Chair Self Design Approval Process. Both of these nominations were accepted.

Discussion Paper – Reporting Requirements

BH outlined the main points of the discussion paper on reporting requirements. The paper highlighted several options:

Option one: Inclusion of reporting template into Code of Practice:

A modification could be raised to include the reporting template into the Code of Practice. A draft could be developed to support the initiation of the modification and then a working group would be established. Unless the Panel considered this to be an inconsequential change the proposals would have to go through the consultation process. Once included in the Code of Practice, for example as an appendix, DNOs would be required to complete the template. Any subsequent changes would need to go through the same open governance process.

Option two: Informal' governance through the Panel:

An alternative would be for the Panel to act as the guardians' of the reporting template. Changes could be made by agreement with Panel. DNOs would not have the same level of obligation to comply with the template but the change process

would be simpler and quicker.

Option three: Best practice document:

Whilst the details of the reporting will be needed to be agreed by Ofgem, the reporting template has the status of a 'best practice' document only. No formal governance is put in place. DNOs can develop their own approaches and work with their own local stakeholders to develop the optimum way for each to demonstrate its compliance with the Code of Practice. This approach allows for innovative solutions but does not guarantee any consistency.

NF said that option one was his first choice, something that would be clear. GS said that his preference was either choice one or two. BH said that this wouldn't be decided today, and that he would finish off the draft for circulation. BH stated that the Panel meeting on 14th December could be used to discuss reporting requirements further. MA stated that it might need wider stakeholder involvement. BH and MA said that they would think over this approach.

Website

NF discussed a link for a website, and whether the DNOs would be featuring this on their websites.