

Governance Workstream Minutes

Thursday 19 February 2009

350 Euston Road, London

Attendees

Tim Davis (Chair)	(TD)	Joint Office
Bob Fletcher (Secretary)	(BF)	Joint Office
Amrik Bal	(AB)	BG Group
Alex Barnes	(ABa)	Shell
Bali Dohel	(BD)	Scotia Gas Networks
Chris Hill	(CH)	RWE Npower
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Joanna Ferguson	(JF)	Northern Gas Networks
John Bradley	(JB)	Joint Office
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Mike Young	(MY)	British Gas Trading
Phil Broom	(PB)	Gaz de France
Richard Fairholme	(RH)	EON UK
Richard Street	(RS)	Corona Energy
Ritchard Hewitt	(RH)	National Grid Transmission
Roddy Monroe	(RM)	Centrica Storage Limited
Simon Trivella	(ST)	Wales and West Utilities
Stefan Leedham	(SL)	EDF Energy

1.0 Introduction and Status Review

1.1. Minutes from Previous Workstream

Accepted without amendment.

1.2. Review of Actions

None

1.3. Review of Live Modifications Proposals and Topics

None

2.0 Modifications

No Modifications to review.

3.0 Topics 013GOV - Industry Codes Governance Review

JD gave a brief overview of the process used by Ofgem to monitor and review modification proposals across the different codes and their approach to maintaining consistency.

ABa asked if it is possible for Ofgem to highlight any issues they may have with the implementation of a proposal before it is fully developed. JD responded that Ofgem representatives attending meetings should be doing this where it is possible for such issues to be identified in advance, or seeking advice within Ofgem if the representative does not have sufficient knowledge of the topic or issue.

JD added that the Codes Governance Review is not just looking outward at code administrators but Ofgem is looking at its own administration and processes to try to deliver

consistency and reduce timescales. Ofgem is keen to receive feedback from the industry to help with their review.

SL asked how the management of licence changes differed from code changes. JD responded the process is similar although set at a much higher level since licence changes are mainly in response to a policy review.

ABa asked if Ofgem could be more mindful of the impacts of what appear to be simple licence changes, eg substitution, which subsequently requires significant industry process development. JD responded that Ofgem were mindful of such examples and this was a consideration in the codes review where it is suggested that Ofgem might raise proposals where a licence change would be too blunt.

4.0 Any Other Business

4.1 Draft Summary of Proposals 0228/0228A

TD explained that provision of short, plain English, summaries of key documents had been raised during the governance review. He presented a draft summary of Proposals 0228 and 0228A, based on the Final Modification Report and containing less than 500 words. TD asked if parties thought a summary of this nature would help smaller or other interested parties to identify Proposals they should or should not consider further.

ABa consider the idea commendable, though was reluctant to support any “dumbing down” of the information available, believing that participants in the industry should either have sufficient technical knowledge or be able to source such knowledge from a service provider.

SL was supportive if the aim is to help parties identify the proposals that should be important to them, adding the Proposer could be asked to provide a summary paragraph. ST agreed that may be useful but preferred any summary to be developed by a neutral party such as the Joint Office.

AB and SL questioned whether the draft summary was too long. TD suggested that the length reflected the fact that the summary covered two complex proposals and consultation responses. Typically a summary may be much shorter.

CH was supportive in principle, though doubted every proposal could be summarised as some were too complex or had many impacts.

ST thought it would be beneficial if the summary contained other information such as impacts on non code parties, e.g. consumers.

TD offered to provide further examples for the March Governance Workstream which may help to identify an appropriate format and coverage if it is concluded that such summaries are worthwhile.

Action GOV1040: Joint Office to provide further summary examples for the March Governance Workstream.

5.0 Next Meeting

19 March 2009, following the UNC Committee meeting.

Action Log – UNC Governance Workstream 19 February 2009

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner*	Status Update
GOV1040	19/02/09	4.1	Provide further summary examples.	Joint Office (TD)	For discussion on 19 March