

---

## Governance Standing Group

### Notes of Meeting held on 15 April 2002, Radcliffe House

<b>Present</b>	Nigel Cornwall, NC	Chair
	Steve Phillips, SP	British Energy
	Mark Cox, MC	National Grid
	Malcolm Taylor, MT	AEP
	Simon Goldring, SG	British Gas Trading
	Jane Butterfield, JB	PowerGen
	Dick Cecil, DC	London Electricity
	David Edward, DE	Authority Observer
	David Payne, DP	Technical Secretary

#### 1. Introductions and Background

Retrospective apologies were received from Richard Ford, St Clements. It was unclear whether Richard would remain as GSG member given that he was in the process of changing employer. It was suggested that the meeting notes should include an invitation for a replacement for Richard on the group although there was a general feeling that the group members were fully representative of Users. *(Post meeting note: Richard Ford has indicated that he will attend the next group meeting at least).*

The chairman explained that at the March CUSC Amendment Panel meeting CAP 017 had been discussed (and subsequently withdrawn). This amendment proposal was concerned with governance issues related to Alternative Amendments. Following discussion at the Panel meeting it was agreed that the issues presented by CAP 017 and other more general governance issue should be considered by a Governance Standing Group. To this end the previous membership of the Governance Working Group was reconstituted as the Governance Standing Group. The Standing Group was tasked with considering the issues for a time limited period of 4 months initially.

#### 2. Internal Working Procedures.

The Standing Group Internal working procedures had been circulated to group members prior to the meeting and these were approved for publishing on the CUSC website. There were no comments on the Internal Working Procedures. (For information the Internal Working Procedures are included as an attachment with these notes).

#### 3. Terms of Reference

MC had received a comment from Barbara Vest (Panel Member) stating that point 8(ii) of the TOF needed further clarification. This point has been clarified following the groups' consideration of the TOR.

After discussion the group also considered that the TOR should include the following issues:

- Urgent Amendment Process
- Process for withdrawal of Amendment Proposals
- Consideration of the ability to delay or bring forward proposed implementation dates for Amendments.
- Inclusion of references to the impact of Amendment Proposals on documents other than Core Industry Documents (eg BSC).

With respect to the last bullet point, DE did not feel that there was a need to change the CUSC as by the time an Amendment Report has been submitted for approval, with current custom and practice Ofgem would already have received an indication of the impact on other industry documents. However DE agreed to seek views within Ofgem as to whether CUSC 8.20.2 requires amendment, for further debate at the next GSG meeting.

**Action DE**

The TOR would be redrafted and circulated to the group for comment prior to circulation to Amendment Panel members on Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> April. (The revised TOR are attached with these notes).

**Action DP**

NC would request that the Amendments Panel ratifies the revised TOR at the next Panel meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> April.

**Action NC**

#### **4. Timetable and Priorities**

The TOR required that the Standing Group report should be presented to the Panel no later than 26<sup>th</sup> July 2002 and therefore the Standing Group deliberations would need to be completed by 16<sup>th</sup> July, allowing 10 days to compile the report. The group expressed concern that the timescales were already limited before additional issues for consideration were added to the TOR. However it was agreed that although the intention would be to consider all issues within the timescale, highest priority should be assigned to items i) and ii) of the TOR. The other issues would be addressed but it was recognised that full consideration may not be completed before 26<sup>th</sup> July deadline.

#### **5. Items for Discussion**

##### Alternative Amendments and Panel Members Views in Consultation.

There was a lengthy discussion on the issue of Alternative Amendments and what was actually meant by an Alternative. There was general agreement that the current definition of Alternative Amendment required clarification and a set of definition requirements for presentation to the Panel were developed (attached with these notes).

There was discussion on how Alternative Amendments could be identified either through a working group or through the consultation process. The process for assessing Alternative Amendments was debated and a set of criteria were identified for presentation to the Panel (attached with these notes). It was agreed that the

original Amendment Proposal would be the benchmark against which Alternatives would be judged and would always remain in the process for consideration. Further a valid Alternative must be capable of better meeting the applicable CUSC objectives when compared with the original Proposal. It was also agreed that guidelines were required on the working group process, drafting of detailed definitions and the process for resolving issues.

MC tabled a copy of a National Grid slide which described an Alternative Amendments process as proposed by CAP 017 (attached with these notes for information).

**6. Any Other Business**

There was no other business for discussion at this meeting.

**7. Date of Next Meeting**

Friday 26<sup>th</sup> April 2002 (following CUSC Amendments Panel meeting).