
Governance Standing Group

Notes of Meeting held on 26 April 2002, Brandon Hall, Coventry

Present	Nigel Cornwall, NC	Chair
	Steve Phillips, SP	British Energy
	Mark Cox, MC	National Grid
	Malcolm Taylor, MT	AEP
	Brian Sequeira, BS	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

Apologies were received from Simon Goldring, British Gas Trading, who was represented by Brian Sequeira.

Apologies were also received from Richard Ford, St Clements, who had recently welcomed two new members to his family. The group wished Richard and his family well.

2. Approval of Notes from last meeting

The notes of the last meeting were approved and would be published on the CUSC website in due course.

Actions from the last meeting

DE had sought a view from Ofgem on the need to amend CUSC 8.20.2. to identify the CUSC and BSC as Core Industry Documents. DE reported that the view was that as the CUSC and BSC were two independent codes with comprehensive governance and change procedures, there was no requirement for a hierarchy to be established. DE also stated that as NGC were members of the CUSC Amendments Panel and the BSC Panel (and others) they were in a position to ensure that a full impact assessment on all documents would be carried out for any amendments. BS also pointed out that the Transmission Licence required NGC to continually ensure that the BSC and CUSC were maintained and modified against the objectives. NC felt that the reply did not address the issue of whether the definition of Core Industry Document should include the CUSC or BSC although this was not an issue that needed further in depth discussion at this stage. However NC agreed to prepare a note for the CUSC Panel seeking guidance on this issue.

Action NC

The remaining actions from the last meeting had been completed.

3. Feedback from the Panel

- Terms of Reference

The Panel had agreed the proposed Terms of Reference for the GSG but with one minor amendment to section 8 (v) to include reference to the Authority. With this amendment the final Terms of Reference would be made available on the CUSC website.

Action DP

- Criteria for assessing Alternative Amendment Proposals.
There had been no comment from the Panel on the set of criteria developed by the GSG. The Panel had been keen for the GSG to progress the issues related to obtaining Panel members views on Alternative Amendment Proposals and the number of times that Alternatives are allowed to go round the 'loop'.

4. Items for Discussion

Alternative Amendments

The Standing Group commented on the note by NC on Alternative Amendments. In particular clarifications were noted to the 'consultation phase':

It was noted that respondents to consultation should be permitted to make Alternative Amendments but that these would need to be clearly labelled. Any definition of Alternative Amendment would need to include the consultation phase so that parties were clear on the criteria at submission. NC agreed to revise the criteria and principles already set out for the Alternative Amendment Process and circulate to the GSG during week beginning 29 April, with the intention of submitting the revised principles to the next Panel meeting.

MT also noted that any definition may need to consider the reference to Alternative Amendments in 8.21.8 and 8.23.5. The group noted this.

Action NC

It was agreed that there was a need for the conclusions of the GSG to be published widely such that a proposal to amend CUSC 8.20 could be brought forward.

The group agreed that the Panel should be invited to endorse the conclusions of the GSG at the next Panel meeting and invite Parties or National Grid to come forward with an Amendment Proposal. The GSG would determine whether the amendments to CUSC 8.20 should be covered by one or more than one Amendment Proposal.

It was also proposed that NGC should be invited to consider the development of a set of Guidelines on the Alternative Amendment Process for clarity to parties and to provide transparency. It was suggested that National Grid should circulate consultation responses at the end of the consultation phase but may circulate early at the request of the respondent.

Panel Views in Consultation

A general discussion took place on when views are sought from the Panel in the consultation process. BS suggested that the group first needed to consider the purpose and role of the Panel before they could determine when their views were sought.

MT agreed to prepare a paper considering the role of the Panel in the Amendment process and also considering when the Panel should be enabled to provide views during the Amendment process, for discussion at the next GSG meeting.

Action MT

NC reported that a Panel member had asked whether it would be appropriate to open up discussions on Amendment Proposals at the end of the Amendment process.

5. Timetable, Priorities and Work Programme

No further discussion

6. Any Other Business

There was no other business for discussion at this meeting.

7. Date of Next Meeting

Friday 17th May 2002