

Potential criteria for progressing a Working Group Alternative Amendment (WGAA)

Below are 4 possible sets of criteria under which the Group would be obliged to put an alternative solution forward to the Panel/Authority as a WGAA.

This is different to the Group's recommendation as to whether that WGAA should actually be made, where the Group would only recommend a WGAA for approval if a majority of members believed that it better facilitated the Applicable CUSC Objectives than both the baseline and the original.

For all options, 'better' means 'better facilitates the achievement of the Applicable CUSC Objectives' in relation to the identified issue or defect.

Criteria option	WGAA would be put forward for decision where a majority of the Group OR the Chair believes that WGAA is:	Implications of this option where the Group believes the original IS better than the baseline:	Implications of this option where the Group believes the original IS NOT better than the baseline:	Does this option enable the Group to develop the 'best' solution(s) allowed by the Amendment Proposal?
1	Better than the baseline <i>(the current CUSC criteria for progressing a WG Consultation Alternative Request as a WGAA)</i>	Allows the Group to put forward options for decision which are 'even better' than the original (as they would also be better than the baseline). However, this criteria also obliges the Group to put forward inferior options for decision (i.e. all options which are better than the baseline but not better than the original).	Prevents the Group from being able to put forward options for decision that are better ('less worse') than the original but aren't better than the baseline.	Achieves this less than options 2, 3 and 4?
2	Better than the original <i>(the current BSC criteria, but without the BSC's limitation to one alternative)</i>	Allows the Group to put forward options which are 'even better' than the original.	Allows the Group to put forward options which are 'less worse' than the original but aren't better than the baseline.	Yes – better meets this intention than options 1, 3 and 4?
3	Better than the baseline OR the original <i>(the current CUSC criteria for progressing a WGAA which is suggested by a Group member)</i>	Allows the Group to put forward options which are 'even better' than the original (in which case the 'or better than the baseline' criteria doesn't add anything). However, the 'or better than the baseline' criteria could oblige the Group to put forward inferior options for decision (i.e. all options which are better than the baseline but not the original).	Allows the Group to put forward options which are 'less worse' than the original but aren't better than the baseline (in which case the 'or better than the baseline' criteria doesn't add anything).	More than options 1 and 4, but less so than option 2?
4	Better than the baseline AND the original	Allows the Group to put forward options which are 'even better' than the original.	Prevents the Group from being able to put forward options which are 'less worse' than the original but aren't better than the baseline.	More than option 1, but less so than options 2 and 3?

Should a WG Consultation Alternative Request have to be better than any existing Draft WGAAs to be progressed? I don't think this would make sense under the CUSC. A WGAA suggested by a Group member doesn't have to be supported by a majority of the Group as being better than any other WGAAs on the table in order to go forward. (If you did follow this logic, you'd end up with only one WGAA rather than the multiple solutions permitted by the CUSC – similar to the BSC where the Group can consider multiple 'better'/'less worse' solutions but can only ultimately put forward the one alternative which it believes is the 'best'/'least worst' overall).