

Payment of Travel Expenses to CUSC Modifications Panel Members and Workgroup/Standing Group Members

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **20th January 2012** to cusc.team@uk.ngrid.com Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the GSG when it makes its recommendation to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	<i>Steven Eyre</i> <i>Steven.eyre@edfenergy.com</i>
Company Name:	<i>EDF Energy</i>
Q.1. Do you think that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should act as impartial experts or as representatives or their employers?	<i>As a principle we support governance arrangements that are consistent, wherever possible, across all of the major industry codes. We note that within the BSC arrangements Workgroup/Standing Group members are required to act as impartial experts and we see no reason why this should not apply in other industry codes such as the CUSC.</i>
Q.2. Do you agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting "impartially?"	<i>Yes. In the event that expenses are paid these costs are likely to be ultimately recovered from CUSC parties. Consequently, these additional costs should only be incurred if the wider industry benefits from meeting representatives acting independently as experts supporting the relevant code objectives rather than acting as a representative of an individual organisation.</i>
Q.3 If the answer to Q2 is "No" would it be an impediment to you if were required to be impartial?	<i>n/a</i>
Q.4 Do you agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses should be paid under the CUSC (see section 2.2 and 2.7 for further information)?	<i>Yes. Some guidance on what would be deemed reasonable would need to be provided.</i>

<p>Q.5 Do you agree the current wording of the CUSC should be made more explicit for the ability to claim travel expenses rather than by reference to the indemnity as per CUSC provision 8.12.2¹.</p>	<p><i>Yes. Greater clarity would be beneficial.</i></p>
<p>Q.6. Would you (or your company) attend more CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group meetings if travel expenses were paid? (See section 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p><i>No. Our decision to attend industry meetings is not affected by the direct travel costs incurred but rather the availability of resource and our ability to add expertise in consideration of the topic at hand.</i></p>
<p>Q.7. If the answer to Q6 is ‘No’ would other constraints be more or less likely to impact on your ability to attend – for example lack of time, availability of personnel, or location of meeting?</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>
<p>Q.8. Regardless of the ability to claim travel expenses, would you be more willing/able to attend CUSC meetings if the were held entirely by teleconference or by using web technology?</p>	<p><i>We consider that the use of teleconferencing facilities and web technology does have some benefits. However, the use of such technology does have a number of limitations and it would not be appropriate to hold meetings entirely through this medium. For example, complex and significant issues that attract a wide degree of interest across CUSC parties are far more efficiently progressed through physical attendance at meetings. These physical meetings can of course be supplemented with other technologies in order to facilitate the widest expert representation available.</i></p> <p><i>On the whole, the level of our attendance at meetings is unlikely to be significantly affected by moves to technology based meetings. However, the efficiency and effectiveness of such meetings could potentially be compromised.</i></p>
<p>Q.9. Do you think the Code Administrator (National Grid) should pick up the costs for reimbursing travel expenses? If not, who should fund them? (See section 3.8 for further information)</p>	<p><i>Yes. The code administrator should pick up the costs and recover these in some form from all CUSC Parties.</i></p>
<p>Q.10. Do you agree that if travel expenses are to be paid that, like the BSC, it should be limited to CUSC</p>	<p><i>Yes.</i></p>

¹ http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdoonlyres/8B81E9A0-F1B1-47B7-906D-41DA0DB69167/50497/CUSCSection8CMP195_2Dec.11.pdf

Modification Panel/ Workgroup / Standing Group members only (and not be paid, for example, to observers)? (see sections 3.3 and 3.7 for further information)	
Q.11. Do you think the CACOP should cover payment of travel expenses? (See section 3.5 for further information)	<i>Yes. In order to promote consistency it would seem sensible for the CACOP to cover this issue.</i>
Q.12 Do you have any further comments?	<i>No.</i>

Payment of Travel Expenses to CUSC Modifications Panel Members and Workgroup/Standing Group Members

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **20th January 2012** to cusc.team@uk.ngrid.com Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the GSG when it makes its recommendation to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	<i>Esther Sutton esther.sutton@eon-uk.com</i>
Company Name:	<i>E.ON UK</i>
Q.1. Do you think that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should act as impartial experts or as representatives or their employers?	<i>The critical issue is that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should bring relevant knowledge/expertise to the Group. This is required to be detailed on the CUSC nomination form used by the CUSC Panel to select Workgroup/Standing Group membership; assessment of these nominations should enable a representative cross-section of industry experience to be reflected in the Group composition. There may be a risk that stipulating impartiality deters any smaller parties from participating in Groups even if travel expenses are paid. In reality each member's contribution to Group discussions will naturally reflect their experience (but this is likely to include academic studies and knowledge gleaned under different industry arrangements, from previous employers, roles, other Workgroup involvement etc., not only their current employer's business). Workgroups are a collaborative effort to develop solution(s) to Code defects and all Group members will be mindful of the 'greater good', ultimately assessing potential solutions against the CUSC Applicable Objectives. Thus we do not see a benefit to be gained from stipulating either impartiality or representation.</i>
Q.2. Do you agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting "impartially?"	<i>No. As above all participants will bring relevant experience to their work in a Group/on the Panel and if travel expenses are to be paid we see no reason to limit this to those acting 'impartially', a requirement also very difficult to assess.</i>
Q.3 If the answer to Q2 is "No" would it be an impediment to you if were required to be impartial?	<i>No. Participants in BSC Workgroups are used to the obligation to act impartially, though this is very hard to prove and as per our answer to Q1 we do not believe that this would bring any benefit to proceedings.</i>
Q.4 Do you agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses should be	<i>No. We understand that this issue was brought to the GSG partly owing to enquiries being received asking for clarification of the</i>

<p>paid under the CUSC (see section 2.2 and 2.7 for further information)?</p>	<p><i>situation with regard to travel expenses. Thus it may be helpful to clarify the CUSC wording. However meeting dates are generally determined a reasonable time in advance, so travel expenses can be kept to a minimum by buying advance train tickets to attend in person. We appreciate that National Grid at Gallows Hill also provides a free shuttle bus from Leamington Spa train station as well as free parking. In addition teleconference facilities are always available. Therefore we do not think that travel expenses deter participation in Workgroups/Standing Groups. If they are to be paid however we agree that only 'reasonable' costs (e.g. Standard but not First- class travel), supported by receipts, should be reimbursed.</i></p>
<p>Q.5 Do you agree the current wording of the CUSC should be made more explicit for the ability to claim travel expenses rather than by reference to the indemnity as per CUSC provision 8.12.2¹.</p>	<p><i>It may be helpful to clarify the CUSC wording to make it clearer what is and what is not covered.</i></p>
<p>Q.6. Would you (or your company) attend more CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group meetings if travel expenses were paid? (See section 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p><i>No.</i></p>
<p>Q.7. If the answer to Q6 is 'No" would other constraints be more or less likely to impact on your ability to attend – for example lack of time, availability of personnel, or location of meeting?</p>	<p><i>Clashes with other internal or external meetings/lack of time/availability of relevant staff is more of an issue. Even in a larger company only a few people deal with Code changes.</i></p> <p><i>Meetings in Warwick are central for all and London has many travel links if Warwick is not possible. Were any meetings to be scheduled further away (such as e.g. some TransmiT meetings which have been held in Scotland), this might impact ability to attend, but this concerns the additional time as well as the expense required for travel).</i></p>
<p>Q.8. Regardless of the ability to claim travel expenses, would you be more willing/able to attend CUSC meetings if the were held entirely by teleconference or by using web technology?</p>	<p><i>No. Unless the agenda is very short, attending in person usually seems preferable. But peoples' preference will be partly dependent on the location/facilities available to the party dialling in – e.g. from a large office, background noise/distractions can be more of an issue than in a smaller/quieter setting.</i></p>
<p>Q.9. Do you think the Code Administrator (National Grid) should</p>	<p><i>No. Ultimately these costs will be borne by end users hence we believe it is preferable for these to be absorbed by parties as they</i></p>

¹ http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/8B81E9A0-F1B1-47B7-906D-41DA0DB69167/50497/CUSCSection8CMP195_2Dec_11.pdf

<p>pick up the costs for reimbursing travel expenses? If not, who should fund them? (See section 3.8 for further information)</p>	<p><i>are at present.</i></p>
<p>Q.10. Do you agree that if travel expenses are to be paid that, like the BSC, it should be limited to CUSC Modification Panel/ Workgroup / Standing Group members only (and not be paid, for example, to observers)? (see sections 3.3 and 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p><i>Yes.</i></p>
<p>Q.11. Do you think the CACOP should cover payment of travel expenses? (See section 3.5 for further information)</p>	<p><i>No, parties are aware of the existing arrangements and it is appropriate for any changes to be debated through the existing Code modification processes.</i></p>
<p>Q.12 Do you have any further comments?</p>	<p><i>No.</i></p>

Payment of Travel Expenses to CUSC Modifications Panel Members and Workgroup/Standing Group Members

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **20th January 2012** to cusc.team@uk.ngrid.com Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the GSG when it makes its recommendation to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	Stuart Cotten (01757 612 751)
Company Name:	Drax Power Limited
Q.1. Do you think that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should act as impartial experts or as representatives or their employers?	<p>Drax believes that Workgroup and Standing Group members should act as impartial experts, similar to the current BSC arrangements.</p> <p>Modification Workgroup members should be developing and evaluating solutions to an identified defect in a way that better achieves the Relevant Code Objectives. Similarly, Standing Group members should be working proactively to identify issues that have the potential to affect the operation of the code and propose appropriate solutions.</p> <p>As such, Drax believes that members of such groups should fulfil the relevant Terms of Reference set by the Panel on an impartial basis.</p>
Q.2. Do you agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting “impartially?”	Yes. Expenses should only be reclaimed from CUSC Parties (and, ultimately, consumers) if they are providing their expertise on an impartial basis. Drax cannot see how there would be any impediment to a member of a Workgroup or Standing Group by acting impartially. This is current working practice under the BSC.
Q.3 If the answer to Q2 is “No” would it be an impediment to you if were required to be impartial?	N/A
Q.4 Do you agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses should be paid under the CUSC (see section 2.2 and 2.7 for further information)?	Yes, although expenses should only be reimbursed if those claiming such expenses are required to act impartially.

<p>Q.5 Do you agree the current wording of the CUSC should be made more explicit for the ability to claim travel expenses rather than by reference to the indemnity as per CUSC provision 8.12.2¹.</p>	<p>To avoid ambiguity, it may be appropriate for the CUSC to explicitly set out which expenses can be claimed, by which parties and for what reasons.</p>
<p>Q.6. Would you (or your company) attend more CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group meetings if travel expenses were paid? (See section 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Q.7. If the answer to Q6 is ‘No’ would other constraints be more or less likely to impact on your ability to attend – for example lack of time, availability of personnel, or location of meeting?</p>	<p>Yes. The main constraint for Drax is the availability of personnel to attend such meetings.</p>
<p>Q.8. Regardless of the ability to claim travel expenses, would you be more willing/able to attend CUSC meetings if the were held entirely by teleconference or by using web technology?</p>	<p>The Code Administrator currently provides teleconference facilities for Workgroup and Standing Group meetings. However, this technology is impractical for meetings with a large number of attendees where constant input is required from the group. This is a particular problem for Workgroups dealing with complex or contentious issues.</p>
<p>Q.9. Do you think the Code Administrator (National Grid) should pick up the costs for reimbursing travel expenses? If not, who should fund them? (See section 3.8 for further information)</p>	<p>It is unreasonable to expect National Grid to fund the involvement of CUSC Parties in such processes. Expenses should be reclaimed from all CUSC Parties, on a similar basis to the BSC process.</p>
<p>Q.10. Do you agree that if travel expenses are to be paid that, like the BSC, it should be limited to CUSC Modification Panel/ Workgroup / Standing Group members only (and not be paid, for example, to observers)? (see sections 3.3 and 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p>Yes. Expenses should only be reimbursed to those that are contributing to the work on an impartial basis.</p>

¹ http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdoonlyres/8B81E9A0-F1B1-47B7-906D-41DA0DB69167/50497/CUSCSection8CMP195_2Dec_11.pdf

Q.11. Do you think the CACOP should cover payment of travel expenses? (See section 3.5 for further information)	Yes. The treatment of expenses should be consistent across the industry codes, i.e. expenses should only be paid where Workgroup, Standing Group and Panel members act impartially. However, such arrangements may not be appropriate for all industry codes and should be considered on a code by code basis.
Q.12 Do you have any further comments?	No.

Payment of Travel Expenses to CUSC Modifications Panel Members and Workgroup/Standing Group Members

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **20th January 2012** to cusc.team@uk.ngrid.com Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the GSG when it makes its recommendation to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	Ian Pashley, email Ian.Pashley@uk.ngrid.com
Company Name:	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc (NGET)
Q.1. Do you think that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should act as impartial experts or as representatives or their employers?	NGET believes that Workgroup and Standing Group Members should act as impartial industry experts. We acknowledge that the CUSC is currently silent in terms of Workgroup Members and Standing Group members acting impartially at CUSC meetings.
Q.2. Do you agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting “impartially?”	Yes, although please see answer to question 4 below.
Q.3 If the answer to Q2 is “No” would it be an impediment to you if were required to be impartial?	N/A
Q.4 Do you agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses should be paid under the CUSC (see section 2.2 and 2.7 for further information)?	We are neutral to the payment of travel expenses, on the grounds that discussions within the Governance Standing Group to date have yet to suggest that payment of expenses would encourage greater participation in CUSC Workgroup or Standing Groups. Therefore, we question the benefit that payment of expenses would bring. We hope that responses to this consultation will offer wider industry views on this issue.
Q.5 Do you agree the current wording of the CUSC should be made more explicit for the ability to claim travel expenses rather than by reference to the indemnity as per CUSC provision 8.12.2¹.	More clarity would ensure CUSC parties are clear on whether travel expenses can be claimed and, if so, what can be claimed. This could be achieved either via a change to the CUSC or a published statement on the CUSC part of National Grid's website.

¹ http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdoonlyres/8B81E9A0-F1B1-47B7-906D-41DA0DB69167/50497/CUSCSection8CMP195_2Dec_11.pdf

<p>Q.6. Would you (or your company) attend more CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group meetings if travel expenses were paid? (See section 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Q.7. If the answer to Q6 is ‘No’ would other constraints be more or less likely to impact on your ability to attend – for example lack of time, availability of personnel, or location of meeting?</p>	<p>The CUSC stipulates that at least one member of “The Company” (NGET) shall be in attendance at Standing Group and Workgroup meetings, so we would therefore attend all such meetings.</p>
<p>Q.8. Regardless of the ability to claim travel expenses, would you be more willing/able to attend CUSC meetings if the were held entirely by teleconference or by using web technology?</p>	<p>NGET would attend CUSC meetings regardless of meetings being held by teleconference or web technology. However, we recognise that teleconference and web technology are beneficial, particularly when holding shorter meetings or in order to save participants travel costs and travel time.</p>
<p>Q.9. Do you think the Code Administrator (National Grid) should pick up the costs for reimbursing travel expenses? If not, who should fund them? (See section 3.8 for further information)</p>	<p>No. We believe that the costs should be recouped from all CUSC Parties. This would also ensure consistency with the BSC.</p>
<p>Q.10. Do you agree that if travel expenses are to be paid that, like the BSC, it should be limited to CUSC Modification Panel/ Workgroup / Standing Group members only (and not be paid, for example, to observers)? (see sections 3.3 and 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p>Yes. Payment of expenses should only be made to CUSC Modification Panel Members/Workgroup Members and Standing Group Members who are attending as impartial experts.</p>
<p>Q.11. Do you think the CACOP should cover payment of travel expenses? (See section 3.5 for further information)</p>	<p>Not necessarily. Although there are benefits to cross-code consistency, we recognise that the CACOP currently applies to the BSC, CUSC and the gas Uniform Network Code and that a one size approach may not be appropriate to all codes in this area, given the different funding arrangements. It is also worth noting that the CACOP may be extended to cover additional industry codes in future, which may have their own unique funding arrangements.</p> <p>It may therefore be more appropriate for the CACOP to consider the principle of impartiality of Workgroup members rather than the payment of expenses.</p>

Q.12 Do you have any further comments?	NGET believes that if a requirement to be impartial is introduced into the CUSC, the generic Terms of Reference for Workgroups and Standing Groups would need to be updated to state that members will be required to act in an impartial manner.

Payment of Travel Expenses to CUSC Modifications Panel Members and Workgroup/Standing Group Members

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **20th January 2012** to cusc.team@uk.ngrid.com Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the GSG when it makes its recommendation to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	<i>James Anderson: 0141 614 3006, 07753 621684</i>
Company Name:	<i>ScottishPower Energy Management</i>
Q.1. Do you think that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should act as impartial experts or as representatives or their employers?	<i>Given the nature of the rights and obligations conferred on Users under the CUSC it is difficult to see how Workgroup/Standing Group members could act wholly impartially without reference to the interests of their employers and therefore, while desirable, we see introducing the need to act impartially as impractical.</i>
Q.2. Do you agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting “impartially?”	<i>We agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting “impartially”.</i>
Q.3 If the answer to Q2 is “No” would it be an impediment to you if were required to be impartial?	<i>n/a</i>
Q.4 Do you agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses should be paid under the CUSC (see section 2.2 and 2.7 for further information)?	<i>We agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses as described under sections 2.2 and 2.7 of the Consultation should be paid if agreed in advance with the Code Administrator.</i>
Q.5 Do you agree the current wording of the CUSC should be made more explicit for the ability to claim travel expenses rather than by reference to the indemnity as per CUSC provision 8.12.2¹.	<i>If expenses are to be made available, then the entitlement to claim such expenses should be stated explicitly within the CUSC rather than “inferred” from CUSC 8.12.2.</i>
Q.6. Would you (or your company) attend more CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group meetings if travel expenses were paid?	<i>It is generally the constraints outlined in our response to question 7 which limit attendance at CUSC meetings rather than travel costs.</i>

¹ http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/8B81E9A0-F1B1-47B7-906D-41DA0DB69167/50497/CUSCSection8CMP195_2Dec_11.pdf

<p>(See section 3.7 for further information)</p>	
<p>Q.7. If the answer to Q6 is ‘No’ would other constraints be more or less likely to impact on your ability to attend – for example lack of time, availability of personnel, or location of meeting?</p>	<p><i>The principal impediment to attending CUSC meetings is the availability of suitably qualified staff and the time commitment involved. While, travel costs are significant for parties travelling from further afield, such as Scotland, it is generally the former constraints rather than travel costs which limit attendance.</i></p>
<p>Q.8. Regardless of the ability to claim travel expenses, would you be more willing/able to attend CUSC meetings if they were held entirely by teleconference or by using web technology?</p>	<p><i>Often the complexity of the subject matter and the number of parties attending a CUSC meeting make the use of teleconference or web technology inappropriate. In particular, parties joining a meeting by teleconference while other members are physically meeting together can be at a disadvantage. However, where the workgroup decides that sub-groups should be formed to consider issue, the use of remote conferencing facilities may encourage greater participation in such sub-groups.</i></p>
<p>Q.9. Do you think the Code Administrator (National Grid) should pick up the costs for reimbursing travel expenses? If not, who should fund them? (See section 3.8 for further information)</p>	<p><i>If introduced, we believe that the Code Administrator should be responsible for reimbursing any travel expenses and that these should be recoverable from all Users through TNUoS.</i></p>
<p>Q.10. Do you agree that if travel expenses are to be paid that, like the BSC, it should be limited to CUSC Modification Panel/ Workgroup / Standing Group members only (and not be paid, for example, to observers)? (see sections 3.3 and 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p><i>We agree that if reimbursement of travel expenses is introduced, that it should be limited to CUSC Modification Panel / Working Group / Standing Group members only and not extended to observers or others attending the meeting in a non-participative capacity.</i></p>
<p>Q.11. Do you think the CACOP should cover payment of travel expenses? (See section 3.5 for further information)</p>	<p><i>If it is decided to permit the payment of travel expenses, it would be helpful for the Code Administrator Code of Practice to provide guidance on the process for pre-authorising, and processing expenses together with guidance on what would constitute “reasonable” expenses.</i></p>
<p>Q.12 Do you have any further comments?</p>	<p><i>No.</i></p>

Payment of Travel Expenses to CUSC Modifications Panel Members and Workgroup/Standing Group Members

Industry parties are invited to respond to this consultation expressing their views and supplying the rationale for those views, particularly in respect of any specific questions detailed below.

Please send your responses by **20th January 2012** to cusc.team@uk.ngrid.com Please note that any responses received after the deadline or sent to a different email address may not receive due consideration by the GSG when it makes its recommendation to the CUSC Modifications Panel.

Respondent:	<i>Garth Graham, 01738 456000</i>
Company Name:	SSE
Q.1. Do you think that CUSC Workgroup/Standing Group members should act as impartial experts or as representatives or their employers?	We believe that Workgroup and Standing Group members should act as impartial experts rather than as representatives of their employers. This will ensure consistency with the BSC and will therefore, in our view, better conform with the guiding principles of the CACOP as well as conforming with the ‘best practice’ found in corporate / public life good practice guidance.
Q.2. Do you agree that the provision to claim travel expenses should only be available to parties who are acting “impartially?”	Yes.
Q.3 If the answer to Q2 is “No” would it be an impediment to you if were required to be impartial?s	N/A.
Q.4 Do you agree that reasonable (receipted) travel expenses should be paid under the CUSC (see section 2.2 and 2.7 for further information)?	We agree with the GSG that it is appropriate that reasonable receipted travel expenses (covering transport, substance and accommodation – as appropriate) should be paid for those acting impartially as members (but not observers) of Workgroups and Standing Group.
Q.5 Do you agree the current wording of the CUSC should be made more explicit for the ability to claim travel expenses rather than by reference to the indemnity as per CUSC provision 8.12.2¹.	Yes.
Q.6. Would you (or your company) attend more CUSC	We would expect to attend broadly the same number of CUSC related meetings.

¹ http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/8B81E9A0-F1B1-47B7-906D-41DA0DB69167/50497/CUSCSection8CMP195_2Dec_11.pdf

<p>Workgroup/Standing Group meetings if travel expenses were paid? (See section 3.7 for further information)</p>	
<p>Q.7. If the answer to Q6 is ‘No’ would other constraints be more or less likely to impact on your ability to attend – for example lack of time, availability of personnel, or location of meeting?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Q.8. Regardless of the ability to claim travel expenses, would you be more willing/able to attend CUSC meetings if the were held entirely by teleconference or by using web technology?</p>	<p>If all attendees are participating by teleconference / web technology then we would be willing to attend more CUSC related meetings in this way. However, if most people are meeting face-to-face and a few are dialing in then we are less likely to participate by teleconference / web technology as the background noise / sound pick-up makes it difficult to meaningfully and practically participate in the meeting.</p>
<p>Q.9. Do you think the Code Administrator (National Grid) should pick up the costs for reimbursing travel expenses? If not, who should fund them? (See section 3.8 for further information)</p>	<p>No. The costs should be recovered from all CUSC Parties. We note that this will ensure consistency with the BSC and will therefore, in our view, better conform with the guiding principles of the CACOP.</p>
<p>Q.10. Do you agree that if travel expenses are to be paid that, like the BSC, it should be limited to CUSC Modification Panel/ Workgroup / Standing Group members only (and not be paid, for example, to observers)? (see sections 3.3 and 3.7 for further information)</p>	<p>Yes. Membership of Workgroups and Standing Groups is open to all relevant stakeholders and it is appropriate that they, and only them, are able to claim expenses as they would, as noted in our response above, be providing impartial knowledge and experience. In contrast observers (who may be from outwith the industry) may be coming along to listen, bring themselves up to speed on an issue etc., etc., and it is not appropriate to ask CUSC Parties to pay their travel expenses.</p>
<p>Q.11. Do you think the CACOP should cover payment of travel expenses? (See section 3.5 for further information)</p>	<p>As noted in our response to the questions above, there are a number of interactions with the BSC where consistency between the two codes would appear, in our view, to better conform with the guiding principle of the CACOP in terms of having consistency across the codes. Given this we believe, in principle, that it would seem appropriate that the CACOP addresses the issue of expenses.</p>
<p>Q.12 Do you have any further comments?</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>