



GSG 08/05/09

nationalgrid
The power of action.™

Today

- ◆ Review of actions
- ◆ Update from CUSC Panel and revised ToR
- ◆ CUSC Panel response to ICGR CAWG consultation
- ◆ Review of urgent process and supporting guidance

Review of actions

6 February 2009

- ◆ 31 – Minutes from last meeting to be published **(BV)**
- ◆ 11 – Review process for determining implementation dates (include slides in report templates) **(BV)**
- ◆ 13 – Ofgem Corporate Plan (to be circulated) **(DG)**
- ◆ 17 – Adequate information to determine implementation dates (include question in report templates) **(BV)**
- ◆ 18 – CUSC Amendment Proposal (on proposal of implementation dates) **(CH)**
- ◆ 22 – Review of report Templates (including reference to transitional arrangements) **(BV)**
- ◆ 26 – Issues Group overview (use in BSC/UNC) **(CH/PB/DB)**

19 February 2009

- ◆ Submission of final responses to ICGR consultations **(CH)**

Update from Panel

- ◆ Recent Urgent Amendments and request for urgent status
- ◆ Best practice paper as prepared by Bob Brown
- ◆ Priorities for GSG from Panel
 - Review of urgency
 - CAP160 review
 - Best practice review
 - [responses to ICGR consultations as required]
- ◆ Terms of reference for the group have been updated accordingly

ICGR – CAWG consultation

Comments particularly invited on the following:

- ◆ Ownership
 - Proposer retains ownership and effective control over the content of the proposal
- ◆ Alternatives
 - More consistent arrangements around timing and number of alternatives – should see opportunity for further options to be considered and ensure robustness, full assessment and scrutiny
- ◆ Legal text
 - Consulted on early in the process, whilst retaining flexibility to amend in light of comments and/or developments
- ◆ Critical Friend
 - Ensuring proposals are clear and all arguments for and against are articulated
- ◆ Plain English
 - Synopsis of modification

Code of Practice

CoP

- ◆ Set out principles modification rules should adhere to, help ensure CA adopt best practice and make use of lessons learnt
- ◆ May also allow standardisation of templates

3 proposals for the form:

- ◆ Licence
 - Underpinned by, or subsumed within, licence
 - May introduce disproportionate regulatory burden upon licensees in terms of compliance and future change management
- ◆ Replacing all provisions in code
 - Each code referring to common set of rules
 - May ensure commonality and reduce complexity for any party operating across several codes
 - May require reference to 2 documents if only common elements were included in CoP – thereby increasing complexity
- ◆ Stand alone
 - Incorporating what the industry considers best practice
 - No formal status/voluntary, with each code modification rules expected to adhere to principles

Way forward – Consultation response

- ◆ Draft circulated in advance of meeting
- ◆ Requirement to provide draft paper for comment to panel for discussion on May 15th
- ◆ Late paper request made for 13th May

Review of Urgent process

Task

- ◆ Determine any revisions required to the CUSC provisions
- ◆ Identify any best practice requirements for urgency that can be applied in the future by the Panel/Secretary/chair
- ◆ Any proposals to revise urgency guidance (Ofgem)

Material circulated in advance of meeting

- ◆ Current CUSC provisions
- ◆ Summary of process (as prepared by National Grid)
- ◆ Explanation of BSC urgency process
- ◆ Ofgem guidance

Recent Urgent Amendment Proposals

- ◆ CAP168
 - Granted urgent status with a timetable including development within Working Group
- ◆ CAP170
 - Granted urgent status proceeding straight to company consultation
- ◆ CAP171/CAP172
 - Rejected by CUSC Panel under 8.15.4 as having substantially the same effect as CAP166 WGAA3

Comments from recent urgency experience

Based on comments following recent urgency debate:

- ◆ Proposal for timetable to be submitted by proposer and circulated at same time as proposal? (or prepared by CUSC secretary)
- ◆ Requirement to convene a meeting? (this is current practice, but not explicit in current provisions)
- ◆ Length of time between submission of Amendment Proposal and meeting?
 - Comments that the Panel were asked to take decisions on urgency at short notice
- ◆ All panel members to be contacted by phone upon receipt of request for urgency?
- ◆ Contact panel members outside of meeting to ascertain vote if necessary?
 - When would the alternate be contacted?
- ◆ If timetable recommendation includes development in WG/SG, meeting timetable to be prepared in advance
 - Representation invited pre or post panel discussion?
- ◆ Explicit reference to circumstances in which a WGAA may be raised

Urgency guidance

CUSC Amendment Proposals will be treated as urgent amendments if the nature of the proposal exhibits at least one of the following characteristics:

- ◆ **There is a very real likelihood of significant commercial impact upon, NGET, industry parties, or customers if the Amendment Proposal is not treated as urgent;**
- ◆ **Safety and security of the network is likely to be impacted if a proposed Amendment is not treated as urgent;**
- ◆ **The proposal is linked to an imminent date related event**

Please note this is not an exhaustive list of all possible reasons for a CUSC Amendment Proposal to be treated as urgent and each Amendment Proposal will be discussed on a case by case basis by the CUSC Amendments Panel.

Additional justification used in recent debate

- ◆ The proposal could have been raised earlier

Way forward - urgency

Summary of discussion to be reported back to Panel May 15th

SG report to be prepared for June Panel meeting

Next meeting?

Outstanding actions

- ◆ 18 – CUSC Amendment Proposal (on proposal of implementation dates) **(CH)**
- ◆ 22 – Review of report Templates/CAP160 review **(BV)**
- ◆ 26 – Issues Group overview (use in BSC/UNC) **(CH/PB/DB)**

Panel priorities

- ◆ Urgency
- ◆ CAP160 review
- ◆ Best practice review