# iGT UNC Code Administration Code of Practice Review

## 1. Purpose

This paper provides an overview of the Ofgem agreed timeframe for the annual review of the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP), and sets out the proposed iGT UNC specific review process timescales and the consultation questions for the Modification Panel to note. CACoP Principle 4 requires the Code of Practice to be reviewed by the Code Administrators at least annually, taking into account the views of users of the Codes.

## 2. Annual Review Process

As part of Ofgem's Code Governance Review (CGR), the Code Administrator's Code of Practice (CACoP) was developed by industry to facilitate convergence and transparency in code modification processes. It is also intended to help protect the interests of market participants and in particular smaller market participants and consumers through the adoption of key code administration principles. The initial version of the CACoP was implemented by Ofgem in June 2010 for the 3 large industry codes with licence requirements coming into effect from August 2013 for all the Codes.

Principle 4 of the CACoP recommends the annual review of the Code by the signatory Code Administrators. The review will incorporate discussion on how the principles within CACoP are being achieved and the results of reporting on identified Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). A review group is to be convened in October 2014 to consider CACoP v3.0.

This year's annual review process will take the form of a consultation issued by Code Administrators to Parties on the current content and performance of the CACoP, with the responses to the consultation then reviewed by all the Code Administrators (and any interested users) at the Annual Review Group.

## 3. Consultation (to be issued online, via Survey Monkey)

1. Name………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   Company………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   Responding as (e.g. iGT /
   Shipper/Consumer)…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

2. Are you aware of the key principles of the Code Administrator's Code of Practice Agreement (CACoP)?
   Yes        Somewhat        No
   Comments……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

3. Do you believe that the key principles within the CACoP are upheld by the iGT UNC Code Administrator?
   Yes        Somewhat        No
   Comments……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

4. Do you agree with the list of Key Performance Indicators to be reported on by the Code Administrator under Principle 12?

Yes        Somewhat        No

Comments…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

5. Please indicate if you feel that any principle, or element of a principle, should be omitted from the CACoP.

Comments…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

6. Please indicate if you feel that any principle, or element of a principle, should be amended in the CACoP.

Comments…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

7. Please provide any further comments on the content of the CACoP.

Comments…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

8. Please provide any further comments on the review process for the CACoP.

Comments…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

|  | Summary of the Key Principles |
|---|---|
| **Principle 1** | Be a Critical Friend to all code Parties |
| **Principle 2** | Published documents to be in clear English |
| **Principle 3** | Information to be published promptly and to be widely available |
| **Principle 4** | Code to be reviewed regularly |
| **Principle 5** | Opportunity to discuss and develop potential modifications |
| **Principle 6** | Proposer to retain ownership of their Modification |
| **Principle 7** | Opportunity to develop Alternative solutions |
| **Principle 8** | Produce costs for Central systems (where relevant) |
| **Principle 9** | Ensure legal text is consulted on prior to approval of a Modification |

**4. Code Administrator Performance Consultation**

Under the principles within CACoP, Code Administrators are required to annually report on a number of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Many of these KPIs are quantitative measures that can be recorded throughout the year by the Code Administrator. However, there are some areas that require feedback from those parties who interact with the Code Administrator, whether in meetings, via the helpdesk or as a part of the Modification process.

iGT UNC Parties are requested to complete this short survey with regard to the iGT UNC Code Administrator.

1. Name…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   Company……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   Responding as (e.g. iGT / Shipper)…………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. How satisfied are you with the service provided by the iGT UNC Code Administrator?

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          Other

3. If you have sought assistance from the iGT UNC Code Administrator, how satisfied are you
   with the assistance offered in relation to the Code and its modification process?

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          Not sought

4. Do you find the iGT UNC Code Administrator's reports/documentation to be sufficiently
   clear? (e.g. Modification Reports, agendas, minutes, emails)

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          No view

5. How satisfied are you with the timeliness of material created by the iGT Code Administrator?
   (e.g. Modification Reports, agendas, minutes, emails)

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          No view

6. How satisfied are you with the ease of navigation of the iGT UNC Website?

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          No view

7. Do you believe the iGT Code Administrator does sufficient to encourage input from all Code
   parties?

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          No view

8. How satisfied are you that the iGT Code Administrator facilitates the discussion and
   development of both potential and actual Modifications?

   Very Satisfied          Satisfied          Dissatisfied          Very Dissatisfied          No view

9. The iGT UNC Code Administrator does well………………………………………………………………………………

10. The iGT UNC Code Administrator could do better……………………………………………………………………….

**5. CACoP Annual Review Indicative Timetable**

The role of management and hosting of the annual review meetings will be rotated each year between the Code Administrators. Elexon is responsible for this year's process.

| Activity | Timetable | Responsibility |
|---|---|---|
| CACoP Review presented to the Panel | 18th June 2014 | Code Administrator |
| CACoP Consultation period for iGT UNC Parties and interested participants | 19th June – 16th July (20 Working Days) | Parties |
| Code Administrator collates consultation responses and presents to Panel for feedback | 20th August 2014 | Code Administrator |
| Code Administrator collates Panel feedback and issues to the Annual Review Group | w/c 1st September 2014 | Code Administrator |
| Code Administrator attends Annual Review Group meeting | w/c 29th September 2014 | Code Administrator |
| Draft report outlining all outcomes of the Annual Review Group meeting issued to Code Administrators for 15 Working Days for review | w/c 13th October 2014 | Elexon |
| Following 15 Working Day review period, meeting host will circulate final version of the report to all other Code Administrators who will then present to the relevant Panel | w/c 3rd November 2014 | Elexon & Code Administrator |
| Code Panels discuss the report and determine whether any further consultation is required, or if they are happy to submit recommendations to the Authority | 19th November 2014 | Panel |
| All Code Administrators agree the finalised report to be submitted to the Authority. | w/c 1st December 2014 | Code Administrator |
| Proposed amendments sent to the Authority for approval | w/c 8th December 2014 | Elexon |
| Publication of revised CACoP | January 2015 | Ofgem |