

## RG004 Option 7 Paper

**Title:** Option 7: **Solution Development Working Group:** building on from RG004 discussion to develop solutions in relation to perceived governance and administration issues.

**Purpose:** To aid RG004 Workgroup discussions at the IGT Modification Workstream on 2<sup>nd</sup> October

**Drafted by:** John Cooper, Chris Barker, BUUK

**Date:** 27<sup>th</sup> September 2018

---

### **Background**

In light of discussion through RG004 and those options originally set out in Gemserv's request for information, BUUK proposed a 7<sup>th</sup> alternative option. This option would look to build on outputs already produced from RG004, whilst furthering discussions on what the agreed issues are, fleshing these out so that solution options can be developed.

BUUK felt that at this current time there was insufficient evidence to point directly towards any of the 3 problem statements as having a meaningful impact upon the workings of the IGT UNC. Couple this with the list of 6 solution options, it became apparent in our analysis that none of these would address what the review group was perceiving to be issues. What was clear from discussions is that the review group, including BUUK, felt that improvements could be made, especially around change management and administration.

The review group to date has worked predominantly at a high-level and therefore, this seventh option looks to determine what the real issues are, with a detailed analysis whereby appropriate and proportionate solutions can be developed and discussed. It may well be the case that, whilst some of the solution options originally presented in the RFI could be valid and justifiable (namely options 2 and 5), this 7<sup>th</sup> options look to refine, what are currently blunt solutions, into specific focused options with clearer actions around current inefficiencies.

### **How Option 7 would work**

BUUK could see this working through the setting up of a workstream dedicated to these discussions, whereby current areas which require improvement are discussed and solutions developed. This granular detailed approach is deemed a more efficient method than the wider scoped solutions already proposed and discussed.

We are open to this being a Joint IGT UNC and UNC Workstream, as we recognise that some of the issues and relevant solutions may result from both codes. From these furthering discussions, changes can be made to address any identified issues.

## **Conclusion and Next Steps**

- Setting up a dedicated working group, ensuring appropriate representation. If the scope allows this could well be a joint IGT UNC/UNC working group.
- Sessions to explore what the issues are in greater detail. For instance, there was a general consensus that there are inefficiencies in the modification process(es). The workgroup would look to delve down and flesh out what particular part of the modification process is failing and thus could be improved.
- Once the issues, and their details, have been agreed these can then be taken forward to develop options targeted and focused around delivering the most appropriate solution.
- Modifications can then be raised and progressed through the usual routes. It may be the case that certain solution options potentially result in a review of the code administrators' requirements. This of course requires detailed discussions, including with the code administrator themselves, as the concept of code manager type roles appears to be seemly more widely considered with Faster Switching developments.
- BUUK see this as a clear progression of RG004, but see the obvious benefits of opening this up to wider discussions. BUUK therefore asks the question whether RG004 needs to be rescoped and redefined in order to clearly set out the changing objectives of what the group is trying to achieve, as a direct result of the outputs already identified under RG004 in its current form.