

Party Engagement in the IGT UNC

1. Background

Engagement from the Pipeline User constituency within the IGT UNC and its meetings has been waning over recent years. This has led to a continued Panel vacancy (2019 - present) and more recently resulted in a permanent issue of non-quoracy at the Panel meetings following another vacancy (August 2020 - present). Lack of engagement has also contributed to limited discussions in Workgroups and has resulted in the cancellation of some IGT UNC meetings.

During the February 2020 Workgroup meeting, the group discussed some of the potential blockers for parties and the Code Administrator was tasked with collating a number of options for encouraging engagement with this community.

The Workgroup meeting noted that possible barriers to engagement could come from:

- A knowledge gap or lack of experience within the IGT sector could account for part of the absence;
- Long meeting lengths could contribute to parties not attending meetings;
- Lack of resources within companies; and
- Awareness and understanding of the impacts to their organisation.

Following these discussions, a paper was presented to the Workgroup which outlined suggested activities that could be carried out to mitigate parties' concerns¹. However, at this meeting it transpired that the core concerns had not yet been clearly identified, therefore, activities to address these could not yet be considered.

2. February 2020 Pipeline User engagement survey²

Following a survey sent out to industry to gauge the issues parties face with engagement, the Workgroup was presented with the results. The results returned a low sample size (five respondents), which asked parties five questions with a variety of open and closed questions. The survey focused on:

- How parties follow changes made to the IGT UNC?
- Why have you not volunteered to be on the IGT UNC Modifications Panel?
- How would you prefer to see the under-resourced Panel resolved?
- Are you aware that changes can be made to the IGT UNC without Shipper votes?

The survey did not return a large enough sample size to determine reliably the issues the industry may be facing. Furthermore, the first survey may have been too prescriptive in its line of questioning to canvas for a correlation on barriers.

3. Proposal

The Workgroup is asked to identify the main barriers to party engagement, taking into consideration previous information gathered. These barriers should then be put to industry to quantify these assumptions. The method of this is open to the Workgroup's suggestion, however, there are several ways this could be done e.g. via survey, email, telephone calls etc.

¹ <https://www.igt-unc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Party-engagement-Further-Discussion-paper-v0.1.pdf>

² <https://www.igt-unc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Pipeline-User-Engagement-Survey-Result.pdf>

Following a further canvassing of the industry it is hoped that trends will become apparent regarding industries concerns, therefore, enabling the group to pursue meaningful mitigation.

It is proposed that following the potential barriers being identified by the Workgroup, these are put to industry for parties to select which is relevant to them, whether none of these are relevant and a free text option to add 'others'.

It should be considered when discussing this approach that it may be difficult to quantify success. Therefore, it is important for the Workgroup to consider how they consider success has been achieved. Whether success should be considered as an increased attendance at meetings, greater volume of website traffic or the filling of Panel vacancies.

4. The Workgroup is asked to;

- **IDENTIFY** the main barriers to party engagement in the IGT UNC; and
- **AGREE** for the Code Administrator to run a further survey of parties as per the proposal detailed in this paper.