

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

## MP079 ‘Provisions for withdrawing modifications’ October 2019 Working Group Meeting summary

### Discussion of the issue

A summary of the Modification Proposal’s issue was provided. It explained that currently the power to withdraw modifications lie solely with the Proposer and that MP079 was raised to explore the possibility of extending this power. The reasoning behind this was given in terms of situations where modifications are sitting in stasis for a number of reasons, namely because the Proposer is no longer engaged in the process or where modifications where security concerns are too high to be implemented or the cost outweighs the benefit.

It was stated that in these circumstances, time and resource is being misused in the following:

- SECAS developing business requirements and solutions options
- SECAS and Parties developing the business case for change
- Performing and reviewing DCC Assessments (with a cost associated with performing Impact Assessments)
- SECAS hosting and administering Working Group sessions and Parties time in preparation and attendance
- SECAS preparation of Consultations and Parties time responding to consultations; and
- SECAS preparation and Parties reviewing documentation such as Modification Reports, business requirements and legal text

SECAS stated that extending the powers to withdraw to Panel will help to resolve the previously mentioned issues and help to create better informed decisions.

### Discussion of the business requirements

The discussions then turned to the four initial business requirements provided. The four requirements are as follows:

1. The power to withdraw modifications will be extended to the Panel.
2. Prior to withdrawing a modification, the Panel must provide rationale for why the modification should be withdrawn.
3. After the Panel withdraws a modification, the Proposer will have the right to appeal the decision to Authority.
4. SECAS will notify Parties of the Panel’s decision.

The business requirements were generally well received by the Working Group. One Working Group member commented that the proposed solution is dramatically different from other codes and it was duly explained that the role of the Proposer differs in the SEC. An example of this is how the Proposer

holds greater responsibility throughout the process in the SEC. the Proposer is an integral part of a SEC modification. It was also explained that there are modifications currently in the process that would benefit from this proposed solution. Another Working Group member raised queries regarding potential exploitation of the power, but it was explained that clear rationale must be provided in order for the Withdrawal to go ahead. Comments were made that the circumstances of the modifications that could be withdrawn must be clearly defined as this will safeguard the possibility of the power being exploited.

A Working Group member also asked for clarity in terms of if implemented, if this modification would only affect modifications raised after the implementation date. SECAS explained that , in fact, this modification will mainly be used for modifications raised prior to the potential implementation date of this modification but will be a 'failsafe' for future modifications raised.

## Next steps

The agreed next steps were to issue the Refinement Consultation for greater Industry input. We intend on issuing the consultation week commencing 7 October 2019.