

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.

# MP084 ‘Other User Panel Seating Amendment’ Annex B Refinement Consultation responses

## About this document

---

This document contains the full non-confidential collated responses received to the MP084 Refinement Consultation.

## Question 1: Do you agree with the solutions put forward?

Question 1			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	No	<p>We broadly agree with the Proposed Solution but believe that additional clarity is required in the legal text given the way that the terms Other User and Other SEC Parties are defined in the SEC.</p> <p>We do not agree with the Alternative Solution.</p> <p>There is no clear differentiation made in the SEC between Other Users and Other SEC Parties. According to the definitions within the SEC Other Users are a subset of Other SEC Parties, they are not a distinct or separate category of SEC Party:</p> <p><b>Other SEC Party</b> means a Party that is not the DCC, is not a Network Party, and is not a Supplier Party.</p> <p>This definition means that all Other Users are also Other SEC Parties.</p> <p>The Alternative Solution, as proposed, could actually lead to three Other Users being elected to the Panel, as both Other SEC Party seats could also be taken up by Other Users.</p> <p>This would clearly not be proportionate, or result in fair and balanced representation of constituencies on the Panel. In order for the Alternative Solution to work the definitions of Other SEC Party and Other User would also need to be amended to make them distinct constituencies.</p> <p>We agree that one of the current Other User seats could be designated specifically to Other Users; we do not agree that an additional Panel seat should be created. Given that the main remit of the SEC is to govern the relationship between the DCC and its Users there is no clear rationale for Other SEC Parties who are not also DCC Users to have two seats on the Panel.</p>

Managed by

Question 1			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
<b>SSEN</b>	Electricity Network Party	Yes	SSEN agree that either solution will reduce the risk of Other Users being underrepresented.

## Question 2: Will there be any impact on your organisation to implement MP084?

Question 2			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	No	MP084 will have no direct impact on EDF Energy. We would be concerned that the addition of Panel seats, as proposed in the Alternative Solution, might change the make-up of the Panel in a way that is not reflective of the constituencies that make up SEC Parties and that use the DCC systems.
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	No	

### Question 3: Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing MP084?

Question 3			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	No	We will not incur any costs as a result of the implementation of MP084.
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	No	

## Question 4: Do you believe that MP084 would better facilitate the General SEC Objectives?

Question 4			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	Yes	<p>The Proposed Solution would better facilitate Objective (g) as it would ensure that Other Users are appropriately represented on the SEC Panel.</p> <p>We do not agree that the Alternative Solution would better facilitate any of the General SEC Objectives; in fact it could negatively impact Objective (g) as it would result in the constituency representation on the Panel no longer being or proportionate.</p>
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	SSEN believes that MP084 will better facilitate SEC Objective (g)

## Question 5: Noting the costs and benefits of this modification, do you believe MP084 should be approved?

Question 5			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	Yes	We agree that the Proposed Solution should be approved, but only if changes are made to the legal text in line with our response to Question 9. We do not agree that the Alternative Solution should be approved.
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	SSEN agree with the costs as these are administration costs only.

## Question 6: If MP084 is approved, which solution do you believe should be implemented?

Question 6			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	Proposed Solution	We agree that the Proposed Solution should be approved, but only if changes are made to the legal text in line with our response to Question 9.
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Proposed Solution	SSEN agree with the proposed solution of keeping the number of Seats constant and change one Other Sec Party Seat to an Other User seat.



## Question 7: How long from the point of approval would your organisation need to implement MP084?

Question 7			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	N/A	No lead time would be required to implement MP084
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	0	SSEN will not require any time to implement

## Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach?

Question 8			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	Yes	We agree that, if approved, this change should be made in the next available SEC Release.
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	SSEN agree with the dates suggested within the modification report.

## Question 9: Do you agree that the legal text will deliver MP084?

Question 9			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	No	<p>As noted in our response to question 1 there is no clear differentiation in the SEC between Other SEC Parties and Other Users; Other Users are a subset of Other SEC Parties.</p> <p>For the Proposed Solution the amended legal text should be updated to something along the lines of the following:</p> <p><b>two persons elected by the Other SEC Parties, at least one of whom must be an Other User.</b></p> <p>For the Alternative Solution the legal text should be updated to something along the lines of the following:</p> <p><b>(e) two persons elected by the Other SEC Parties, who are not also Other Users;</b>  <b>(f) one person elected by the Other Users;</b></p>
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	SSEN agree that the legal text changes within section C3 will assist in delivering SECMP084.

## Question 10: Please provide any further comments you may have

Question 10		
Respondent	Category	Comments
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	N/A
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	N/A