

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 arrangements’

Conclusions Report – version 1.0

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation and the decision of the Change Board regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

Summary of conclusions

Change Board

The Change Board voted to recommend **rejection** of MP084. It believed the modification did not better facilitate SEC Objective (g).

Modification Report Consultation

Four responses were received to the Modification Report Consultation. All the respondents believe the modification should be approved, with three preferring the Alternative Solution and one preferring the Proposed Solution. They considered the modification better facilitates SEC Objective (g).

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

There were four responses to the Modification Report Consultation. All of the respondents (three Other SEC Parties and one Large Supplier) voted to approve the Modification Proposal. The three Other SEC Parties were in favour of the Alternative Solution, while the Large Supplier preferred the Proposed Solution. All respondents considered the modification better facilitates SEC Objective (g)¹ by providing Other Users appropriate levels of representation on the SEC Panel.

Preference of Proposed or Alternative Solution

Three of the four responses preferred the Alternative Solution, stating this choice would be a better means of representation. They believed this would not dilute the Other SEC Parties' existing representation, whilst allowing Other Users to be represented on the Panel. One of these respondents stated they would have rejected the Proposed Solution because they wanted to ensure that two Other SEC Parties that aren't Other Users could retain both their seats so they wouldn't lose their representation. One other respondent added that they approved of regularly reviewing the composition of the SEC Panel and its forums so that the balance changes along with industry over time.

The one respondent who preferred the Proposed Solution believed either solution would ensure that Other Users are better represented and would be acceptable. However, they explained their preference for the Proposed Solution was so that it didn't provide disproportionate representation to SEC Parties who weren't DCC Users. The respondent instead suggested that those Parties could use alternative methods to engage with SEC governance such as the Panel Sub-Committees.

¹ Facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of the SEC.

Change Board vote

Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to recommend **rejection** of MP084.

The vote breakdown is summarised below.

Change Board vote – Proposed Solution				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	0	5	0	Reject
Small Suppliers	0	3	0	Reject
Network Parties	0	2	0	Reject
Other SEC Parties	0	3	0	Reject
Consumer Representative	0	1	0	Reject
Overall outcome:				REJECT

Change Board vote – Alternative Solution				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	0	5	0	Reject
Small Suppliers	0	3	0	Reject
Network Parties	0	2	0	Reject
Other SEC Parties	0	3	0	Reject
Consumer Representative	0	1	0	Reject
Overall outcome:				REJECT

Views against the General SEC Objectives

Objective (g)

The Change Board believes that MP084 will not better facilitate SEC Objective (g) in contrast to the responses in the Modification Report Consultation. This was due to concerns that the issue raised was not as much of a problem as first thought and that the case for making the change was not strongly supported throughout the process.

Change Board discussions

Multiple Change Board members noted their opposition to the Modification Proposal. They stated that although either the Proposed Solution or the Alternative Solution would deliver the necessary change, they believed the Modification Proposal's issue was not well supported in industry and that the responses given in both previous consultations didn't indicate a compelling need for the change. Although the initial catalyst for the Modification Proposal was raised from a comment to a SEC Panel questionnaire, some Change Board members believed that whilst it had been correct to raise this issue with the industry, they believed there wasn't enough of a case to justify the change.