

Summary of SECMP0050/SECMP0051 Responses from SEC Section D Consultation

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposal to move the detail around how Working Groups operate out of the SEC and into a Panel-owned document?

- All said Yes except E.ON declining and Western Power Distribution seeking further clarity
- All respondents except E.ON noted some benefit with the flexibility
- E.ON's objections to the suggestion is that they want the ToRs in a codified position that isn't in the Panel's hands, that this only addresses an issue rather than the cause of the issue and that they believe this is a scheduling issue rather than an availability issue – citing other meetings and short notice periods being the problems instead
- Npower desires a drafted "Panel Owned Document" for reference and what to consider
- Western Power Distribution have concerns about 'favoured' modifications or a type of progress
- Otherwise, most respondents are supportive of the modification solution in general

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed quoracy arrangements for Working Groups? Do you agree these should be adopted immediately?

- All except E.ON agree with this in the short term. Utilita said they would prefer a different long-term idea. Opus Energy and Npower want the minimum lowered to three, rather than removed entirely
- E.ON's main objection is that they support the current quoracy as it is and that changing this threatens the chances of multiple voices in the decision making
- A minority of respondents have suggested that the modifications process may be skewed in favour of those who have a disproportionate ability to attend these meetings
- Others suggest that so long as there is a "standing" working group, quoracy is not an issue and should not be a barrier for the meeting to proceed whilst there are a number of committed parties involved
- Others have suggested that there be a flexibility clause, for instance the aim is to have a minimum of five, but under certain circumstance or with permission that the number can be lowered
- Overall, the response is quite mixed, a large number being very supportive, E.ON being against and a smaller number preferring a flexible approach that adopts the current system with minor changes

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Fast Track process?

- All except two support the proposal, E.ON and Utilita acknowledge an issue, but disagree with the proposed solution
- Every other participant supports the proposed changes, citing less bureaucracy and its similarity to other codes
- Some respondents acknowledge some amendments – Npower suggest Panel should retain the ability to decide whether or not a modification should be fast tracked and the DCC suggests any changes made should be highlighted to all Parties with a plain English explanation of the new process