



Code Administration Code of Practice

User feedback form

The Code Administration Code of Practice (CoP)¹ was implemented on 31st December 2010. The aim was to facilitate convergence and transparency in code modification processes. The CoP is formally adopted by the UNC, BSC and CUSC, and has been voluntarily observed by other codes.

In accordance with Principle 4, the CoP is subject to periodical review by users. In this first review, we welcome your feedback on how well the CoP Principles are being achieved in practice and any suggested amendments that you would like to raise for consideration.

Please provide your feedback by completing this form and returning your comments to Ofgem **by Friday 20th January**:

industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk

If you would like any comments to be considered as confidential, please indicate this clearly.

Thank you

Name: Amie Charalambous

Company: npower

Email: Amie.Charalambous@npower.com

Which industry code(s) are you actively involved with*?

UNC BSC CUSC Other

How would you characterise your involvement with the above code(s)?

~~Code Administrator~~ Panel Member ~~Code Signatory~~ Interested Party

* Please indicate in each of your responses which code your comments relate to.

¹ A copy of the Code Administration Code of Practice can be found at <http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Licensing/IndCodes/CGR/Documents1/FinalCoP.pdf>

Please share examples of any areas where you have found the application of the CoP Principles particularly successful. Please include any suggestions of 'best practice'.

We feel that the Code of Practice describes the service we would expect to see from the code administrator. We feel that the Code of practice sets a minimum level of service from the code administrators

Please share examples of any areas where you have found the application of the CoP Principles particularly *unsuccessful*. Please include any suggestions for improvement.

Where appropriate, we would like to see the code of practice to be extended to the other codes i.e. IGT UNC, this would provide consistency across all codes.

How useful do you consider the standardised processes, timetables and documents to be, as set out in the CoP?

They are useful, as standard processes deliver enduring change at minimum cost to the industry

Do you consider that the standardised processes, timetables and documents have been successfully implemented in the code(s)?

Yes, wherever possible

In respect of Principle 1, which describes the role of Code Administrators as 'critical friends', if you are a code user, how would you evaluate the implementation of this principle in 2011?

BSC – Very good

UNC - Good

CUSC – No view

Of the codes covered by this Code of Practice, the model the BSC co have adopted is more conducive to the principle of 'critical Friends' We believe this is a consequence of the relative development of the Modification Process at the time the Code of Practice was published

Have you identified any additional areas that you feel it would be helpful for the CoP to cover? If so, please describe how you feel this would improve the code administration processes.

We feel that the Code of Practice is restricted by the unique way some of the code administrators are funded which prevents a consistent approach across the codes

Are there any areas of the CoP that you have found to be inconsistent with other code processes? Please identify any specific examples.

No

Have you identified any parts of the CoP that you feel should be removed or amended? If so, please explain your reasons for this.

None identified

Do you feel it would be useful at this stage to impose KPI targets on the Code Administrators (whereas currently KPI data is recorded, but no targets are set)?

We would like to see more transparency wherever possible across the codes, However, this would need to be in line with the current administrative costs.

How would you rate your experience of the overall usefulness of the CoP?

CODE	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Excellent
<i>BSC</i>					
<i>CUSC</i>					
<i>UNC</i>					

Do you have any other comments?

We feel the Code of Practice is a useful tool which we support.