Guidance for completion of the quantitative metrics

This document sets out the necessary guidance for code administrators to complete the CACoP Data Metrics. It should also assist interested parties in understanding the CACoP Data Metrics. The aim of this guidance is to ensure that all data is collected in a consistent manner from all code administrators.

Overview

The questions that relate to modifications, relate in the main to modifications to the main code document. The following table sets out a guide as to what should be included.

Code	Included	Not included
SPAA	draft modifications (but do not double count) SPAA schedules	
BSC		change proposals that are raised to amend code subsidiary documents and central systems that sit beneath the code
UNC	enabling modifications (except in respect of question 10)	
Distribution Code	Technical Standards (Distribution Code Standards and Other Industry Standards)	Guidance Notes and Distribution Code Introduction
Grid Code	Electrical Standards	supporting guidance documents or associated agreements, eg BEGA
DCUSA		any guidance notes associated with the DCUSA processes
CUSC	Schedules and Exhibits	any of the associated agreements, eg BEGA
STC		STC Procedures (STCPs)
iGT	iGT UNC and individual GT codes	
MRA		subsidiary documents, i.e. MAPs and the DTCs.

We recognise that in respect of the modification to some codes, these are referred to as 'change proposals', the metrics should be completed in respect of the terminology used in the specific code.

For completeness, we have included five categories of modification proposal: Authority Consent – non-urgent; Authority Consent – Urgent; Self-governance; Fast Track self-governance; Self-governance – Urgent. We recognise that for some of these categories the return for a number of codes will be nil.

General

Question 1

For the purposes of this question a modification proposal is considered raised when it has been submitted on the standard modification template to the code administrator and the code administrator has given notice that a modification has been raised (as per the Common Modification Process).
We do expect that all new code modification proposals should have a recommendation as to whether they are self-governance, authority consent, etc. Even if this changes later on in the process we expect the proposer, possibly with help from the code administrator, to have given this some thought and made a recommendation.

Question 2

This question aims to find out the number of modification proposals that have been withdrawn in the relevant period. Irrespective of the stage in the process that it has been withdrawn, it should be counted in this section. For the avoidance of doubt, modifications that have been simply been reclassified (e.g. to self-governance) should not be counted here.

Question 3

This question looks to gather data on how many modification proposals have been submitted to the Authority for decision in the period. If a modification is also sent back in this period it should still be counted. For example if two non-urgent modifications are submitted to the Authority in the time period, one of which has three alternates, then '2' should be put in the first column and '3' in the alternates column.

Question 4

This question only looks to gather data on the final panel vote on whether to approve or reject a self-governance modification. It does not include minded-to decisions made earlier in the process. It does not include multiple counting for all decisions made on a final modification report (e.g. if the panel votes to approve the modification, implementation date, and the implementation method, this counts as one vote - even if there is a mix of approve and reject). Alternates should be treated the same as in question 3.

Question 5

This question looks to capture data on any reports that have been sent back by the Authority following submission. (It should be noted that the submission to the Authority and send back may not be captured in the same reporting period.)

Question 6

This question looks to capture the number of modifications (of all categories) that have been implemented during the reporting period. Implementation means that all the industry change has been completed.

Question 7

This includes any consultation (including impact assessments) raised by workgroups for a specific modification proposal as well as any consultation raised following a panel meeting.

Question 8

The consultations considered in response to this question should be those in the relevant categories of modification proposals that are included in question 7.

Question 9

The consultations considered in response to this question should be those in the relevant categories of modification proposals that are included in question 7.

Question 10

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in questions 3 and 4. Alternates should not be counted in response to this question. We note that in respect of the SPAA

as a result of the appeals mechanism, the modifications considered here may not be exactly the same as those in question 3.

Question 11

This question just requires the number of parties that have acceded to the code in the given period to be included.

Question 12

This question aims to find out how many times code administrators are asked for help in their role as code administrators. This is not just restricted to parties to the code or to the modification process. Each request (by email or phone) should be counted. Each request should only be counted once (i.e. if there are follow-ups to a request these should not be counted). Requests may range from confirmation of the date of a meeting to assistance in drafting a modification proposal.

Question 13

The calculations for this question should be in respect of the Authority consent modifications (both urgent and non-urgent) that are included in the answer to question 7.

Question 14

The calculations for this question should be in respect of the self-governance modifications (both fast track and non-fast track) that are included in the answer to question 7.

Question 15

The costs that should be considered are central system implementation costs. Costs incurred by individual market participants should not be included.

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in questions 3 and 4. Alternates should not be counted in response to this question. For those modifications for which the estimated cost of implementation at the time of the final vote is zero, should not be counted in this metric. We note that in respect of the SPAA as a result of the appeals mechanism, the modifications considered here may not be exactly the same as those in question 3.

Question 16

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in question 6.

Question 17

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in question 6, where the final costs were available. However, if the final costs have only become available for modifications implemented in previous quarters then these should also be considered in response to this question.