

Representation

Independent Panel Chair Appointment Process

Consultation close out date: 21 March 2014

Respond to: enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk

Organisation: Energy UK

Representative: Julie Cox

Date of Representation: 21 March 2014

Q1: Do you consider that a Selection Adviser should be used to identify the candidates to be the Panel Chair?

A: Yes

Q2: Do you have any views on what should be considered as a normal tenure of the Panel Chair?

A: 2/3 Years although considering the cost of the Selection Advisor the 2+2 proposal may be appropriate

Q3: Do you consider that a Panel Subcommittee should be formed to oversee the appointment of the Panel Chair?

A: Yes

Q4: Do you have any views on the make-up of the Panel Subcommittee?

A: Energy UK considers 2 Transporter representatives (one of which could be from the Joint Office) plus 2 shipper representatives would be more representative of the constitution of the UNC panel. We would also seek confirmation that the HR and Legal representatives do not play a part in selection of the preferred candidate beyond providing advice on their specialist areas where relevant.

Q5: What are your views on the ideal candidate attributes?

Energy UK broadly agrees with the pros and cons identified by the JGAC and included in the consultation document. We would like to highlight that a UK based candidate would be preferred in order to manage costs.

Q5: Do you consider that the general terms proposed for the Panel Chair appointment are appropriate?

A: Yes

Q6: Do you agree that the enduring Deputy Chair role should be assigned to the JO Chief Executive?

A: Yes

Q7: Do you have any views on the Responsibilities and Experience requirements for a Panel Chair?

A: Energy UK does not agree that past employees of transporters, Ofgem or parties materially affected by the UNC should be excluded since such candidates may well have relevant industry expertise and knowledge.

Panel Chair Appointment
Representation

21 March 2014

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 2

© 2014 all rights reserved

Q8: Do you have any views on the indicative timeline?

A: A step for the appointment of the transporter representative to the Panel subcommittee needs to be included. Consideration should also be given to compressing the timescale so that the appointment process does not run into the election process for User representatives. This may also assist with ensuring the new chair is in place, rather than shadowing, for the December UNC Panel meeting which would seem to be an expectation of the Ofgem letter of 7 November 2013.

Q9: In light of the indicative costs provided, are you still of the opinion that it is correct to have an Independent Panel Chair?

A: The costs are clearly significant and it will be important to negotiate to minimise these on behalf of the industry. However it is difficult to see how otherwise compliance with the licence condition to have an independent panel chair can be achieved, particularly when other codes have taken this path.

Q10: Do you have any additional views you wish the JGAC to consider?

A: The JGAC is a body tasked with oversight of the Joint Office, we consider that in order to provide the industry with confidence in this body that there should be more transparency over its activities. As a starting point we believe that the minutes of the meetings should be published.