

Mode Rules reference	372 Workgroup comment	NG NTS response	Action
2.1 Panel Chairman defined term	Should "independent" be defined?	NG feel that the dictionary definition is suffice	None
3.8 (b)	Is the change in the proposal?	Yes	None
3.8 (b)	The change does not preclude Ofgem appointing an Ofgem employee, which might usefully be ruled out	We agree that the text would benefit from this clarification.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
6.1.3	Drafting glitch highlighted with new text to be inserted.	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
6.2.1 (e)	The re-instated text conflicts with the CoP?	The CoP is silent on and therefore we believe there is no conflict.	None
6.2.1 (h)	Re-instated text - the sections of the code impacted by the proposal cannot be known until the text is produced?	This rule worked before, the Mod template facilitates this intent and Modification Proposals are filled in now without the need for text.	None
6.2.1 (k)	Drafting change proposed. The re-instated text is inconsistent with the CoP?	We agree to drafting change but do not feel it is inconsistent with the CoP as this detail is included in the current templates.	We have amended the text to reflect the drafting proposed.
6.2.1 (l) (i)	Typo identified	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
6.2.1 (l) (iii)	Drafting change proposed.	Consultation Phase is no longer the definition used in the Mod Rules ("Consultation" only).	None.
6.2.1 (n)	Re-instated text – 9.6 relates to formal text which can't be included in the proposal?	The text is only suggested text, that may help the GTs prepare formal text In accordance with 9.6	None.

6.2.2	Drafting change proposed.	We do not believe that the text re-instated to 6.2 conflicts with the CoP and therefore the suggestion is not required.	None
6.6.5	Is the change in the proposal?	No - this drafting error was identified during the development of the draft text for 372 and could be included with other housekeeping changes included in Mod 384?	None?
6.7.1	Drafting glitch highlighted with revised text.	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
6.7.2	Drafting glitch highlighted with revised text.	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
8.3.2	Drafting glitch highlighted with revised text.	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
9.3.3 (a)	Question raised as to the clarity of current text.	We believe the current text does not preclude voting against and is consistent with 9.3.3 (b) but 9.3.3(b) could benefit with some clarification in this respect	None
9.3.3 (b)	Drafting glitch highlighted with revised text.	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made. Drafting clarification made that the determination made under 9.3.3(a) is submitted to the Authority.
9.3.10 (a)	Typo identified	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.

13.1	Question raised as to the clarity of the current text.	We agree that it would be beneficial to explain that implementation is suspended if an appeal is raised.	We have amended the text in 9.3.12 to reflect the comment made.
13.9 (b) and (c)	Typos identified	We agree.	We have amended the text to reflect the comment made.
13.9	Drafting change proposed and question raised as to whether a proposal (where the Authority decides to make the decision) remains self governance.	The proposal does not remain self gov and the Panel determination is "treated as" a recommendation	None.