

CMP 213 post-modification review



Adelle Spouge
29th November 2013

Purpose

To understand issues and learning from the CMP213 modification development process, specifically around industry engagement and process improvements.



Review process



Responses: industry engagement

✓	✗
<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Special TCMF■ Pre-mod engagement■ Fact-sheet on mod■ Process clear and transparent■ Small supplier engagement■ Good level of detail in report	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Some felt “Bamboozled” by report■ Topic complex■ Industry engagement too inclusive?

Responses: workgroup process

	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Two day meetings■ Pacing of meetings■ Agreeing dates in advance■ “Car park” list for out of scope discussions■ Chair unbiased and impartial■ NG staff open to challenge/questioning and good at explaining complex info clearly	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Spacing between meetings■ Scope of work too large for tight timescales■ WG engagement in analysis and development of proposal could be better■ Material could be on website more quickly■ WG large and at times unmanageable

Responses: production of report

✓	✗
<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ WG contribution to summaries of their own views■ Using sectional approach to CA consultation report drafting■ Fact sheet■ Use of Yammer to circulate large documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ File sharing with WG prior to use of Yammer■ Dropbox not supported■ Tight timescales for both WG and NG to turn around report■ Format of report can be repetitive

Other issues considered

- **Expertise and technical issues** – limited Industry experts
- **Scope of modification** – disagreement about whether should have been 1 or 3 modifications
- **Timelines** –extremely challenging for WG and NG
- **National Grid internal processes**

Actions

- Repeat what has worked well for future large scale mods
- Make improvements in highlighted process areas for example:
 - spacing of WG meetings
 - consultation response forms
 - WG report structure
 - investigate file sharing mechanisms

Points to consider for CUSC Panel

- Timescales
- WG chairmanship
- WG member appointments
 - Process
 - Could academics be included?
 - Separate for methodology development, assessment and implementation?
- Impact assessment modelling – should this be done by NG or Ofgem

Any questions?



Adelle Spouge

01926 653142

Adelle.spouge@nationalgrid.com