CUSC Key Performance Indicators Quarter 1 – January – March 2014







Introduction

- As part of the Code Governance Review Final Proposals, the Code Of Practice was established. This included a Principle for Code Administrators to report on KPIs
- The KPIs cover two measures:
 - Qualitative
 - Quantitative
- The KPIs are reported to the Panel each quarter, on a retrospective basis
- The KPIs identified in the COP are a minimum requirement and may be expanded

Quality of Assessment							
Measure	Quarter 1	YTD	YTD%	Comments			
Final decision by Authority which ACCORDS with Panel Recommendation against the relevant objectives	1	1	N/A	Q1: CMP221			
Final decision by Authority which CONFLICTS with Panel Recommendation owing to wider statutory considerations	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			
Final decision which conflicts with Panel recommendation but NOT owing to wider duties	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			
Reports 'sent back' by Authority	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			

Effective Communication						
Measure	Quarter 1	YTD	YTD%	Comments		
Average number of respondents to Workgroup Consultation	6	6	N/A	Q1: CMP222, CMP223, CMP224, CMP225		
Average number of respondents to Industry Consultation*	11	11	N/A	Q1: CMP224		
Glossary and plain English summary provided with reports	100%	100%	100%			

^{*} In the CUSC, 'Industry Consultation' is referred to as the 'Code Administrator Consultation' (Section 8)

Efficient Administration 1							
Measure	Quarter 1	YTD	YTD%	Comments			
CUSC Panel Papers Issued*	15	15	N/A	Q1: 15			
Late Papers	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			
Number of Final Modification Report submitted in line with original timetable**	0	0	0%	Q1: 0			
Number of Final Modification Report submitted with extension	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			
Number of extensions to timetable requested	2	2	N/A	Q1: CMP222, CMP223			
Average business days between standard proposal raised and submitted to Authority***	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			
Average business days between Self-governance proposal raised and submitted for CUSC Panel decision	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0			

^{*}Target for publication is 5 Working Days before Panel meeting for Panel papers and 1 Working Day after Panel meeting for publication of final minutes

^{**}Original Timetable as agreed by CUSC Panel

^{***} The CUSC defines a Standard proposal as 'neither suitable for inclusion in a Significant Code Review nor meets the Self-governance criteria'.

Efficient Administration 2						
Measure	Quarter 1	YTD	YTD%	Comments		
Average business days between standard proposal submitted to Authority for decision and decision published	32	32	N/A	Q1: CMP221		
Average business days between Authority decision on standard CUSC proposal and implementation	44	44	N/A	Q1: CMP221		
Average business days between Authority decision on standard Charging modification and implementation	0	0	N/A	Q1: 0		
Average business days between Self-governance decision and implementation	27	27	N/A	Q1: CMP219		
Number of CUSC Modification Proposals progressed through Self-governance*	1	1	N/A	Q1: CMP228		
Number of CUSC Modification Proposals progressed through Fast-Track	1	1	N/A	Q1: CMFTP226		

^{*}The YTD data for this measure could be affected by the Authority changing the route of a Proposal at a later state prior to the Panel's final determination, or by an appeal which may result in the Authority making the final determination instead of the Panel.

Efficient Administration 3						
Measure	Quarter 1	YTD	YTD%	Comments		
Number of Urgent modifications raised	0	0	0	Q1: 0		
Average business days between Authority decision on Urgent CUSC proposal and implementation	0	0	0	Q1: 0		

Implementation Costs					
Measure	Quarter 1	YTD	YTD%	Comments	
Number of final CUSC Modification Reports where implementation costs estimates were available for consultation*	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Average Percentage difference between estimated and actual costs	N/A	N/A	N/A		

^{*}Refers to Central Systems only and therefore may often be Not Applicable .