

Meeting Note

Meeting name	GC0086: Grid Code Open Governance
Meeting number	1
Date of meeting	10 September 2014
Time	10:00 – 15:00
Location	National Grid House, Warwick.

Attendees

Name	Initials	Company
Alex Thomason	AT	Code Administrator (Chair)
Emma Radley	ER	Code Administrator (Technical Secretary)
Rob Wilson	RW	National Grid (Workgroup Member)
Guy Philips	GP	E.ON (Workgroup Member)
Mike Kay	MK	ENWL (Workgroup Member)
Peter Bolitho	PB	Waters Wye (Workgroup Member)
Richard Lowe	RL	SHET (Workgroup Member)
Garth Graham	GG	SSE (Workgroup Member)
Lesley Nugent	LN	Ofgem
Franklin Rodrick	FR	National Grid (Observer)

Apologies

Name	Initials	Company
David Spillett	DS	ENA (Workgroup Member)

In addition to this Meeting note, please refer to the slides for the meeting which have been published to the Grid Code Workgroup webpage:

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/Electricity-codes/Grid-code/Modifications/GC0086/>

1 Introductions/Apologies for Absence

1. Introductions were made around the group. It was noted that DS would attend as an alternate for MK when he is not able to attend.

2 Meeting Objectives

2. AT ran through the agenda for the meeting and highlighted the key areas for discussion, including a brief run through of the Terms of Reference, a summary of GC0086 from the Proposer and how the Code Administrator propose to compartmentalise the key aspects of Open Governance to enable effective discussions.

3 Terms of Reference Overview

3. AT advised that there are a number of items on the Terms of Reference and that ER would talk later about how to potentially package some of the items.
4. PB highlighted that there is a concern about the high number of discussion items on the Terms of Reference and that he believed that GC0086 is more about using current processes that are already in existence in other codes and therefore should be more straightforward. He added that there is a concern about revisiting and duplicating work that has already been done previously. AT advised that a number of strawman proposals have been written using existing principles and they will be used as a starting point to see how the various elements might fit into the Grid Code.

4 Summary of GC0086

5. GG gave a summary of GC0086 and highlighted the key elements in the Issue Paper that was raised at the July GCRP and advised that he believes that it is no longer tenable not to have open governance in the Grid Code. GG added that the suggestion is to copy and paste the CUSC Section 8 (Governance) legal text, replacing CUSC Panel with GCRP as a simple starter for 10 as it encapsulates the proposed changes.
6. MK commented that it would be good to see some real examples where things have not worked and how they were dealt with under the existing rules. MK added that if there is nothing except theoretical drivers, then it is hard to see the reasons for change. GG felt that they are not theoretical reasons and that one of the concerns is about small parties being able to have a say. With regard to the GC0086 proposed process GG noted that it will be identical to CUSC, therefore the Code Administrator (National Grid) will only have to run one process for the two codes; Grid Code and CUSC; that they administer and there will be one single approach, so there are efficiency savings in addition to the other benefits. GG added that currently the governance of the Grid Code is fundamentally different to the open governance in the CUSC and BSC and Proposer Ownership is a key principle of open governance and gives comfort to parties that no one else can change their proposal, as opposed to the current process whereby, with the Grid Code, the Workgroup could amend the proposal. PB emphasised the right of parties to put forward changes and have them properly evaluated and critiqued before being submitted to the Authority for a decision. PB added that clearly the process has to be robust but there are essentially no potential blockers for having changes distorted and sending a modification that differs from the original to Ofgem for assessment. Ofgem then have enough information to make an informed decision. For example this proposal (GC0086) could theoretically not be progressed and relies on the willingness of National Grid to have an open debate, which does happen, but theoretically could not. PB added that National Grid has nothing to fear from the process and in fact this protects them from criticism. GG highlighted that one particular party have had a situation in the past where they wanted to take forward a proposal to the Authority concerning Two Shift Limits and experienced problems. Proposer Ownership ultimately gives one party the right to change a proposal. MK felt that it is an issue of interpretation and that he would interpret the current requirements in the constitution of the Panel very much similar to other processes, as any party can raise an issue and the Panel discusses it openly. What does not exist is the same level of prescription as other codes, but it tends to happen and therefore this proposal may add a level of bureaucracy that is not perhaps necessary. GG noted that in all cases the Authority make the decision, but currently only one commercial company (National Grid) has the power over the progression of all Grid Code Modifications even though the Grid Code is a multi-party agreement. If a change is put forward, under the current Grid Code arrangements that are directly at odds with the commercial position of National Grid then they could, as has happened with the Two Shift Limits proposition, delay or frustrate the proposals' progression. With open governance that would not be possible. GG noted that one of the reasons why 'consensus' maybe achieved with Grid Code changes is that parties believe that National Grid will not raise / facilitate the progression of certain Modifications, so those parties refrain from raising those types of Modifications, with this perhaps being reinforced by the National Grid approach to the Two Shift Limits issue.
7. PB highlighted experiences in the past where there have been issues with gas governance and now all the rules are set out in one code for Gas. Previously it was known for industry to have to put forward urgent proposals in order to get issues on the table and that the process could be filibustered so that a final report was never sent to the Authority. PB noted that this is an extreme example but that is the reason why it got reformed. RW advised that currently anyone can raise an issue under the Grid Code and he can only think of one example recently where an issue has not progressed to a modification and that this was by a consensus in the GCRP when the issue was presented to them. GG summarised that there is basically an imbalance of power with the Grid Code that does not exist for other codes such as the CUSC and BSC.
8. LN commented that she is keen to understand the concerns about introducing open governance. AT responded that from a Code Administrator point of view, there are no concerns with open governance as it tends to be self-regulating and the Panel agree on the

best way forward. AT added that it is important to try to limit the bureaucracy and make sure that the legal text is something that could be read and understood as Section 8 of the CUSC is not particularly readable due to the changes made as a result of Code Governance Review Phase 1 and Phase 2. GG commented that he has no problem with making the legal text easier to read but is concerned about National Grid lawyers essentially reverting any 'plain English' drafting developed by the GC0086 Workgroup for the Grid Code back to the equivalent of CUSC Section 8 which would make the work done by the Workgroup nugatory. GG asked if confirmation could be obtained from National Grid lawyers that if the Workgroup embarked on developing 'plain English' drafting that it would not, subsequently, be turned into 'legalistic English' later on in the progression of GC0086. LN asked if there is anything about the Grid Code that means that open governance is not appropriate. MK felt that there is not but noted that he finds the CUSC process slightly intimidating as it is so procedure driven, but for the Grid Code he believes that most elements of open governance already exist. RL asked about the impact open governance may have on Workgroups, as we need to make sure it will not be any less efficient. GG advised that the first Panel meeting is straightforward as it assesses the validity of the proposal and then agrees how to progress it (via a Workgroup or straight to consultation), the Workgroup then discuss the modification thoroughly and there is a Workgroup consultation in addition to a Code Administrator consultation. It then goes back to the Panel who ensure the Workgroup has met its Terms of Reference, goes out to industry consultation and then the Panel has its vote. So GG summarised that there are basic steps to cover off certain phases.

9. AT asked about the attendance for Grid Code Workgroups and the issue of resourcing. MK advised that it depends on the subject matter. AT considered that if the membership of the Panel reduced, would there be a greater requirement for representative membership in Workgroups as the Panel would not be discussing the modification in detail. AT asked the group to what extent there is duplication between the Workgroup and the Panel. GP responded that he sees open governance in the Grid Code as bringing more structure to the process, more control and rigour which in turns drives efficiency. GP gave the example of the Frequency Response Workgroup, established some four years ago which has never been clear about what it has been trying to achieve. GP added that the role of the Panel acting as a gateway to allow a modification to progress to a Workgroup would drive process efficiency into the way the GCRP works rather than discussing everything in detail. PB added that you don't need detailed debates replicated in the Panel, just an idea of the subject. The GCRP has an advisory role, and sometimes it is not clear where an issue sits.
10. AT highlighted the item on the Terms of Reference relating to the creation of an informal issues group which would help in accessibility, engagement and in the preliminary discussion of issues before they reached the GCRP. MK noted that the level of debate is not the same in the D Code as there are not so many live issues and they tend to be small generator related. MK added that there is quite an active series of modifications going on and there is also a lot going on to do with generation connections, so much so that Ofgem have prompted DNO's to run forums. On paper the two Panel constitutions look very similar but in reality they are quite different. PB highlighted that a lot of issues under the BSC do not result in modifications so it is good to discuss in a more informal environment to prevent modifications being raised that are not appropriate. GG added that it gives a loose structure and is a useful mechanism for parties that are not sure if it is an issue, rather than the alternative which would lead to them raising a modification straight away.
11. AT summarised the discussions so far. GG noted examples in the past that took a lot of rigorous debate, such as CMP213 and Transmission Access Review (TAR) which despite being very complex and having lots of options, still only took a year to progress through the CUSC change process. MK asked what compels a Workgroup to meet timelines set out in the CUSC. AT responded that a timetable is set out at the Panel meeting at which the proposal is raised and the Authority has the right to veto that timetable. AT continued, adding that if the work is not finished in the 4 month [standard] period, the Workgroup Chair has to ask for an extension at the next Panel meeting and the Panel and Ofgem have the responsibility to discuss and agree or disagree. AT added that there is usually an Ofgem representative in the Workgroup who communicates with the Ofgem representative in the Panel. Ultimately the Authority sets the deadline. PB considered the risk that the report will not be up to scratch if there is not enough time for the Workgroup to discuss effectively. GP suggested that the Panel would act as a better gateway for what is an issue / proposal and that is where the issues group starts to come into its own, particularly for the more technical issues. PB felt that overall no one is objecting to the ideas raised, but that the technical issues are more of a concern. MK noted

another concern around how this relates across to the DCUSA, as it costs around £50-£70k a year to run at the moment and this may increase 10 fold with the introduction of open governance (£800k is the documented cost of running the DCUSA). GG noted that GC0086 relates to the Grid Code. PB advised that there are examples of a technical issue in the Grid Code that has large costs for parties such as generators. GP noted that the Frequency Response Workgroup is an example of where technical and commercial issues cross over, and it has taken 4 years of discussion and the group is not really any further forward. Therefore, there is a trade off between higher costs of administration if that then leads to a better process and the costs of running meetings, particularly if they do not result in a reasonable outcome.

5 Proposed packaging of proposals

12. ER explained the proposed packaging of the various elements that make up open governance. ER presented the three main elements that are fundamental to introducing this; (i) the introduction of open governance, Proposer Ownership and the creation of Workgroup Alternative Modifications, (ii) GCRP Membership and the creation of a Panel Recommendation Vote, and (iii) GCRP Elections. ER went on to add that additional elements could be standalone, particularly the introduction of an Independent chair as there are a number of issues to discuss such as the process, funding etc. ER explained that the other three elements (Urgency, Self-Governance and Fast Track) are all about progressing a modification quicker so are separate, but have the same principle. MK asked why a vote is needed in the GCRP. AT advised that for other codes (but not Grid Code) it opens up right of appeal to the CMA in certain circumstances. This is set out in the Act and in secondary legislation, which specifies which codes this appeal route applies to. MK asked that the WG was provided with the references to the legislation. It was noted that it is very rare to have an appeal to the CMA, with PB and GG only recalling one previous example (with a UNC change). GG added that a vote from the Panel gives the Authority a recommendation from the Panel to consider, and that is what the purpose of a GCRP vote would be (ie as opposed to being related to CMA appeal route). MK considered the proposed packaging and felt that it is logical to group them in the way suggested. AT added that it makes it more manageable and helps try to prioritise the work of this group. RW noted that the elements are not contingent on each other by doing it in this way. PB agree that the first three elements are the core of open governance and the three relating to how proposals are progressed do not need much discussion as they are fairly straightforward. LN asked if the top three are interlinked rather than being separate. AT advised that elections could effectively be done now. LN asked if the last three elements could be done without open governance. AT advised that they could not and noted that they would also need a licence change. GG noted that the appropriate wording already existed in the licence, all be it in Condition C10 (CUSC), which could be copied into Condition C14 (Grid Code). MK highlighted that the D Code has the ability to do fast track amendments without consultation but still needs an Authority decision. It was also noted that for the purposes of the group, breaking down the objectives into these straw man proposals is helpful but there is a question around the logical implementation.
13. RL noted that the fundamental requirement of the Grid Code is to run an efficient system and meet demand on the network. RL felt that if we go down the route of membership and voting then there may be an issue regarding the weight of generators in this Workgroup to push through this issue and that there may not be sufficient technical debate allowed in the Panel. AT commented that the open governance and modification route allows for engagement by all at every step. If open governance is introduced as envisaged by the proposal and in line with the CUSC, there are multiple times for engagement. The first option is for it to go to Workgroup if the Panel decide it is necessary. GG added that the Terms of Reference of that Workgroup, set by the GCRP, could state that the necessary technical elements are discussed. RL voiced his concern about not having the right people in the meetings and potentially watering down the technical routes. If Panel membership is cut down, it puts more focus on getting the right people in the Workgroup. GG noted that there is a Workgroup consultation and the ability to raise an Alternative, and also a Code Administrator consultation. GG added that there is also nothing to stop a party writing separately to Ofgem with their views on the technical (and any other) issues / concerns with the proposal. LN highlighted that the fundamental issue is that it is National Grid's duty to keep the lights on and to ensure that the right people are in the Workgroup. AT advised that there is also an Ofgem representative in the Workgroup. GG raised the point that National Grid is given the right to expressly provide their views on the proposal in the report that goes to Ofgem. LN asked if there are risks for National Grid in that there could be undue influence of large generators. AT responded that this would all be

considered as part of the membership review. PB felt that he is mindful of the System Operator view as they have a unique position although they are commercial, so he would be happy to have their view explicitly set out in the report. RL noted the need to have balance between generation issues and the operational requirements of the Transmission System. GP felt that in terms of maintaining a robust level of technical challenge it means having the right people on the Workgroup, which actually is not very different to what happens at the moment.

6

Introducing Open Governance, Proposer Ownership and Workgroup Alternative Modifications

14. The group looked at the example of the summary table of the CMP213 alternatives to see how Alternatives could be measured and assessed and also CMP227 for implementation alternatives. PB noted a concern with the BSC process being too restrictive, but also that the CUSC process has a large range of possibilities so can become complicated. GG responded that the Workgroup and the Chair can argue for and against Alternatives so there is leeway. GG noted that the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACOP) requires multiple alternatives rather than one. LN noted BSC Modification P314 as an example highlighting potential limitations of the BSC process. GG echoed this and noted the multiple zonal losses Modifications raised after P198 was raised, because there was not a route for multiple alternatives in the BSC. GG noted that often alternatives were around giving parties (and Ofgem) various 'permutations' around what is often a small number of options. CMP213 was a classic example of this where the options were requested, in their Direction, by Ofgem and that this lead to 'natural' permutations with multiple alternatives. LN felt that the importance is around checks and balances and the key is for the Workgroup to make it efficient as possible. PB added that there is a filter but if anyone feels passionately about an alternative and the Workgroup don't agree, then they have the safeguard of convincing the Chair that it better meets the objectives.
15. ER talked through the straw man proposal. LN asked why it stated that only licensed parties can raise proposals. ER noted that this was taken from the issue paper for GC0086. GG responded that the ability to raise proposals should be for parties bound by Grid Code obligations, Citizens Advice and Citizens Advice Scotland, and anyone else designated by the Authority as Materially Affected; either individually or collectively as a 'grouping'; and so it is not restricted to just Licensed parties. MK stated that this must include small generators. GP advised that we need to be mindful of what is in the existing constitutional rules. GG commented that CUSC parties, BSC parties, licensed DNOs and designated parties should be able to raise modifications as they are materially affected. GG added that this puts the onus on those parties to go to Ofgem to become designated. LN asked whether there is particular group of users that need to be defined or is this considered on case by case basis since relying on parties going to the Authority to be designated may be a concern. GP considered whether the wording could be simplified to say that it is any party that is subject to Grid Code and/or D Code. GP noted that this does however place the emphasis on those parties to explain why they are subject to the code(s). AT suggested that any Authorised Electricity Operator (as per definition) can raise a Grid Code modification. AT clarified that it would be specifically Citizens Advice and Citizens Advice Scotland as the consumer representative and the group agreed that it would. PB suggested that you could add 'and any successor body' as a safeguard for the future in case Citizens Advice and Citizens Advice Scotland changes. MK asked where the term Authorised Electricity Operator comes from as it seems to suit what is appropriate but there are concerns around what its origins and futures are. GP agreed that it is worth checking its origins and longevity.

Action – Find out the origins of the Authorised Electricity Operator definition in industry documents.

16. The group moved on to looking at the legal text that had been provided for GC0086. GG highlighted paragraph 8.16.1 (a) with regards to the 'Materially Affected Party' section and suggested that (iii) could be removed. Therefore the ability to raise a proposal is captured through the Authorised Electricity Operator route, and the others are captured through the 'materially affected parties' definition. LN noted that Scottish TOs have no licence obligations in relation to the Grid Code. PB agreed that that is conceptually right as everything happens through the STC. LN commented that the framework is designed so that the SO, independent of generation and supply, has the licence obligations in relation to user facing codes. The group considered whether Scottish TOs should be allowed to raise GC mods. GG suggested

that if they are, then you could use the Authorised Electricity Operator definition and update it to include 'or relevant licensees'. PB noted that Scottish TOs have a right but it is through the STC and not the Grid Code. PB added that Users do not have a path through the STC code, so it's fair for Scottish TOs not to have a path through the Grid Code in turn. The group agreed that OFTOs are included in the definition. LN asked about interconnectors. GP noted that under Europe they are all classified as TSOs. GG felt that TSOs should be allowed to raise Grid Code modifications at least to the areas affected by European codes. LN advised that the group need to be careful about making assumptions about the future implementation of European codes in GB.

17. AT asked the group for their views on whether other ONTOs, OFTOs, and TSOs (interconnectors) would be able to raise a Grid Code modification. RW advised that there is no restriction currently as to who can raise an issue. PB felt that we should try and retain what we have got but extend slightly to include smaller generators. GG noted that they are still entitled to use the STC route and this would act as check and balance. RL noted that currently, if a Scottish TO had an issue then it would be taken to the GCRP. LN felt that this goes back to the principles of who can raise a modification and why and clear explanations are needed. AT reminded that group that this question will be consulted on. GG commented that by signing up to the CUSC, a party is bound by the Grid Code. So therefore any party who is bound by it should be able to raise a modification. LN noted that if you apply that logic then the Scottish TOs would not be included, as they do not sign up to CUSC/are not bound by Grid Code. RL responded that they are affected by the Grid Code so should be able to raise modifications. PB noted that, accordingly, generators who were affected by the STC should be able to raise STC changes. MK considered which sections of the Grid Code would apply in this regard. RL responded that the Grid Code has the Planning Code in it and the Scottish TOs are required to plan the network. MK noted that there is no obligation on the TO for either side of the transmission boundary and that there are lots of assumptions, but no obligations. The point was raised that if TO's are not allowed to participate, then how are National Grid regulated as being both SO and TO? RW felt that he would rather not be restrictive in respect of who can raise a Grid Code modification and that the Panel's function is to act as a filter anyway so would be able to regulate modifications raised. GG suggested that the options could be listed in the consultation.
18. AT summarised that the group seem to have landed on 4 options for parties who can raise Grid Code mods [more than one of which could be applied]:
 1. Using the Authorised Electricity Operator definition (after finding out where it has come from and whether it can be future proofed).
 2. Citizens Advice and Citizens Advice Scotland.
 3. NGET plc.
 4. Materially Affected Party (designated as such by the Authority).
19. LN noted that these options still do not capture interconnectors. RW reiterated the point about the current ability for anyone to raise an issue. GG queried whether that is that strictly true because it relies on parties knowing who their representative is at the GCRP. GG noted that there is a pragmatic balance between excluding parties, and allowing absolutely everyone in GB to raise Grid Code Modifications, as every consumer is affected by the Grid Code. GG felt that the Materially Affected Party route, when combined with the other three options, is the most pragmatic way forward.
20. AT highlighted the recent requirement for the Authority to raise or direct modifications under the Third Package and asked the group whether they agree that this should be included in the Grid Code. LN noted it seemed appropriate to ask the question in the consultation. GG advised that it needs to be included in the legal drafting. The group considered the wording in 8.16.1 b (iv) – 'unless otherwise permitted by the Authority'.

Action: Check wording in legal text 8.16.1 b (iv).

21. MK asked LN about Ofgem's view on the benefit of open governance. LN responded that Ofgem recognised in CGR Phase 2 the potential benefit of having open governance in the Grid

Code but acknowledged that it may not have been an appropriate time to ask industry to resource the change due to other workload at that time.

22. ER talked through what would go in a Grid Code Modification Proposal form. PB noted that it should be clear that proposals can only be raised against the baseline and not based on possible future changes. ER advised that this could be made clear in the guidance, although it is implicit already. ER noted that the role of the Code Administrator would become more crucial in engaging with parties, talking through potential mods and generally supporting the whole process.
23. GG talked about the timetable for raising and progressing a modification. MK noted that the Grid Code Review Panel meets every 2 months rather than every month like the CUSC Panel. GG noted that this does not make a particular difference and that it should be possible to have extraordinary GCRP meetings (by teleconference?) to consider if a Workgroup has discharged their terms of reference and that the Workgroup report could go to Code Administrator consultation as this would be an efficient way to proceed.
24. The group briefly talked about the potential for the Panel to amalgamate modifications but it was agreed that this is not appropriate and to remove this option.
25. The 4 month timetable for bringing a Workgroup Report back to the Panel was discussed. RL felt that this is short compared to current expected workgroup timelines and it would mean that that, dependent on ToR and issues raised, the Workgroup may have to meet frequently in order to complete their work in this timescale. GG advised that it is possible to ask the Panel and Ofgem for a time extension up front at the first Panel meeting where the proposal is raised, or indeed throughout the process. The Code Administrator would compile a timetable and work out the likelihood of meetings, holidays etc. that may affect the timetable and take that to the Authority at the first Panel meeting with a realistic timetable and any potential need for an extension. RL commented that the Grid Code has significant technical content, whereas BSC and CUSC do not, therefore the likely commercial implications of BSC and CUSC Work Group discussions could be expected to drive better WG participation. GG noted that Grid Code changes could have commercial implications for Grid Code parties which could, therefore, be expected to drive better WG participation. GP advised that there may be a natural priority with modifications. AT asked for an overall view from the group as to how long the Workgroup period should be. RW, RL and MK felt that 6 months is appropriate. GP sympathised with the views against having 4 months, points particularly with financial implications not always being visible, but advised that he would prefer to start with 4 months with the potential to agree an extension. PB agreed that it is best to start with 4 months and can always go to 6. GG noted that there is a KPI with extensions in the CUSC and if it turns out that there is a large number of extensions then we can always change to 6 months. AT summarised that there are split views and that a question would be asked in the consultation regarding this.

Action – Ask a question in the consultation regarding how long the Workgroup phase should be (4 or 6 months).

26. ER ran through the Proposer Ownership process and highlighted the past issues in the CUSC around making changes to the legal text after the Code Administrator consultation stage. The group felt it would be pragmatic to adopt a common sense approach in this matter and that the Panel would be able to agree on minor changes after the Code Administrator consultation stage.
27. The group moved on to looking at the Workgroup Voting process. LN asked about how vote 2 works in the Workgroup vote with regard to assessing any Alternatives against the original proposal, and also potential confusion around expressing a 'best' preference (in particular whether at this stage it is accurate to say in all cases that 'baseline' can remain an option for individual Panel members when voting, if they have already voted that one or more options better facilitates the objectives; LN questioned how a Panel member could vote that 'no change' is best - if they have already formed a view that one or more options on the table is better than baseline/status quo). ER noted that although the CUSC Panel expresses a 'best' preference as this is something that Ofgem had requested in the past, it is actually not required in the Panel vote and it is simply a vote as to whether each proposal better facilitates the Applicable Objectives. AT asked how current Grid Code Workgroups are run. RW commented that he would like there to be a formal process for voting in workgroups and that it would help to crystallise views as sometimes it is not clear. GP did not think that there is currently an

assessment against Objectives in peoples' minds in Grid Code Workgroups and that it is more about solving a problem, but noted that a view on the objectives is requested in the consultation. AT asked if we should follow the CUSC approach. The group felt that this was reasonable. The group considered Ofgem's position in making a decision when there is not a consensus on the best way forward. GG highlighted that Parliament decided that Ofgem makes decisions on Grid Code mods and therefore they need to have the resources to be able to do this. RL clarified that if a Workgroup Member wants to vote no against all proposals, then the best preference would be the baseline Grid Code. The group also considered when the Workgroup holds their vote and ER advised that it is best to vote live in the meeting but there is some flexibility and it can, for example, be done afterwards via email. However you cannot vote in advance as the discussions in the final meeting may affect the vote. AT also noted that a Workgroup Member or their Alternative needs to attend at least 50% of the meetings to be able to have a vote to avoid the risk of a party attending the final meeting in order to have a vote without being part of the majority of discussions.

28. The group then considered Workgroup Alternatives and whether it is preferential to limit it to one (as in the BSC), or have an unlimited amount, bearing in mind efficiency (as in the CUSC). The group generally felt that the CUSC model works well by having an unlimited amount but placing an onus on the Workgroup and Chair to try and be efficient and minimise the number of Alternatives raised.

7 Next Steps

29. The next meeting is scheduled for 2 October. AT confirmed that at the next meeting the discussions on Workgroup Alternatives, including the ability to raise a Workgroup Consultation Alternative Request and the role of the Workgroup Chair in progressing Alternatives would be completed. Discussion would then move on to GCRP Membership and the creation of a formal Panel Recommendation Vote and GCRP Elections.

Action – Circulate Consultation responses from GC0074 (GCRP Membership).