#

# Reforming the Energy Industry Codes - response form

The consultation is available at: [www.gov.uk/government/consultations/reforming-the-energy-industry-codes](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/reforming-the-energy-industry-codes)

The closing date for responses is: 16 September (23.45)

Please return your completed form to the following email addresses. As this is a joint review, please ensure you respond to both email addresses below.

Email to: codereform@beis.gov.uk & industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk

If you would like to send a hard copy then please send copies to the following. As this is a joint review, please ensure you send copies to **both** postal addresses below.

Write to:

Code Reform - Electricity Systems Team
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Abbey 1, 3rd Floor,
1 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0ET

Ofgem
Industry Code and Licensing Team
Office of Gas and Electricity Markets
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London, E14 4PU

BEIS and Ofgem will share with each other all responses that are received.

When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation.

Your response will be most useful if it is framed in direct response to the questions posed, though further comments and evidence are also welcome.

Please be aware that we intend to publish all responses to this consultation.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or release to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. Please see the consultation document for further information.

If you want information, including personal data, that you provide to be treated as confidential, please explain to us below why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we shall take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

I want my response to be treated as confidential [ ]

Comments: Click here to enter text.

## Questions

Name:
Organisation (if applicable):
Address:

Please select a box from the list of options below that best describes you as a respondent. This allows views to be presented by group type.

|  | Respondent type |
| --- | --- |
| [ ]  | Business representative organisation/trade body |
|[ ]  Central government |
|[ ]  Charity or social enterprise |
|[ ]  Individual |
|[ ]  Large business (over 250 staff) |
|[ ]  Legal representative |
|[ ]  Local government |
|[ ]  Medium business (50 to 250 staff) |
|[ ]  Micro business (up to 9 staff) |
|[ ]  Small business (10 to 49 staff) |
|[ ]  Trade union or staff association |
|[ ]  Other (please describe) |

Question 1 [page 17 in consultation document]

Do you agree with our four desired outcomes for the code governance landscape by the mid-2020s?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

If you disagree, please explain what you consider the outcomes should be.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 2 [page 17 in consultation document]

Do you agree with the problems we have identified (in chapter 1 – Background – and in later chapters), and that they present a persuasive case for reform of the current framework for energy codes?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 3 [page 18 in consultation document]

Do you have additional evidence on the performance of the current framework?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 4 [page 18 in consultation document]

Do you agree with our proposed scope of reform?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

If not, which additional codes or systems do you think should be included/excluded?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 5 [page 18 in consultation document]

Are there any codes or systems that we should only apply a limited set of reforms to?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 6 [page 21 in consultation document]

Do you agree that the four areas for reform are required? Please provide reasons for your position and evidence where possible.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 7 [page 21 in consultation document]

Do you agree with the two broad models outlined? Please provide reasons for your position and evidence where possible.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

 Question 8 [page 21 in consultation document]

Which model do you believe will best deliver on our desired outcomes? Please explain.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 9 [page 21 in consultation document]

Do you agree with the changes to the role of code signatories we are proposing?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 10 [page 29 in consultation document]

Do you agree there is a missing strategic function for codes development in the energy sector and that introducing a strategic function with the responsibilities outlined in chapter 3 is the best way to address the lack of strategic direction?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

 Who is best placed to fulfil the strategic function and why?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 11 [page 29 in consultation document]

Do you agree with the objectives and responsibilities envisaged for the strategic function, and are there any additional objectives or responsibilities the strategic function should have?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 12 [page 29 in consultation document]

How may this new function potentially impact the roles and responsibilities of other parts of the framework? Do you foresee any unintended consequences?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 13 [page 29 in consultation document]

What are your views on how the strategic direction should be developed and implemented (including the option of establishing a strategy board to aid engagement)?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 14 [page 29 in consultation document]

Do you think that the scope of the strategic function should be limited to taking account of the Government’s vision for the energy sector and translating it into a plan for the industry codes framework, or are there other areas it should address (for example, impact on vulnerable consumers)?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 15 [page 36 in consultation document]

Do you agree that in addition to the current responsibilities that code administrators have, that the code manager function should also have the following responsibilities?

1. **identifying, proposing and developing changes (analysis, legal drafting etc.), including understanding the impacts;**

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

1. making decisions on some changes, or making recommendations to the strategic body; and

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

1. prioritising which changes are progressed.

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 16 [page 36 in consultation document]

What is the best way to ensure coherent end-to-end changes to the codes and related systems? For example, is it through having end-to-end code and system managers?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 17 [page 36 in consultation document]

Should the approach differ on a case-by case basis (i.e. depending on the code or system in question)?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 18 [page 36 in consultation document]

Do you agree that the code manager function should be accountable to the strategic body and that this should be via a licence or contract?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Please note questions 19- 26 only apply in respect of Model 1 (code managers and a strategic body).

Question 19 [page 36 in consultation document]

Are there more effective ways that the code manager function’s accountability to the strategic body could be enshrined other than in a licence or contract?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 20 [page 36 in consultation document]

Do you agree that we should not consider further a model whereby the code manager function is accountable to industry?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 21 [page 37 in consultation document]

Do you have views on whether the code manager function should be appointed following a competitive tender process or other competition?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 22 [page 37 in consultation document]

Do you think the code manager function should be established by the strategic body creating a body or bodies?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

**If the code managers were established in this way, would we need to consider any alternative approaches to funding or accountability?**

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 23 [page 37 in consultation document]

In terms of establishing/choosing the code manager function, do you agree that we should not consider further:

1. requiring an existing licensee to become the code manager; and/or

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

1. requiring a licensee (or group of licensees) to create the code manager?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

 **Please explain.**

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 24 [page 37 in consultation document]

What would be the most effective way to ensure the code manager function offers value for money (for example, through price controls or budget scrutiny)? More broadly, what is the right incentive framework to place on the code manager function?

**Please explain.**

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 25 [page 37 in consultation document]

Are there any factors that:

1. would stop parties (including code administrators) from becoming a code manager?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

1. should prevent parties from becoming a code manager (e.g. do you agree that licensees should not be able to exercise control of the code managers)?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 26 [page 37 in consultation document]

How should the code manager function be funded (for example through licence fees or by parties to the code(s)?

**Please explain.**

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 27 [page 44 in consultation document]

Are there any quick wins that could be realised in terms of code consolidation and simplification?

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 28 [page 44 in consultation document]

How many codes would best deliver on the outcomes we are seeking under these reforms?

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 29 [page 44 in consultation document]

Which option (one code manager versus multiple) would best deliver on the outcomes we are seeking under these reforms?

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 30 [page 44 in consultation document]

Which of our consolidation options would best deliver the outcomes we are seeking to achieve? Please provide evidence for your examples.

 Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 31 [page 44 in consultation document]

Do you agree that the codes should be digitalised?

 [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know

**Please explain.**

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 32 [page 47 in consultation document]

What role should industry have in monitoring code compliance or making decisions on measures needed to address any identified non-compliance?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 33 [page 47 in consultation document]

Which of the two models we propose would better facilitate effective monitoring and compliance arrangements?

Please explain.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

**Please note this question only applies in respect of Model 2 (integrated rule-making body).**

Question 34 [page 47 in consultation document]

With Model 2 - integrated rule-making body - should the IRMB have responsibility for imposing measures (where a party is non-compliant with the code) or should this be for another organisation?

Please explain.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Do you have any other comments that might aid the consultation process as a whole?

Please use this space for any general comments that you may have, comments on the layout of this consultation would also be welcomed.

Click here to enter text.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply [ ]

At BEIS we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be okay if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

[ ] Yes [ ] No