

Guidance for completion of the quantitative metrics

This document sets out the necessary guidance for code administrators to complete the CACoP Data Metrics. It should also assist interested parties in understanding the CACoP Data Metrics. The aim of this guidance is to ensure that all data is collected in a consistent manner from all code administrators.

Overview

The questions that relate to modifications, relate to modifications to the main code document. As a guide, these figures DO include draft modifications that are raised in SPAA as these are put into the modification process at this stage (but should not be double counted once they have moved out of the draft stage). They do NOT include the BSC change proposals that are raised to amend code subsidiary documents and central systems that sit beneath the code.

We recognise that in respect of the modification to some codes, these are referred to as 'change proposals', the metrics should be completed in respect of the terminology used in the specific code.

For completeness, we have included five categories of modification proposal: Authority Consent – non-urgent; Authority Consent – Urgent; Self-governance; Fast Track self-governance; Self-governance – Urgent. We recognise that for some of these categories the return for a number of codes will be nil.

General

GENERAL				
1	Number of modifications raised in the period January 01 to March 31: (Any modifications with alternates should just be counted as 1)	Authority Consent - Non-urgent		
		Authority Consent - Urgent		
		Self-governance		
		Fast Track self-governance		
		Self-governance - Urgent		
2	Number of modifications withdrawn in the period January 01 to March 31: (Any modifications with alternates should just be counted as 1)	Authority Consent - Non-urgent		
		Authority Consent - Urgent		
		Self-governance		
		Fast Track self-governance		
		Self-governance - Urgent		
Alternates				
3	Number of modifications submitted to the Authority for decision in the period January 01 to March 31 (include the number of alternates submitted in the second box)	Non-urgent		
		Urgent		
4	Number of final industry decisions on modifications in the period January 01 to March 31 (include the number of alternates submitted in the second box):	Self-governance		
		Fast Track self-governance		
		Self-governance - Urgent		
5	Number of reports 'sent back' by the Authority in the period January 01 to March 31 (include the number of alternates submitted in the second box):	Non-urgent		
		Urgent		
6	Number of modifications implemented in January 01 to March 31:			

Question 1

For the purposes of this question a modification proposal is considered raised when it has been submitted on the standard modification template to the code administrator.

We do expect that all new code modification proposals should have a recommendation as to whether they are self-governance, authority consent, etc. Even if this changes later on in the process we expect the proposer, possibly with help from the code administrator, to have given this some thought and made a recommendation.

Question 2

This question aims to find out the number of modification proposals that have been withdrawn in the relevant period. Irrespective of the stage in the process that it has been withdrawn, it should be counted in this section. For the avoidance of doubt, modifications that have been simply been reclassified (e.g. to self-governance) should not be counted here.

Question 3

This question looks to gather data on how many modification proposals have been submitted to the Authority for decision in the period. If a modification is also sent back in this period it should still be counted. For example if two non-urgent modifications are submitted to the Authority in the time period, one of which has three alternates, then '2' should be put in column F and '3' in column G.

Question 4

This question only looks to gather data on the final panel vote on whether to approve or reject a self-governance modification. It does not include minded-to decisions made earlier in the process. It does not include multiple counting for all decisions made on a final modification report (e.g. if the panel votes to approve the modification, implementation date, and the implementation method, this counts as one vote - even if there is a mix of approve and reject). Alternates should be treated the same as in question 3.

Question 5

This question looks to capture data on any reports that have been sent back by the Authority following submission. It should be noted that the submission to the Authority and send back may not be captured in the same reporting period.

Question 6

This question looks to capture the number of modifications (of all categories) that have been implemented during the reporting period.

Consultation

CONSULTATION			
7	Number of consultations which closed in the period January 01 to March 31 for the following types of modification (this includes any consultation raised at any point during the modification cycle, and any modifications with alternates should be counted as 1):	Authority Consent - Non-urgent	
		Authority Consent - Urgent	
		Self-governance	
		Fast Track self-governance	
		Self-governance - Urgent	
8	Number of consultations to <i>non-urgent</i> modifications, which closed in the period January 01 to March 31, that had a consultation period of <u>less than 15 business days</u>	Authority Consent	
		Self-governance	
		Fast Track self-governance	
9	Number of consultations to <i>urgent</i> modifications, which closed in the period January 01 to March 31, that had a consultation period of <u>less than 5 business days</u>	Authority Consent - Urgent	
		Self-governance - Urgent	
10	Number of modifications which had their final vote in the period January 01 to March 31, for which legal text <u>was not</u> available in the final consultation	Authority Consent - Non-urgent	
		Authority Consent - Urgent	
		Self-governance	
		Fast Track self-governance	
		Self-governance - Urgent	

Question 7

This includes any consultation raised by workgroups for a specific modification proposal as well as any consultation raised following a panel meeting.

Question 8

The consultations considered in response to this question should be those in the relevant categories of modification proposals that are included in question 7.

Question 9

The consultations considered in response to this question should be those in the relevant categories of modification proposals that are included in question 7.

Question 10

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in questions 3 and 4. Alternates should not be counted in response to this question. We note that in respect of the SPAA as a result of the appeals mechanism, the modifications considered here may not be exactly the same as those in question 3.

Engagement

ENGAGEMENT			
11	Number of new parties who have acceded to the code in the period January 01 to March 31:		
12	Number of times assistance was requested with access and engagement to the code and the modification process in the period January 01 to March 31:		
13	Number of respondents to Authority Consent modification consultations which closed in the period January 01 to March 31 (this includes any consultation raised at any point during the modification cycle):	Minimum	
		Mean	
		Median	
		Maximum	
14	Number of respondents to Self-governance modification consultations which closed in the period January 01 to March 31 (this includes any consultation raised at any point during the modification cycle):	Minimum	
		Mean	
		Median	
		Maximum	

Question 11

This question just requires the number of parties that have acceded to the code in the given period to be included.

Question 12

This question aims to find out how many times code administrators are asked for help in their role as code administrators. This is not just restricted to parties to the code or to the modification process. Each request (by email or phone) should be counted. Each request should only be counted once (i.e. if there are follow-ups to a request these should not be counted).

Question 13

The calculations for this question should be in respect of the Authority consent modifications (both urgent and non-urgent) that are included in the answer to question 7.

Question 14

The calculations for this question should be in respect of the self-governance modifications (both fast track and non-fast track) that are included in the answer to question 7.

Costs

COSTS			
15	Number of modifications which had their final vote in the period January 01 to March 31, for which an estimation of the implementation costs <u>was not</u> available in the final consultation	Authority Consent - Non-urgent	
		Authority Consent - Urgent	
		Self-governance	
		Fast Track self-governance	
		Self-governance - Urgent	
16	Number of modifications, implemented in January 01 to March 31, where the central system and code costs were zero:		
17	Number of modifications, implemented in January 01 to March 31, where the central system and code costs were more or less than that advised prior to the final industry vote:	Greater than or equal to 10% MORE than the advised implementation cost	
		Greater than or equal to 10% LESS than the advised implementation cost	

The costs that should be considered are central costs (for both system and code). Costs incurred by individual market participants should not be included.

Question 15

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in questions 3 and 4. Alternates should not be counted in response to this question. We note that in respect of the SPAA as a result of the appeals mechanism, the modifications considered here may not be exactly the same as those in question 3. For those modifications for which the estimated cost of implementation at the time of the final vote is zero, should not be counted in this metric.

Question 16

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in question 6.

Question 17

The modifications considered in response to this question should be those included in question 6.