

The Voice of the Networks



# Energy Networks Association

## Open Networks Project Advisory Group Response

July 2019

Restriction: Public

## Introduction

The third Advisory Group meeting of 2019 took place on 4<sup>th</sup> July at ENA’s offices in London. The first section of this session was run as a webinar to outline key progress updates and this was followed by a workshop on Workstream 3 Product 7 (Potential Conflicts of Interest and Unintended Consequences) for stakeholders to feed into the more detailed product development.

The webinar recording is now available on our website and can be accessed [here](#). The feedback from the breakout session is captured below, along with the Open Networks Project response.

Workstream 3 Product 7: Potential Conflicts of Interest and Unintended Consequences	
<p>The Product 7 is a risk log associated with the Open Networks Programme of work, capturing the potential conflicts of interest and unintended consequences which could arise and compromise the energy system’s ability to reach best outcomes.</p> <p>The objective of the session was to present the initial version of the risk log that build on Baringa’s work for feedback and to get further stakeholder input to understand and investigate potential conflicts of interest and unintended consequences, and identify appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>Overall, there was broad support for this product and its scope. The table below captures the detailed feedback on the proposed format of the risk log and other suggestions that we received to progress the work.</p>	
Feedback	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially different levels of impacts and different stakeholders for each column. Need to highlight different stakeholders that are affected in the ‘who loses’ section, and the summated impact across these multiple stakeholders should be factored into the overall score.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The owner of the risk has been identified and added to the table</li> <li>The ‘status’ column has been updated to include a dropdown list to reflect proposed stages (as described in the ‘Read Me’ tab).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘Description of impact’ isn’t really a description of the impact, but a description of the column. The section about who loses could include why they lose, which is where the impact should be described e.g. ‘bill payers lose; higher bills.’</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edited the "description of impact" field by adopting a stronger discipline to differentiate between description of impact and description risk.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likelihood and Impact need some definitions and maybe numbers so we can multiply them out. Likelihood and Impact should be described (e.g.: to highlight the fact that it is 'Perceived Likelihood') and will need to have definitions for what we mean by High, Medium and Low. Need to add post-mitigation Likelihood and Impact scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likelihood and Impact definitions and numbered scoring added.</li> <li>Post-mitigation Likelihood and Impact scores have been added.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set up a change log to highlight what changes are made and when.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A change log to capture changes and when they are made has been added to the newest version of the product.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ENA to set up dedicated discussion with Ofgem / BEIS to get feedback and understand potential timelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was completed on 21<sup>st</sup> August.</li> </ul>