

## CUSC Key Performance Indicators Quarter July –September 2013



## Introduction

---

- As part of the Code Governance Review Final Proposals, the Code Administration Code Of Practice (CACOP) 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 CACOP are a minimum requirement and may be expanded.

## CUSC Modifications Panel KPIs – Quarter 3

Quality of Assessment				
Measure	Quarter 3	YTD	YTD%	Comments
Final decision by Authority which ACCORDS with Panel Recommendation against the relevant objectives	0	2	N/A	Q1- CMP207/CMP208
Final decision by Authority which CONFLICTS with Panel Recommendation owing to wider statutory considerations	0	0	N/A	
Final decision which conflicts with Panel recommendation but NOT owing to wider duties	2	2	N/A	Q2 - CMP209/CMP210
Reports 'sent back' by Authority	0	0	N/A	

## CUSC Modifications Panel KPIs – Quarter 3

Effective Communication				
Measure	Quarter 3	YTD	YTD%	Comments
Average number of respondents to Workgroup Consultation	0	21	N/A	Q1 - CMP213
Average number of respondents to Industry Consultation*	2	5.1	N/A	Q1-CMP201/CMP215/CMP216/ CMP217 Q2 - CMP213/CMP218 Q3 - CMP220
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)

## CUSC Modifications Panel KPIs – Quarter 3

Efficient Administration 1				
Measure	Quarter 3	YTD	YTD%	Comments
CUSC Panel Papers Issued*	16	56	N/A	YTD figure Includes 1 late paper
Late Papers	0	1	0.5%	
Number of Final Modification Report submitted in line with original timetable**	0	0	0%	Q1 - CMP208 submitted in January 2013 granted an extension in 2012. CMP213 submitted in June with extension to the agreed timetable.
Number of Final Modification Report submitted with extension	0	2	N/A	Q2- CMP201 submitted in May following Send-back. CMP213 submitted in June.
Number of extensions to timetable requested	0	1	N/A	Q1-CMP213
Average business days between standard proposal raised and submitted to Authority***	194	192	N/A	Q1-CMP207/CMP208/ Q2-CMP213/CMP209/CMP210
Average business days between Self-governance proposal raised and submitted for CUSC Panel decision	86	56	N/A	Q1-CMP215/CMP216/CMP217 Q4 - CMP218

\*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'.

## CUSC Modifications Panel KPIs – Quarter 3

Efficient Administration 2				
Measure	Quarter 3	YTD	YTD%	Comments
Average business days between standard proposal submitted to Authority for decision and decision published	124	74.5	N/A	Q1 -CMP207/CMP208 Q2 - CMP209/210
Average business days between Authority decision on standard CUSC proposal and implementation	0	77	N/A	Q1-CMP208 approved in February, with a 3 month implementation date due to system changes
Average business days between Authority decision on standard Charging modification and implementation	0	0	N/A	
Average business days between Self-governance decision and implementation	33	33	N/A	Q2 - CMP215/CMP217
Number of CUSC Modification Proposals progressed through Self-governance*	0	5	N/A	Q1- CMP215/CMP216/CMP217/218 Q2 - CMP219

\*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.

## CUSC Modifications Panel KPIs – Quarter 3

Implementation Costs				
Measure	Quarter 3	YTD	YTD%	Comments
Number of final CUSC Modification Reports where implementation costs estimates were available for consultation*	NA	NA	NA	
Average Percentage difference between estimated and actual costs	NA	NA	NA	

\*Refers to Central Systems only and therefore may often be Not Applicable .