

What stage is this document in the process?

01 Initial Written Assessment

02 Definition Procedure

03 Assessment Procedure

▶ 04 Report Phase

P303 'Amendments to the Provisions for BSCCo Directors'

This Modification Proposal seeks to amend the current BSCCo Board Director provisions with the aim of increasing the pool of potential candidates that may fill a BSCCo Board Director position.



The BSC Panel recommends **approval** of P303 Alternative Modification



The BSC Panel recommends **rejection** of P303 Proposed Modification

This Modification is expected to impact:

- BSC Parties
- BSCCo (ELEXON)

P303
Final Modification Report

9 October 2014

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 34

© ELEXON Limited 2014



Any questions?

Contact:

Claire Anthony



claire.anthony@elexon.co.uk



020 7380 4293

Contents

1	Summary	3
2	Why Change?	4
3	Proposed Solution	7
4	Alternative Solution	8
5	Impacts & Costs	10
6	Implementation	11
7	Workgroup's Discussions	12
8	Workgroup's Conclusions	20
9	Panel's Initial Discussions	23
10	Report Phase Consultation Responses	26
11	Panel's Final Discussions	29
12	Recommendations	32
	Appendix 1: Workgroup Details	33
	Appendix 2: Glossary & References	34

About This Document

This is the P303 Final Modification Report, which ELEXON has submitted to the Authority on behalf of the BSC Panel. It includes a summary of the Workgroup's assessment, the Panel's full views and the responses to both the Workgroup's Assessment Consultation and the Panel's Report Phase Consultation. The Authority will consider this report and will decide whether to approve or reject P303. There are seven parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides details of the solution, impacts, costs, benefits/drawbacks and proposed implementation approach. It also summarises the Workgroup's key views on the areas set by the Panel in its Terms of Reference, and contains details of the Workgroup's membership and full Terms of Reference.
- Attachment A contains the approved redlined changes to the BSC for P303 Proposed solution.
- Attachment B contains the approved redlined changes to the BSC for P303 Alternative solution.
- Attachment C contains the full responses received to the Workgroup's Assessment Procedure Consultation.
- Attachment D contains the responses received from BSCCo Board Members.
- Attachment E contains the full responses received to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation.
- Attachment F contains the response received from the BSCCo Board to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation.

P303
Final Modification Report

9 October 2014

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 34

© ELEXON Limited 2014

Why Change?

BSC Section C 'BSCCo and its Subsidiaries' sets out the current BSCCo Board Director provisions.

To be considered a non-industry independent Director an individual must be completely independent of the industry for five years meaning that they must not have been a Panel Member or an employee, Director or representative of a Party in this time. There is also the restriction that if the individual is involved in the industry, then they shall not be remunerated in their role as a Director.

It is suggested that these provisions restrict the pool of potential candidates who may apply for the BSCCo Board Director positions and should therefore be amended.

Proposed Solution

Under the P303 Proposed Modification, the requirement of a five year gap will be removed and instead be replaced with an obligation on the Nomination Committee to have the flexibility to consider independence as part of the appointment process.

The proposed solution will also remove the current restriction that only industry independent Directors can be remunerated and instead give the Remuneration Committee the option to remunerate industry Directors.

Alternative Solution

Under the P303 Alternative solution, the requirement of a five year gap will be removed, however the restriction that only industry independent directors can be remunerated will be retained.

Impacts & Costs

P303 will impact **all BSC Parties** as it amends the process for applying to the BSCCo Board. However, the implementation of P303 would not directly impact Parties, and the central cost would be negligible.

Implementation

- **28 November 2014** if an Authority decision is received on or before 14 November 2014; or
- **2 January 2015** if an Authority decision is received after 14 November 2014 but on or before 18 December 2014.

Recommendation

The majority of the Panel agrees that P303 Alternative solution would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) and therefore its final majority recommendation is that **P303 Alternative solution** should be **approved**.

2 Why Change?

What is the BSCCo?

BSC Section C sets out the powers, functions, responsibilities and constitution of BSCCo, whose principle role is to give proper, effective and efficient implementation of the BSC.

What is the function of the BSCCo Board?

Under the BSC, the Board is responsible for:

- Appointing the BSCCo Chief Executive after consultation with the Panel (BSC Section C4.6); and
- Approving BSCCo's Annual Budget following consultation with BSC Parties and other interested parties (BSC Section C6.4).

In addition to its specific BSC requirements, the Board has the wider role of directing BSCCo. This role includes responsibility for monitoring BSCCo's performance, scrutiny of BSCCo's finances and ensuring that BSCCo operations are subject to effective cost-control. The manner in which the Board fulfils its role is not prescribed in the BSC. However, requirements (e.g. regarding quorum at meetings) are included in BSCCo's Articles of Association.

BSCCo Board structure

The size and composition of the BSC Board is determined by a Nomination Committee as defined in BSC Annex X-1. The Nomination Committee consists of the Chairman of the Board, an industry Director and a Director appointed under Section C4.1.3(c) of the BSC. The Terms of Reference of the Nomination Committee are approved by the BSC Panel. The BSC states that the Terms of Reference must:

- set out that the majority of the Board directors (excluding the Chairman) must have relevant electricity industry experience; and
- that at least two directors should be 'industry independent' members; meaning that in the last five years they must not have been a Panel Member or an employee, director or representative of a Party.

The Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference requires them to give due consideration to the [UK Corporate Governance Code](#) which sets out standards of good practice in relation to board leadership and effectiveness, remuneration, accountability and relations with shareholders. The UK Corporate Governance Code states that a Non-Executive Director (NED) is no longer considered independent if they have served on the Board for more than nine years from the date of their first election. An individual is therefore unable to go through the election process more than four times.

Section C4.2.1 provides that a Director shall hold office for a term of two years, but shall be eligible for reappointment on the expiry of this term. The BSC does not limit the number of times that a Director can be reappointed, however the normal expected term for a NED is six years. Taking the standards of best practice into account, after this time, the reasons for appointing a particular candidate would have to be clearly set out by the Nomination Committee in the Annual Report.



Where can I find more information about the Nomination Committee?

You can find further information on the duties and responsibilities of the Nomination Committee in its Terms of Reference [here](#).

Board Member expenses and remuneration

All Directors are entitled to recover reasonable costs and expenses including travel and accommodation costs. However, only industry independent Directors are remunerated for their time and effort as Directors on the Board. As set out in BSC Section C4.4.2, industry independent Directors' remuneration and benefits are decided by the Panel Chairman following consultation with the Panel.

Currently, the two industry independent Board Directors David Rigney and Gillian Wilmot are paid a flat rate fee and remunerated £26,000 per annum and £25,000 per annum¹ respectively, with an expected workload of two days' worth of effort per month. The terms and conditions for Board members are clearly stated in the advertisement for the role and in their terms of appointment.

What is the issue?

The Proposer of P303 believes that the current BSCCo Board Director provisions restrict the pool of candidates who may apply, with the absence of remuneration for industry directors and the requirement of a five year gap in the definition of an industry independent director.

There are two elements that the Proposer is seeking to address with the aim of increasing the pool of potential candidates:

Firstly, the Proposer argues that the timescale in the current definition of an industry independent director of a five year gap since a Board member has been a Panel Member or an employee, director or representative of a Party is not necessary. It is not clear why there needs to be this gap rather than simply the requirement that a director is not currently a Panel Member or an employee, director or representative of a Party. Having this requirement again restricts the potential pool of candidates who may apply to fill a director position.

Secondly, the Proposer argues that the current lack of remuneration for industry members does not reflect the considerable time and effort that an industry member will need to commit in their capacity as a Board member. This lack of remuneration for time and effort may put off potential candidates to the role.

The Proposer also notes that it is possible that industry directors may not be employed, and whilst they may have the experience to be an industry Board member, they may not be encouraged to apply while there is an absence of remuneration, which again restricts the pool of suitable candidates to fill the positions.

Furthermore, the Proposer also believes that there is an inequality with the current situation, as the existence of remuneration for other industry independent directors reflects their value to the Board and the time and effort they commit. The role of a BSCCo Board director is a responsible and substantive one and the Proposer therefore argues that this effort should be reflected for all directors, as it may pose as a barrier for potential candidates who may wish to apply to fill a position.

Although considered during the discussions of [P281 'Change of BSCCo Board of Directors and Chairman'](#), the restriction in BSC Section C4.4 that only the industry independent directors shall be entitled to receive remuneration and benefits was not amended. Some



Where can I find more information on the current remuneration payable to all BSCCo Directors?

The remuneration and benefits payable to all BSCCo Directors can be found in the 'ELEXON Ltd Report and Financial statements' report at the following [link](#).

¹ The difference in remuneration accounts for David Rigney also being the Chairman of the Board's Audit Committee.

P281 Workgroup members had expressed the view that under the P281 arrangements, industry Board members should be remunerated, with the Nomination Committee Terms of Reference allowing some direction around pay, to ensure that Board members of the right calibre can be found (i.e. without the framework of Panel elections). However, the Group agreed that changes to Board remuneration arrangements were outside the scope of P281 and should be considered separately.

Overall, the P281 Workgroup agreed that no changes around Board remuneration arrangements should be made. However, the Panel and Workgroup highlighted that a separate change in this area could be progressed in the future. Similarly, the Authority decision letter on P281, whilst not explicitly commenting on remuneration, did not place any restrictions on a further modification being raised if it was considered that changes to other elements of the BSCCo Board arrangements would further contribute to the achievement of efficiency in the BSC.

3 Proposed Solution

P303 seeks to amend the current BSCCo Board Director provisions in BSC Section C with the aim of increasing the pool of potential candidates that may apply to fill a BSCCo Board Director position. To achieve this, P303 proposes the following two changes:

1) Five year industry independent gap requirement

The requirement of a five year gap since a Board member has been a Panel Member or an employee, director or representative of a Party for industry independent Directors should be removed and replaced with an obligation on the Nomination Committee to consider independence as part of the appointment process.

To help decide whether a potential candidate is suitably independent, the Nomination Committee should assess applicants' 'independence of mind' which goes further than the five year limitation. To do so, they should take into account three qualitative measures to ensure that an individual has suitably detached themselves from any previous allegiances:

- a candidate's current and past employment;
- any affiliations or interests; and
- any additional involvement such as consultancy.

Potential candidates should also submit a 'declaration of interest' to the Nomination Committee which should include any interests they hold outside of their current position, including memberships of organisations that might affect their position on the Board or shares and stock in industry organisations. This enables the Nomination Committee to be able to use its discretion and helps make a decision on whether somebody should be considered as either industry or industry independent.

2) Remuneration restriction

The current restriction that only industry independent directors can be remunerated should be removed. Instead, the existing arrangements that industry independent Directors are remunerated will remain but the Remuneration Committee will have the option to remunerate industry Directors.

Further details of the Workgroup's discussions on the proposed solution are outlined in section 7.



Where can I find more information about the Remuneration Committee?

You can find further information on the duties and responsibilities of the Remuneration Committee in its Terms of Reference [here](#).

During its discussions, the P303 Workgroup came up with a potential alternative solution. The potential alternative solution is identical to the proposed solution in respect of removing the requirement of a “five year industry gap” and replacing this with an obligation on the Nomination Committee to have the flexibility to consider independence as part of the appointment process.

However, the Alternative solution would maintain the existing arrangements that only industry independent Directors are remunerated. Further details of the Workgroup’s discussions on the alternative solution are outlined in section 7.

BSC Legal text

The proposed redlined changes to the BSC to deliver the P303 Proposed and Alternative solutions can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

A clause has been included in the proposed legal text to state that remuneration can only be paid to a Director appointed after 1 March 2015. This will allow the BSC amendment to come into effect as soon as possible (if it is approved by the Authority).

As part of its discussions, the Workgroup agreed that as part of the appointment process, in order for the Nomination Committee to be able to assess an individual’s independence, applicants should also submit a ‘declaration of interest’ similar to that of the [House of Commons Register of Members’ Interests](#). A reference has therefore been included in both the proposed and alternative legal texts to require the Nomination Committee to have regard to present or future business interests disclosed by nominees when determining whether a nominee is “suitably independent from the electricity industry”.

The P303 Workgroup also agreed that with the proposal to remove the five year industry gap for both the proposed and alternative solutions, new obligations should instead be placed on the Nomination Committee. They agreed that these should not explicitly be set out in the BSC itself but instead, included in updating the Nomination Committee’s Terms of Reference in time for the next round of BSCCo Board appointments.

The Workgroup therefore recommends to the BSC Panel that the following requirements should be considered when updating the Nomination Committee’s Terms of Reference as part of the implementation of P303 (if approved):

- An obligation should be placed on the Nomination Committee to use its discretion to assess independence as part of the appointment process;
- An explicit criteria of what the Nomination Committee should consider as part of the appointment process including a candidate’s current and past employment, any affiliations or interests; and any additional involvement such as consultancy;
- To counteract the removal of a five year industry gap, there should be guidance provided that in normal circumstances, an individual would not be considered for the role of an industry independent Director before a period of time (for example two years) since working in the industry.

The Workgroup agreed to be involved in the review process for updating the Nomination Committee’s Terms of Reference before they are submitted to the Panel for approval.

Further details of the Workgroup's discussions on updating the Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference are outlined in Section 7.

5 Impacts & Costs

Estimated central implementation costs of P303

The central implementation costs to implement P303 will be approximately £240 (1 man day) in ELEXON effort.

P303 impacts

Impact on BSC Parties and Party Agents

Party/Party Agent	Impact
BSC Parties	The proposed changes may impact who can sit on the BSCCo Board.

Impact on Transmission Company

There is no direct impact however the Transmission Company may have an interest in the governance of BSCCo.

Impact on BSCCo

Area of ELEXON	Impact
BSC Governance	The governance of ELEXON (as BSCCo) would be amended by P303.

Impact on BSC Systems and process

BSC System/Process	Impact
No impact.	

Impact on Code

Code Section	Impact
Section C	Changes will be required to implement the solution.

Recommended Implementation Date

The Workgroup recommends an Implementation Date for both the Proposed and Alternative solutions of:

- **28 November 2014** if an Authority decision is received on or before 14 November 2014; or
- **2 January 2015** if an Authority decision is received after 14 November 2014 but on or before 18 December 2014.

This proposed Implementation Date will enable the Nomination Committee to use the revised Terms of Reference for the next round of BSCCo Board appointments in time for the contract expiration date of two industry Directors on 1 March 2015.

In relation to the P303 Proposed solution, a clause will also be included in the P303 Proposed legal text which will state that remuneration will only be paid to a Director appointed after 1 March 2015. The proposed changes would therefore only apply to future applicants of a Board member position. This would include existing Board members who re-apply for their positions as part of an open appointment process when their current term ends. The new arrangements would therefore be included in the new contract, which would apply from the new date of appointment.

For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed changes would not apply to the existing Board members, including Board members whose terms are continued as reappointments. The current Board members applied for their roles under the terms and conditions set out at the time and so it would be unfair and inappropriate to amend these, taking into account that their positions would not have been openly advertised.

Further details of the Workgroup's discussions on the recommended Implementation Date are outlined in section 7.

The following section provides details on the P303 Workgroup discussions that led to the proposed and alternative solutions.

As background information, ELEXON informed the Group that in the previous BSCCo Board elections, there had been over 400 applications for the role of the non-industry NED but less than 15 applications for the industry Directors position. It was noted by the Workgroup members that more than 15 people approached the head-hunters for details on the industry Director position. ELEXON advised that the Workgroup should consider these statistics as part of its discussions.

Removal of the requirement of a five year gap

The Workgroup considered whether removing the requirement of a five year gap since a Board member has been a Panel member or an employee, director or representative of a Party would increase the pool of potential candidates applying and filling a BSCCo Board Director position.

Why have the current arrangements?

The Workgroup discussed the logic behind having industry independent Board members and why five years was deemed appropriate. A member noted that the aim of the Board NED structure was to bring independent expertise and view to the Board on specific matters, such as I.T procurement etc., whilst maintaining a distance from any specific industry Parties.

The Workgroup emphasised that the BSCCo Board structure is a unique model which largely differs from a 'normal' Board structure because of the nature of the company and its ownership. Workgroup members noted that the BSCCo Board is not responsible for doing things that 'normal' Boards would do such as finding ways of expanding the business.

The Workgroup noted that the requirement for the Nomination Committee to appoint Board members had been created under P281 in order to place more transparency around Board appointments. It was the expectation that the Nomination Committee would appoint industry independent Directors that have the required skills and knowledge that the Board may be missing at that particular time. Similarly, the Nomination Committee should also be responsible for appointing relevant experts who have the required experience and expertise within the electricity industry.

The Group also noted that P281 introduced the requirement of a five year gap before an individual could be considered independent. The Group discussed the P281 Workgroup's view that the five year gap was a sufficient amount of time for an individual to no longer have a perceived bias towards a party and that any built up allegiances in the past would be irrelevant after a five year gap. Therefore the individual concerned would be considered independent of industry at this point.

Establishing independence

Role of Nomination Committee

The Workgroup noted the P281 Workgroup's logic for a five year requirement but overall agreed that this is an arbitrary number. The Group therefore considered whether the Nomination Committee should have more flexibility around distinguishing whether a candidate is suitably independent rather than relying on the five year requirement introduced by P281.

Members of the Workgroup suggested that an obligation is placed on the Nomination Committee to assess potential applicants' 'independence of mind'. It was believed that this allowed discretion where a suitable candidate may have been out of the industry for four years but may be more suitable for the role than someone who has been out of the industry for six years (for example).

The Workgroup agreed that in order to be able to assess an individual's independence, applicants should also submit a 'declaration of interest' similar to that of the House of Commons Register of Members' Interests which allows MPs to declare any interests that they hold outside of Parliament. These interests include outside jobs or consultancy work, and gifts or membership of organisations that might affect their position in Parliament. ELEXON advised that provisions under the [Companies Act 2006](#) place an obligation on Directors regarding actual or potential conflicts of interest, and include a duty to declare to the Board the nature and extent of any interest in a proposed transaction.

The Workgroup agreed that including this 'declaration of interest' will make the process more flexible so that the Nomination Committee takes this independence and the applicant's affiliation into account, which will include extra factors such as shareholdings. The Workgroup also noted that if an individual had a particular conflict of interest, the Chairman could ask the individual to do something about the conflict before agreeing to take up a position on the Board.

Several members queried whether asking the Nomination Committee to assess 'independence of mind' causes any Human Resources (HR) issues. A Workgroup member noted that as the Chairman of the company set up under the Smart Energy Code (SEC) he understood that when employing an independent Director, there were no HR issues for 'independence of mind' as they were just being asked to take various aspects into account when choosing a suitable candidate.

Members of the Group agreed that it is not ambiguous for the Nomination Committee to assess 'independence of mind' and should instead be considering additional criteria that an individual has to fulfil. They argued that a candidate still has to be of sufficient quality and meet the criteria for the Nomination Committee to be able use its discretion and make a decision on whether somebody is industry or industry independent. The majority of the Workgroup therefore agreed that a similar approach to the SEC should be taken for the BSCCo Board and subsequently, the five year requirement should be removed.

However, two Workgroup members argued that a specific clear timescale, such as two years (for example), is required. They believed that a specific timescale provided a 'black and white' requirement removing any potential confusion.

It was also noted that without a clear date requirement an individual could in theory apply for both industry and industry independent Board Director positions. For example, an individual could have worked in the industry for 30 years, leave their role and the next day be available to be an industry independent director. However, a Workgroup member highlighted that it is about getting the right person for the role rather than being

restrictive. They noted that allowing the Nominations Committee flexibility to do the job industry expects of them, will make it more likely that the right person will be appointed into the position. They also noted that the requirements of the Nomination Committee to consider independence will resolve this concern.

One Workgroup member suggested updating the definition 'industry', as they believed that it is currently prescriptive and could therefore restrict potential candidates such as consultants from applying any further. Members of the Workgroup believed that ideally, an industry member would be an expert in their field and have independent judgement. The Workgroup noted that this had previously been discussed under P281 and agreed it would be sufficient to allow the Nomination Committee to use their judgment rather than extending this definition even further and causing confusion.

Length of service on the Board

As noted in section 1, Section C4.2.1 provides that a Director shall hold office for a term of two years, but shall be eligible for reappointment on the expiry of this term. The BSC does not limit the number of times that a Director can be reappointed, however the normal expected term for a NED is six years. The terms of reference of the Nomination Committee require them to give due consideration to the provisions of the UK Corporate Governance Code so after this time, the reasons for appointing a particular candidate would have to be clearly set out by the Nomination Committee in the Annual Report.

One member argued that a timescale should be placed in the BSC so that there is a requirement detailing how long a Director can sit on the BSCCo Board. They were concerned that an individual could serve on the Board for two years as an industry Director, leave their position and then become re-appointed as an independent Director a few days later. The majority of the Workgroup agreed that the Nomination Committee would see through this when considering an individual's 'independence of mind' and that taking good corporate governance into account, it would be assumed that the individual had lost their independence after nine years.

Members of the Group agreed that consideration should be taken when reappointing Board members who have served longer than six years and that no Board member should serve longer than nine years as per the UK Corporate Governance Code (as detailed in section 2). Some members of the Group highlighted that they should not 'pick and choose' when it should and should not use the UK Corporate Governance Code. One member noted that following the [Knight Report](#), the ELEXON Governance is currently under review to bring it in line, wherever possible, with best practice as set out in the UK Corporate Governance Code. The Group therefore agreed that it would not interfere with the work being done on the ELEXON Governance review but agreed with the principle that a Board Member should not be able to be re-appointed more than nine times.

A respondent to the P303 Assessment Consultation commented that not allowing anyone to be on the BSCCo Board for more than 10 years should be included in the drafting for this Modification. The Workgroup agreed that this should be included in the Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference.

Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference

The majority of respondents to the P303 Assessment Consultation agreed with the majority of the P303 Workgroup that a five year requirement is too prescriptive as it may

unnecessarily exclude exceptional candidates from joining the Board. Instead, respondents agreed that an obligation should be placed on the Nomination Committee to use its discretion to assess independence as part of the appointment process.

One respondent commented that they would like an express provision for the Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference to be reviewed so that an obligation is placed on the Nomination Committee to apply discretion as part of the appointment process. In addition, the Workgroup agreed that the following should be considered when updating the Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference: a candidate's current and past employment, any affiliations or interests; and any additional involvement such as consultancy (see page 8).

One respondent was concerned that there could be a situation where two or more people from the same employer or its affiliate(s), whether Panel Members, or Board Members, or any combination thereof, could serve simultaneously and similarly, another respondent wanted to eliminate the possibility that a Director could serve as an industry Director and then come back a month later and serve as a non-industry Director. For visibility and assurance for BSC Parties, the majority of the Workgroup agreed that the five year requirement should be removed from the BSC but that guidance should be included in the Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference to the effect that in normal circumstances, an individual would not be considered for the role of an industry independent Director before a period of time (for example two years) since working in the industry.

ELEXON advised that similarly to P281, the Panel will agree the revised Terms of Reference for the Nomination Committee following an Authority decision on the Modification (i.e. if P303 is approved). ELEXON agreed that the P303 Workgroup will be included in the review process of these Terms of Reference before they are submitted to the Panel for approval.

Remuneration of industry directors

The Workgroup considered whether removing the restriction that only industry independent directors can be awarded remuneration would increase the pool of potential candidates that may fill a BSCCo Board Director position.

A Group member asked what was the problem that this Modification was trying to address. The Proposer explained that it was seeking to try and attract and retain the best possible Board candidates whilst also removing a discrepancy between the two categories of Board members who both put in equal time and effort.

The Group questioned whether this meant that the current, or previous, Board members were not acceptable candidates; a view they strongly disagreed with.

A Workgroup member queried whether a Director had resigned from the BSCCo Board in the past because of a lack of remuneration. ELEXON advised that this has never been the case, however, the recruitment of industry Directors has only occurred recently so it may become an issue when industry directors come up for reappointment.

Members of the Workgroup commented that irrespective of remuneration, an individual has a fiduciary duty as a co-Director on the Board to properly devote the time and commitment required to discharge their roles effectively. They agreed that if somebody is not prepared to do so then they should not apply for the role. The Group commented that

including remuneration in the package should not be the only incentive for an individual to devote the necessary time and effort to the role.

A Workgroup member queried whether 'benefits' in the BSC refers to travel expenses, accommodation etc. or whether they refer to benefits such as pension, health insurance, car etc. ELEXON confirmed that benefits in the BSC refer to any benefit other than financial remuneration (e.g. paying for an annual Board dinner, which would not be a reimbursement if the Board members do not fund this individually). ELEXON advised that no NED is entitled to employee benefits such as pensions as they are not considered employees of ELEXON. This would also have been highlighted in the advert for the position.

Discrepancy?

The question was put to the Group as to why the perceived discrepancy exists in the Board. It was asked whether it is acceptable to pay a Non-Executive Director if their other employment is, for example, in the banking sector; and yet not right to pay a Non-Executive Director because their other employment is in the electricity industry.

A Group member responded that non industry NEDs were paid in order to attract them to the post. This was particularly relevant where you are trying to attract the best candidate with, for example, procurement experience as this, along with IT experience, is a key part of the BSCCo role. However, it was felt that the industry NEDs did not seek financial reward but the kudos that being a Director of an organisation would bring, and the ability to provide industry representation when helping the organisation move forward. It was felt that the ability to return something to the industry was the reward industry directors sought over remuneration.

A member noted that the decision-making on BSC and industry matters is largely down to the BSC Panel and not BSCCo Board who are there for the more general day to day running of the business.

The Proposer questioned whether or not this meant that NEDs should be equally remunerated for their time and effort in line with the UK Governance Code. A member responded that since ELEXON is not considered a standard corporate model, perhaps the standard UK Governance Code on remuneration should not apply.

A Workgroup member highlighted that the industry representatives may not wish to be remunerated as it may cause more difficulties for their employer. Employers might not allow an individual to participate in a role outside of what they are contracted for if it is a paid position that does not bring direct benefit for the organisation. Similarly, if an individual does choose to be a NED for somewhere else, an employer will often deduct their time away from their salary. This can often be more hassle than it is worth for the individual.

It was noted that small Suppliers may not have the resource to be able to allow their employees to participate in the Board so remunerating may help them; unlike larger companies who could perhaps afford to support this resource without much effort.

Timing of this Modification

One member was concerned with the timing of the Modification and questioned why it is being raised now when the electricity industry is currently at the forefront of media

speculation in relation to price sensitive issues such as rising bills. The Workgroup member highlighted that ELEXON suddenly remunerating all its Board Directors may not be perceived in a positive light given the current climate and noted that the perception of the industry is important to consider.

The Proposer responded that the Modification had been raised at this time because the Board had recently had a new Chair and new members who had looked at the structure of the Board and could not understand the discrepancy in remuneration when all Board members put in equal time and effort.

The Group asked for clarity around the salaries of the Board members. As noted in section one above, the remuneration to Board members is circa £25K per Director for an average of around 24 days a year.

Unintended consequences

The Workgroup expressed concerns that remunerating all Board members may have unintended consequences. These were:

- The expansion of remuneration. A Workgroup member expressed concern as to where the line of remuneration would stop if all BSCCo Board Director positions included remuneration. They noted that a potential argument could subsequently be raised for all BSC Panel members and Panel Committee members to also be remunerated. ELEXON noted that this is outside the scope of the P303 Modification and highlighted the difference between a NED performing a recognised employable function on the Board and the Panel who, as noted above, make industry impacting decisions and have industry members who have joined to help shape the market and regulations.
- P303 would be limiting the talent pool. Remuneration may act as a barrier and restrict the number of candidates who apply even further due to issues with employee release and complications over individual pay and contracts.
- The timing of this change could lead to bad publicity as Board members are remunerated at a time when the industry spending is under scrutiny.
- The quality of candidates may go down as "serial NEDs" apply for the posts simply because there is remuneration attached rather than industry members who want to return something to the industry.

Overall, the Workgroup unanimously agreed that the restriction that only industry independent directors can be awarded remuneration should remain. However, the Proposer disagreed and was still of the opinion that the terms of the appointment should include the option of remuneration so that the applicant has the choice to accept or decline remuneration as part of their contract. This therefore remains included as part of the proposed solution.

As a separate request, the Workgroup asked that after the next appointment process, the number of applicants for the non-industry and industry NED roles should be fed back to the Panel as a key performance measure. This is so the new statistics can be compared to the previous appointment numbers prior to the implementation of P303.

Board Members' responses

As part of the assessment of P303, the current BSCCo Board Members were contacted and asked to provide their views on the P303 proposal to give all BSCCo Directors the option to be remunerated. We are very appreciative of the responses we received from the Chairman of the Board, two industry Directors, one non-industry Director as we believe these will be very useful to publish alongside this Assessment Report.

The majority of the Directors agreed that all BSCCo Board Directors should have the option of remuneration. You can find the full collated Board Members' responses in Attachment D.

Implementation Approach

Workgroup's consideration of the Implementation Date

The Workgroup initially recommended an Implementation Date of 1 March 2015 as this is in line with the date of the next BSCCo Board appointment as the term of two industry Directors are due to expire on this date.

The Workgroup unanimously agreed that the proposed changes would only apply to future applicants of a Board member position. This would include existing Board members who re-apply for their positions as part of an open appointment process when their current term ends. The new arrangements would therefore be included in the new contract which would apply from the new date of appointment.

However, the Workgroup unanimously agreed that the proposed changes would not apply to the existing Board members, including Board members whose terms are continued as reappointments. They noted that as the current Board members applied for their roles under the terms and conditions set out at the time; it would therefore not be appropriate to amend these. The Workgroup agreed that this would be the fairest way of managing the process, taking into account that their positions would not have been openly advertised.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views of the proposed Implementation Date

The majority of respondents to the P303 Assessment Consultation agreed with the proposed Implementation Date of 1 March 2015, noting that it is appropriate to align the proposed changes with the next round of BSCCo Board appointments.

Only one respondent disagreed with the proposed Implementation Date commenting that although the change does not require a long lead time, it might be best to delay the implementation to have more rounds of appointments and statistics to make judgements on. The Workgroup agreed that this would not be a sensible approach to take as it would involve withdrawing P303 and starting the Modification again once the results of the next round of appointments had been published. The Workgroup noted that the Panel would be informed of the new statistics after the next round of BSCCo Board appointments as a key performance measure so they will be able to see whether P303 (if approved) has made a difference to the number of candidates who apply.

The Workgroup also noted a Board Member's agreement with the proposed Implementation Date in their response to questions on the option of remuneration.

Changes to the Implementation approach

Although the proposed Implementation Date of 1 March 2015 aligns with the next round of BSCCo Board appointments, the Workgroup agreed that the proposed changes would need to be implemented and take effect before this date. This is so the Nomination Committee is able to use its revised Terms of Reference as part of the appointment process and so the advertisement for the available BSCCo Board Director positions is updated with the new terms of appointment (e.g. including remuneration after 1 March 2015 if the P303 proposed solution is approved).

The Workgroup therefore recommends an Implementation Date for P303 proposed and alternative solutions of:

- **28 November 2014** if an Authority decision is received on or before 14 November 2014; or
- **2 January 2015** if an Authority decision is received after 14 November 2014 but on or before 18 December 2014.

The Workgroup also agreed that a clause would need to be included in the P303 proposed legal text to state that remuneration will not take effect until after 1 March 2015.

Workgroup's views against the Applicable BSC Objectives

The Workgroup provided its views on both the P303 proposed and alternative solutions against the Applicable BSC Objectives. The majority of the Workgroup agreed that the P303 alternative solution would overall better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives compared with both the existing baseline and the proposed solution. The Proposer recognised that the alternative solution is better than the current baseline but believed that the P303 proposed solution is better than the alternative solution.

The following table contains the Workgroup's views against each of the Applicable BSC Objectives for both the proposed and alternative solutions:

Does P303 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?		
Obj	Proposed Solution	Alternative Solution
(a)	• Neutral – no impact.	• Neutral – no impact.
(b)	• Neutral – no impact.	• Neutral – no impact.
(c)	• Neutral – no impact.	• Neutral – no impact.
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (Proposer): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensures that all members are properly able to devote the time and commitment required to discharge their roles effectively through being appropriately remunerated – Remove the current discrimination between industry and non-industry Directors – Changing the five year requirement around industry independent directors would also expand the number of suitably qualified candidates eligible to become Board members – Would increase the pool of potential candidates for the non-industry post and the number of potential candidates who apply for the positions • No (majority): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Detrimental impact to BSC Parties of a cost being introduced – No certainty on improving function of BSCCo – if individuals are prepared to step up and do the job then there should be no reason why remuneration would encourage this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (Proposer) - benefit in removing 5 year requirement (for reasons under proposed) outweighs detrimental impact of lack of remuneration restricting the potential pool of candidates who may apply • Yes (majority): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – More sophistication and useful flexibility as it gives the Nomination Committee more discretion – Does not allow anyone to be on the BSCCo Board for more than 10 years – Minimal one-off implementation cost to amend the BSC – Allows exceptional candidates to move from one role to another • No (minority): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Timing - flexibility does not help but instead causes confusion without a specific timeframe – suggest two years instead of five



What are the Applicable BSC Objectives?

(a) The efficient discharge by the Transmission Company of the obligations imposed upon it by the Transmission Licence

(b) The efficient, economic and co-ordinated operation of the National Electricity Transmission System

(c) Promoting effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as consistent therewith) promoting such competition in the sale and purchase of electricity

(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation of the balancing and settlement arrangements

(e) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency [for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators]

(f) Implementing and administering the arrangements for the operation of contracts for difference and arrangements that facilitate the operation of a capacity market pursuant to EMR legislation

P303
Final Modification Report

9 October 2014

Version 1.0

Page 20 of 34

© ELEXON Limited 2014

Does P303 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?		
Obj	Proposed Solution	Alternative Solution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remuneration may restrict the pool of candidates who apply even further – no certainty that it will increase • No (minority): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Wording could be taken to be insulting to current Board as it implies that what is happening now is not good enough – Timing - flexibility does not help but instead causes confusion without a specific timeframe – suggest two years instead of five 	
(e)	• Neutral – no impact.	• Neutral – no impact.
(f)	• Neutral – no impact.	• Neutral – no impact.

The majority of the respondents to the P303 Assessment Consultation agreed with the Workgroup's majority view that the P303 alternative solution is better than the P303 proposed solution. The reasons provided by these respondents are consistent with those of the Workgroup. The majority of respondents agreed that they do not support the remuneration of industry Directors as they believe that the potential 'unintended consequences' would outweigh any benefits advocated.

Only one respondent disagreed that the P303 alternative solution is better than the P303 proposed solution for the reasons identified by the Proposer of the P303 Modification.

Assessment Consultation respondents' views against the Applicable BSC Objectives

The majority of the respondents to the P303 Assessment Consultation agreed with the Workgroup's majority view that the P303 alternative solution does better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) than the current baseline. The reasons provided by these respondents are broadly consistent with those of the Workgroup.

A minority of respondents disagreed, noting that to agree that removing the five year restriction better facilitates Applicable BSC Objective (d) would be to criticise the current Board. They were not comfortable with this inference as they believed that this would be indicating that better candidates could have been found if this change had come in sooner. The same respondent also commented that removing this five year restriction would make even more people eligible for the non-industry NED roles which could potentially detract from the pool of candidates.

Another respondent who disagreed also commented that the Nomination Committee should already have flexibility to consider independence as part of the appointment process. They therefore noted that this is not a 'new' obligation and so will not better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) than the current baseline. The Workgroup noted the respondent's concern but agreed that this would be a 'new' obligation as the Nomination

Committee does not currently have the flexibility to use its complete discretion because of the restriction of a five year gap.

One respondent considered that there is a neutral impact on Applicable BSC Objective (d) but a detrimental impact on Applicable BSC Objective (c). They noted that although they recognise that the individuals concerned are obliged to act with impartiality, suspicion of bias would be likely to remain if for example, a serving employee of a BSC Party and a recently retired employee of that same BSC Party enjoyed simultaneous or overlapping appointments to the Board, it might serve to discourage new entrants if they perceive bias in the decisions of this key market influencer. The Workgroup noted the respondent's concerns but highlighted that Board members are acknowledged as a very selective group and that the Chairman does not fall into the situation described as the Chairman's appointment is approved by the Authority. The Workgroup highlighted that perception of bias is key.

A respondent to the P303 Assessment Consultation commented that to include additional transparency to the process, applicants should be asked to submit a declaration of interest to insure that any other roles, consultancy work, memberships or other areas that could affect their impartiality leading to conflict of interest could be addressed prior to the individual taking up the position. Following its discussions outlined in section 7, the Workgroup agreed that the BSCCo should maintain and make available to the Nomination Committee a confidential register of declarations of financial interests for applicants and successful Board members. Members of the Workgroup agreed that reference to express criteria for declaring financial interests should be added to the BSC. This has therefore been incorporated into the legal text to require the Nomination Committee to have regard to present or future business interests disclosed by nominees when determining whether a nominee is "suitably independent from the electricity industry".

You can find the full responses to the Assessment Consultation in Attachment C.

Overall the majority of the P303 Workgroup believes that the P303 alternative solution does better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) and therefore recommends that the P303 alternative solution is approved.

Panel's initial discussions

Number of candidates

A Panel member queried whether the Workgroup had looked at the number of applicants who had applied for the previous BSCCo Board Director positions. ELEXON advised that the Workgroup had taken this into account as part of its discussions, noting that there had been over 400 applications for the role of the non-industry NED but less than 15 applications for the industry Director position. The Panel agreed that all NEDs have a wide range of experience that they can bring to the role and so if the Board is unable to find an individual with the suitable calibre, then they should not appoint them. The ELEXON Chief Executive suggested that ELEXON had been fortunate so far in the appointments made under the existing process.

Timing

A Panel member proposed that neither the P303 Proposed solution nor P303 Alternative solution should be progressed but that they should instead be considered as part of the current ELEXON Governance Review. Another member suggested waiting a year until after the next round of BSCCo Board appointments to ensure that any problems are highlighted prior to any amendments being made to the current provisions. They also noted that the five year gap and remuneration requirements may be included in the review and that this Modification may be trying to address an issue that does not exist.

The Chairman noted that the intention of the P303 Modification was to have a resolution in time for the next round of BSCCo Board appointments on 1 March 2015.

Remuneration

The Chairman noted the current BSCCo Board Directors' views that in principle, all BSCCo Directors should have the option to be remunerated. A Panel member agreed that the principles of industry and non-industry Directors are the same and so they should be remunerated as such. A Panel member posed the question as to if they were to start from scratch, whether all BSCCo Board Directors would be remunerated. They commented that it would be good governance to do so.

Another Panel member also agreed with this view and noted that it is discriminatory, which can cause resentment and may not encourage an individual to work as hard if some Directors are appropriately remunerated and some are not.

Some Panel members highlighted the unintended consequence of where the line of remuneration would stop if all BSCCo Board Director positions included remuneration, i.e. that an argument could be made for remuneration to extend to Panel members and Panel Committee members, positions that are not currently remunerated. One member noted that as a Panel member and Panel Committee member they are not remunerated but instead took on the role in order to be involved in making industry impacting decisions. They commented that if an individual who is not remunerated resents their role and so does not devote the time and commitment required, they should not apply or take on the role.

Panel's initial views against the Applicable BSC Objectives

Proposed vs current baseline

The **majority** of the Panel agrees with the Workgroup's majority view that the P303 Proposed solution **does not** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) compared with the existing baseline for the following reasons:

Proposed solution		
Obj	Does better facilitate (minority)	Does not better facilitate (majority)
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ensures that all members are properly able to devote the time and commitment required to discharge their roles effectively through being appropriately remunerated- Removes the current discrimination between industry and non-industry Directors- More sophistication and useful flexibility as it gives the Nomination Committee more discretion- Would increase the pool of potential candidates who apply for the positions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Board members should devote the appropriate time and effort so there is no reason why remuneration would encourage this further- There is no certainty that remuneration will increase the pool of candidates who apply- Unintended consequence as it raises questions about remuneration of Panel and Panel Committees- The Modification is attempting to address an issue that does not exist



Recommendation

The majority of the BSC Panel initially recommends the approval of P303 Alternative solution.

Alternative vs current baseline

The **majority** of the Panel agrees with the Workgroup's majority view that P303 Alternative solution **does** better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) compared with the existing baseline. The views of the Panel are in line with the views of the Workgroup and the responses received to the P303 Assessment Consultation as follows:

Alternative solution		
Obj	Does better facilitate (majority)	Does not better facilitate (minority)
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More sophistication and useful flexibility as it gives the Nomination Committee more discretion- Would increase the pool of potential candidates who apply for the positions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The Modification is attempting to address an issue that does not exist

The **majority** of the Panel agrees with the Workgroup's majority view that P303 Alternative solution is better than the P303 Proposed Modification.

Panel's views on draft legal text

The **majority** of the Panel agrees with the Workgroup's view that the proposed changes to the BSC in Attachments A and B deliver the intention of the P303 proposed and alternative solutions.

One Panel member disagreed with the proposed changes to the draft legal text as although the text covers 'independence', the necessary skills and experience of a BSCCo Board Director are not mentioned. ELEXON advised that although this is not explicitly included in the BSC itself, these will be detailed in the Nomination Committee's Terms of Reference which will be updated as part of the implementation of P303.

Panel's views on the proposed Implementation Date

The Panel **unanimously** agrees with the proposed Implementation Date for the P303 Proposed and Alternative Modifications as detailed in Section 6.

10 Report Phase Consultation Responses

This section summarises the responses to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation on its initial recommendations. You can find the full industry responses in Attachment E. In addition, the BSCCo Board has provided a collective response to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation. This can be found in Attachment F.

Summary of P303 Report Phase Consultation Responses

Question	Yes	No	Neutral/ No Comment	Other
Do you agree with the Panel's initial majority recommendation that P303 Proposed Modification does not better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives and should therefore be rejected?	5	1	0	0
Do you agree with the Panel's initial majority recommendation that P303 Alternative Modification does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives and should therefore be approved?	5	1	0	0
Do you agree with the Panel's initial majority recommendation that P303 Alternative Modification is better than P303 Proposed Modification?	5	1	0	0
Do you agree with the Panel's initial majority view that the redlined changes to the BSC deliver the intention of the P303 Proposed and Alternative solutions?	5	0	1	0
Do you agree with the Panel's recommended Implementation Date?	6	0	0	0
Do you have any further comments on P303?	1	5	0	0

Respondents' views against the Applicable BSC Objectives

Proposed vs current baseline

A majority of respondents to the Report Phase Consultation agreed with the Panel's initial majority view that the P303 Proposed solution does not better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) and should therefore be rejected. The reasons provided by these respondents are in line with the views expressed by the Workgroup and the Panel.

Only one respondent disagreed (this respondent was also the Proposer of the Modification). This respondent provided a substantial response but did not identify any new arguments. However, they provided some additional clarification on their views against the Applicable BSC Objectives, as set out in Section 8.

The respondent's clarifications of the Proposer's views against the Applicable BSC Objectives in comparing the P303 Proposed Modification with the existing baseline, all against Objective (d), are:

- Further to the benefits associated with Board members being appropriately remunerated, they contended there would be benefit of members being demonstrably financially independent from their employer in the time committed to the role;
- Further to removing the current discrimination between industry and non-industry Directors, they contended this discrimination does not appropriately reflect the position that they are subject to the same fiduciary and code duties;
- Further to increasing the pool of candidates and the number of applicants, they contended that remuneration would address the significant asymmetry experienced during the last recruitment round to the Board where 400 applications were received for the role of the non-industry NED but less than 15 applications were received for the industry Director position;
- They contended that an additional benefit is that the P303 proposed solution would align the BSC with relevant parameters of the UK Corporate Governance Code, which underpin good practice and by implication, efficiency in governance;
- They contended that an additional benefit is that the small direct cost to implement the proposed changes would be quickly offset by the indirect benefits of an increased calibre Board acting with true independence; and
- They contended that an additional benefit is that the change is not intended to preclude any industry applicant to the Board waiving an entitlement to remuneration, but they consider such entitlement necessary to remove financial dependence and ensure independence.

Alternative vs current baseline

A majority of respondents agreed with the Panel's initial majority view that the P303 Alternative solution does better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) and should therefore be approved. The reasons provided by these respondents are in line with the views expressed by the Workgroup and the Panel.

One respondent disagreed, commenting that they do not believe that the five year restriction is detrimental to the Applicable BSC Objectives nor that removing the restriction would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives. Another respondent commented that although in their view the implementation of P303 proposed solution would be preferable, they acknowledge that the implementation of the P303 alternative solution would represent a small improvement to the current arrangements.

Proposed vs Alternative

A majority of respondents to the Report Phase Consultation overall agreed with the Panel's initial majority view that the P303 Alternative Modification is better than the P303 Proposed Modification. The reasons provided by these respondents are in line with the views expressed by the Workgroup and the Panel.

Only one respondent (this respondent was also the Proposer of the Modification) disagreed that the P303 Alternative solution is better than the P303 Proposed solution, for the reasons identified by the Proposer of the P303 Modification. In particular, they argued that the current arrangements are not consistent with the UK Code of Good Corporate

Governance and that remunerating both industry and non-industry directors will ensure that all directors are able to commit the required time to their role and increase the potential pool of candidates for the industry role. The respondent's view was that the P303 Proposed Modification would address these deficiencies while the P303 Alternative would not.

BSCCo Board Members' response

The BSCCo Board has also provided a collective response to the Panel's Report Phase Consultation. The BSCCo Board agree that the P303 Proposed solution does better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) and should therefore be approved. They believe that the P303 Alternative solution falls short of delivering the benefits that they anticipate will be achieved by implementing the P303 Proposed solution. You can find the full collective response in Attachment F.

Respondents' views on the draft legal text

All respondents to the Report Phase Consultation that provided a view on this question agreed that the proposed changes to the BSC will deliver the intention of both the P303 Proposed and Alternative solutions.

Respondents' views on the proposed Implementation Date

Respondents unanimously agreed with the proposed Implementation Date to implement the proposed changes, if approved, in time for the next round of BSCCo Board appointments.

Respondents' other views and comments on P303

Only one respondent provided an additional comment on P303. They suggested that the issues of remuneration and categorisation of Board members are better addressed as part of wider reform of the ELEXON governance arrangements currently under discussion, and as recommended in the 2013 Knight Report.

Panel's final discussions

Number of candidates

A Panel member noted that less than 15 applications were received for the industry Director position during the previous appointment process, compared with over 400 applications for the non-industry Director position. However, the Panel member highlighted that this difference was partly down to the application of the five year rule to those interested in the position. The difference was therefore not necessarily down to the absence of remuneration and removing the five year restriction would increase the number of candidates who are able to apply for positions. Another Panel member argued that less emphasis should be applied to the recruitment process when considering the merits of remuneration, and more should be placed on the time and effort an individual puts into their role on the BSCCo Board.

Remuneration

The Chairman highlighted the importance of the collective response received on behalf of each current BSCCo Board Director (both industry and non-industry), as the P303 Modification is directly relevant to them. The Chairman noted the current BSCCo Board Directors' views that all BSCCo Directors should have the option to be remunerated. The BSCCo Board therefore unanimously agrees that the P303 Proposed Modification does better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d) and should therefore be approved.

A Panel member noted that the Panel has a duty to take the Board letter seriously and agreed that the responsibilities of industry and non-industry Directors are the same and so they should be remunerated as such. The member believed that appropriate remuneration drives performance, and commented that they found the manner in which the Panel can fetter the Board's ability to govern itself to be unsatisfactory. Another Panel member agreed with this view and noted that it is unfair to differentiate between the roles, which could cause tensions and could affect the effort that an individual applies to their role.

A Panel member questioned the validity of the BSCCo Board's use of the UK Corporate Governance Code in the arguments set out in their collective response, suggesting that the application of the principles was selective. The same Panel member emphasised that all NEDs were aware of the Terms of Reference and remuneration package they signed up for as part of their appointment process. They noted that an individual should not have applied or taken on the role if they were unhappy with the conditions stipulated. Another Panel member agreed and highlighted that all NEDs have a legal duty and that this should not depend on whether they are remunerated.

Another Panel member reiterated the risk of an unintended consequence with respect to uncertainty over where remuneration would stop if all BSCCo Board Director positions included remuneration, i.e. that an argument could be made for remuneration to extend to others who work in BSC processes such as Panel members and Panel Committee members, positions that are not currently remunerated.

Timing

Some Panel members emphasised the unintended consequence also identified by the P303 Workgroup of the timing of this Modification. They were concerned that there would be adverse publicity at a time where the industry spending is already under scrutiny.

A Panel member also reiterated their previous initial view that neither the P303 Proposed solution nor P303 Alternative solution should be progressed but that they should instead be considered as part of the current ELEXON Governance Review.

The Chairman again noted that the intention of the P303 Modification was to have a resolution in time for the next round of BSCCo Board appointments on 1 March 2015.



Panel's final views against the Applicable BSC Objectives

Proposed vs current baseline

Overall the majority of the Panel agreed that P303 Proposed solution would not better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d). The views of these Members are in line with those previously expressed by Workgroup members (in Section 7) and Report Phase Consultation respondents (in Section 10) who felt P303 Proposed solution did not better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives.

The majority of the Panel believes that P303 Proposed solution does not better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives, and therefore recommends that the P303 Proposed solution should be rejected.

Alternative vs current baseline

Overall the majority of the Panel agreed that P303 Alternative solution would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d). The views of these Members are in line with those previously expressed by Workgroup members (in Section 7) and Report Phase Consultation respondents (in Section 10) who felt P303 Alternative solution did better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives.

The majority of the Panel believes that P303 Alternative solution does better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d), and therefore recommends that the P303 Alternative solution should be approved.

Proposed vs Alternative

The majority of the Panel agreed that the P303 Alternative solution **is better** than the P303 Proposed solution for the reasons expressed by the Workgroup and those received to both the Assessment Consultation and Report Phase Consultation.

Panel's final views on legal text

The Panel **unanimously** approved the proposed changes to the BSC for the P303 Proposed and Alternative solutions. These can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

Recommendation

The BSC Panel recommends that P303 Alternative solution should be approved.

Panel's final views on the proposed Implementation Date

The Panel **unanimously** agreed with the proposed Implementation Date for the P303 Proposed and Alternative Modifications as detailed in Section 6.

12 Recommendations

The BSC Panel recommends to the Authority:

- That the P303 Alternative Modification should be **approved** and that the P303 Proposed Modification should be **rejected**;
- An Implementation Date for the P303 Proposed Modification of:
 - 28 November 2014 if an Authority decision is received on or before 14 November 2014; or
 - 2 January 2015 if an Authority decision is received after 14 November 2014 but on or before 18 December 2014;
- An Implementation Date for the P303 Alternative Modification of:
 - 28 November 2014 if an Authority decision is received on or before 14 November 2014; or
 - 2 January 2015 if an Authority decision is received after 14 November 2014 but on or before 18 December 2014;
- The BSC legal text for the P303 Proposed Modification; and
- The BSC legal text for the P303 Alternative Modification.

Appendix 1: Workgroup Details

Workgroup's Terms of Reference

Specific areas set by the BSC Panel in the P303 Terms of Reference

When should the proposed changes go live?

What are the impacts on the existing Board make up?

Terminology – should there be a new term for 'independent'?

Are there any Alternatives to stop the restriction of suitable candidates?

Does P303 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?

Assessment Procedure timetable

P303 Assessment Timetable

Event	Date
Panel submits P303 to Assessment Procedure	12 Jun 14
Workgroup Meeting 1	8 Jul 14
Assessment Procedure Consultation	28 Jul 14 – 18 Aug 14
Workgroup Meeting 2	27 Aug 14
Panel considers Workgroup's Assessment Report	11 Sep 14

Workgroup membership and attendance

P303 Workgroup Attendance

Name	Organisation	08 Jul 14	27 Aug 14
Members			
Adam Lattimore	ELEXON (<i>Chair</i>)	✓	✓
Claire Anthony	ELEXON (<i>Lead Analyst</i>)	✓	✓
Bill Bullen	Utilita (<i>Proposer</i>)	✗	✗
Adam Boorman	Cornwall Energy (<i>Proposer rep</i>)	✓	✓
Eric Graham	TMA	✓	✗
Andrew Colley	SSE	✓	✓
Joanna Alexander	SmartestEnergy	✓	✓
Garth Graham	SSE	✓	✓
Esther Sutton	E.ON	☎	✓
Attendees			
Tim Kerr	ELEXON (<i>Lead Lawyer</i>)	✓	✓
Lisa Charlesworth	Ofgem	✗	✓

P303
Final Modification Report

9 October 2014

Version 1.0

Page 33 of 34

© ELEXON Limited 2014

Appendix 2: Glossary & References

Acronyms

Acronyms used in this document are listed in the table below.

Glossary of Defined Terms	
Acronym	Definition
BSC	Balancing and Settlement Code
BSCCo	Balancing and Settlement Code Company
HR	Human Resources
IWA	Initial Written Assessment
NED	Non-Executive Director
SEC	Smart Energy Code

External links

A summary of all hyperlinks used in this document are listed in the table below. All external documents and URL links listed are correct as of the date of this document.

External Links		
Page(s)	Description	URL
4	UK Corporate Governance Code	https://www.frc.org.uk/Our-Work/Codes-Standards/Corporate-governance/UK-Corporate-Governance-Code.aspx
4	Nomination Committee Terms of Reference webpage on ELEXON website	http://www.elexon.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Nomination-Committee_Terms-Of-Reference_1.0.pdf
5	ELEXON Report and Financial statements on ELEXON website	http://www.elexon.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/ELXON_Limited_Report_and-Financial_Statements_YE-31-March-2014-VFINAL.pdf
5	P281 webpage on ELEXON website	http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p281-change-of-bscco-board-of-directors-chairman/
7	Remuneration Committee Terms of Reference webpage on ELEXON website	http://www.elexon.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/ELEXON-Limited-Remuneration-Committee_1.0.pdf
8	House of Commons Register of Members' Interests webpage	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmregmem.htm
13	Companies Act 2006 webpage	http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/contents
14	Bill Knight Report webpage on ELEXON website	http://www.elexon.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/The-Governance-of-ELEXON-Final-Report.pdf