

**DCP 016 – ‘More Open Website’ – Consultation Responses**

**Summary**

- 16 Responses were received and a number of additional comments were made.
- 5 Responses were received from non-Parties.
- Not all Respondents answered all questions.
- With the exception of 1 area, the majority of respondents favoured all areas of the website being ‘Open’
- Respondents were equally divided as to whether ‘Meeting Locations’ should be public or not
- Further discussion with a number of respondents has indicated that parties are supportive of access being granted to industry participants rather than the general public – i.e. Retention of a password protected site but not restricted to signatories.

<b>Area Of Website</b>	<b>Open</b>	<b>Closed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
DCUSA document current version	16	0	In general – providing greater access will ensure consistent transparency across the industry codes and provide parties with access to all information they may require.
DCUSA document previous versions	11	5	<p>Don't see an issue</p> <p>Copies of earlier versions should be available on request. I'm not sure that it is important to maintain records of earlier versions on the web site. If they are available how many versions would be maintained (the previous version? the last six years?). I guess if previous copies are maintained in an archive section, and maintaining them doesn't result in significant additional costs, there may be some value in making them available</p> <p>I am unsure whether users would need to review previous versions of the document</p>

			<p>I don't think there is a need to display old versions. There could be a link to request previous version if required.</p> <p>May be of historical interest. If not available on the website to avoid confusion, should be available on request</p> <p>This seems unnecessary</p>
Meeting dates	16	0	
Meeting locations	8	8	<p>Not relevant to anyone but the attendees</p> <p>Potential Security Issue</p> <p>This info is only relevant to the attendees</p> <p>If it is a 'Yes' to Meeting dates then there is no reason for it to be a 'No' to Meeting locations</p> <p>I don't think this is particularly sensitive</p> <p>Irrelevant to those not attending</p> <p>This could be potentially be seen as a Security issue and is only really relevant to those parties attending the meeting.</p> <p>This seems unnecessary</p>
Accession template	12	3	<p>This could be useful to new parties</p> <p>This seems unnecessary</p>
Party information	16	0	<p>With the expectation of confidential information or personal data which party did not wish to make public</p>

			The layout is not particularly friendly i.e. Inconsistent upper/lower case / word wrap
Contract manager details	9	7	<p>Contact details should follow the example of MRA &amp; SPAA websites and only be available when a user has logged in</p> <p>With the option to allow people to opt out if they do wish to have their details published in line with data protection</p> <p>LDSOs provide contact details in their relevant charging statements these are in public domain.</p> <p>This is a useful piece of information</p> <p>Individuals contact details should not be available publicly</p> <p>Not necessary for it to be publicly available</p> <p>No these details should remain in the password protected section</p> <p>This may generate spam email</p>
Change Proposal template	11	5	<p>Change proposal template should only be available to those parties that are authorised to make a proposal.</p> <p>If not a party you can't raise a change so not required.</p> <p>If you're not a party you can't propose a change, but there seems no need for it to be confidential.</p> <p>Read only, this would provide a flavour of how DCUSA operates</p>
Change Register	16	0	
Change Proposal document	15	1	As long as they contain no personal details

			<p>I think it would be useful for interested parties to see the details / justifications for making a change proposal</p> <p>DCUSA change proposals affect people other than DCUSA parties, and the earlier a CP is available, the more time is available for interested parties to comment.</p> <p>Enables contact with the originator</p>
Change Proposal assessments/reports	14	2	<p>As long as they contain no personal details</p> <p>The final reports could be useful for interested parties.</p> <p>DCUSA change proposals affect people other than DCUSA parties, and the earlier a CP is available, the more time is available for interested parties to comment.</p> <p>This seems unnecessary</p>
Change voting responses	9	6	<p>As long as they contain no personal details</p> <p>Unless marked confidential and the cost of publishing such information is not greater than any benefits of increased transparency</p> <p>I'm a little uncomfortable about this. I think the responses could be published but should not identify the party. The reason I'm uncertain is that if parties don't want their response to be seen by the wider world they may mark them as confidential, in which case no one will receive the benefits</p> <p>Unconvinced of need to have this level of detail publicly available. Aggregated results are fine</p> <p>Responses should only be available to other DCUSA signatories – i.e. via a login</p>

			This seems unnecessary
Each Working Group's Agenda & papers	11	3	<p>As long as they contain no personal details</p> <p>This would assist in transparency of workgroups progress Probably unnecessary</p> <p>Any recommendations would be issued as a Change Proposal and the document could be made open at this point in time.</p> <p>A matter for the working group and DCUSA parties</p>
Each Working Group's minutes	11	5	<p>As long as they contain no personal details and all comments are anonymous as in the BSC.</p> <p>But only after approval by the working group</p> <p>Unconvinced of need to have this level of detail publicly available.</p> <p>A brief summary would be useful</p> <p>Attendee information should only be available to other DCUSA signatories – ie via a login. The working groups are open and honest so discussions should be kept within the signatories.</p> <p>A matter for the working group and DCUSA parties</p>
Each Working Group's consultation responses	9	6	<p>I'm a little uncomfortable about this. I think the responses could be published but should not identify the party. The reason I'm uncertain is that if parties don't want their response to be seen by the wider world they may mark them as confidential, in which case no one will receive the benefits</p> <p>Unconvinced of need to have this level of detail publicly available. But contributors should have the option to make their response</p>

			<p>confidential</p> <p>Responses should only be available to other DCUSA signatories – ie via a login</p> <p>A matter for the working group and DCUSA parties</p>
Panel open meeting Agenda & papers	16	0	<p>As long as they contain no personal details</p> <p>This would assist in transparency of the Panel</p> <p>The decisions taken affect parties other than just DCUSA parties, and so it is helpful to know what discussions and decisions are made.</p> <p>Agenda, but not papers. This would provide a flavour of how DCUSA operates</p>
Panel open meeting Minutes	14	2	<p>As long as they contain no personal details and all comments are anonymous as in the BSC panel</p> <p>Only after approval</p> <p>Unconvinced of need to have this level of detail publicly available</p> <p>The decisions taken affect parties other than just DCUSA parties, and so it is helpful to know what discussions and decisions are made.</p> <p>Attendee information should only be available to other DCUSA signatories – ie via a login. If it could be published without the names than we have no objection, as long as this was not too great an administrative task.</p> <p>This would provide a flavour of how DCUSA operates</p>
Annual accounts	16	0	
User directory/contact details	8	7	With the option to allow people to opt out if they do wish to have their

			<p>details published in line with data protection</p> <p>Only where a party gives such consent</p> <p>Individuals contact details should not be available publicly.</p> <p>No these details should remain in the password protected section</p> <p>Contact details should follow the example of MRA &amp; SPAA websites and only be available when a user has logged in</p> <p>This may generate spam email</p>
Guidelines	14	1	<p>Only relevant guidelines which aid understanding of the DCUSA document But only those that assist in understanding the DCUSA document.</p> <p>The website user guide could be allowed. If they were general industry guidelines, as on MRA or ELEXON websites these could also be published.</p> <p>Not sure</p>

### General Comments

- We believe that the general presumption should be as follows – that the website should be open to the public to the extent that no confidential information belonging to a single party, a class of parties or to all parties who have signed the DCUSA is compromised. Similarly, where data is held on the website the release of which would breach data protection legislation, it should be appropriately protected.
- We are slightly confused as to why password protection was ever thought necessary as the BSC, UNC, etc are all open access. DCUSA should start from the view that it is all open access until a case can be made for making anything password protected. The principle of open governance is important.
- 'Yes' to the free access to everything. In this day and age of openness and transparency it is the only way to go.