ToR	Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues	Teleconference/ Face to Face	Duration of meetings	Any other comments
I believe the TOR are fit for purpose	I believe we should review the 4 initiatives from 2019 before moving on and identify any gaps/issues. They covered the key areas and we can establish how to move forward from the success (or not) of these.	I would prefer teleconference meetings monthly, with a quarterly face to face meeting. The face to face meeting would need to have a substantial agenda to justify the travel/time. If we are moving towards new initiatives this would justify face to face meetings, when it is safe to do so.	Teleconference 1 hour based on current agenda, half day face to face.	
In my view they do, I'm not convinced however that the agenda and the work we do currently reflects section 2.3 ToR.	There are already four issues identified as workstreams, we should bring these to a resolution (or not) before considering bringing anything else forward. Maybe each owner could provide an update / presentation to the group during the next meeting.	I agree with others, it depends on the content. If we are to continue with the same agenda then this does not justify a face to face meeting. If we are however looking to take a closer look at the ToR and bring more to the meeting then this might justify a half day in a room together, when it is safe to do so.	Teleconference – Based on recent calls 1hr, max 2. F2F – At least half a day.	Be good to not keep going over old ground on some subjects and focus on the future and delivery.

Yes agree still reflect purpose.	Safe isolations one would be good to finally get some movement on!	I am easy as live relatively near to London so face to face when we can or conference.	Again if the time is required its booked out, but if we know they are going to be shorter then we can cut down beforehand.	
believe the ToRs are still fit for purpose and could be reviewed periodically to ensure they are current	As mentioned by others already I believe there is value in reviewing the success of implementation of past initiatives to see how they have landed and to follow up and add solution to any gaps observed to date. I also share the view that a consistent approach to reporting incidents by the DNOs is adopted by all parties as some are very good at passing on comprehensive known facts of an incident and supporting photos; whereas some give little to go on and this causes issues of challenge within my own business when	I would advocate teleconference for the remainder of 2021 until restrictions are fully lifted and then as others have stated a face to face meeting periodically whilst ensuring there is sufficient content to warrant individuals travelling long distances in to London	Bi-monthly and review dependant on content and immediacy of any issues for discussion	

	trying to carry out an investigation			
TORs look clear. Agenda items (including AOB) for the meeting should establish a clear link to the specific requirements of section 2.3 the TORs.	This feels a bit like we are trying to find issues, some of which may be minor or impact a small number of parties that might be better resolved through bilateral discussions and, although important to those involved, take up time during the meeting. The Register maintained by the Working Group does not feel like a living document that is used to drive change. Probably needs another good overhaul in terms of its intended purpose. Probably best done after we have clarified 1. above.	Teleconference	Needs to reflect current issues but more than 2 hours would need some form of justification over and above planned business.	
Seem OK	Lack of information. Technical info and the ability to access photo's over the business would be a major benefit to all reporting issue's safety	Both have pro's and con's. my preference would always be teleconference. They are much more controlled save time and money and	These meetings are important and we all need to be flexible to the approach. I have no preference on time but will be flexible to the decision.	

	of staff attending faults and speed of resolutions.	location then is not an issue. However it would be nice to meet everyone.		
	Cross Polarities	If it's F2F it has to be substantial enough to travel to London and also that the subject matter is better F2F. eg if it's general update of progress then MS Teams is sufficient	up to 2 h for MS Teams & half day plus for F2F	Can any of the DCP groups be on the same day, often same participants which would then justify travelling. I also think that F2F should be delayed until 2022.
I am satisfied with the TOR but would like for us to include at the actual meeting more stats around the performance against SLAs (anonymised if desired) as this is a key element within the Clause. Also, under item 9 – Timetable; this could be enhanced to reflect any change to frequency and meeting type as suggested in my response below to question 3.	Back in Feb 2019 and after a huge piece of work, we launch the 4 workstreams. It would be good to review the success of that launch and if the 4 items have improved the efficiencies. I have a particular interest in workstream 4, Communications between Parties, and have some real concerns that we haven't made enough improvements on this subject. I am a firm believer in bi-lateral engagement and feel	When the time is right, I would rule out 2021 in it's entirety, we should move to bi-annual face to face general meetings. Sub and/or Work groups may define the meeting type based on the subject matter, obviously when safe to do so. The virtual general meetings maybe scheduled for 1 hour per quarter and the face to face 4hrs but only if required.	Difficult to call and will be determined by the subject matter. I think the TOR can define this better..	

	that this method should be the first port of call in every instance to drive improvements, but as the workstream set out improvements, I would say I have not seen any real benefit, namely on the incident reporting front. For example, I am aware of 17 incidents reported by DNOs to SPERL since the launch and of these only 5 came with any tangible report and more importantly only 2 of these came to SPERL with concise detail as defined in the Incident Investigation Template (or similar). In summary, I would like us to revisit this workstream and seek buy in and a commitment to provide a detailed incident report, evidence and retention of evidence being the norm rather than the exception.			