Sub-Committee Voting Guidance

A REC Code Manager User Guide

Published June 2025

V1.0

For more information email enquiries@recmanager.co.uk

Version History

Version	Date Published	Status	Reason for Change
1.0	**June 2025**	**Final**	**Initial production**

Purpose of this User Guide

The purpose of this document is to guide Sub-Committee Members and Alternates as to what they can expect and what is expected from them regarding Change Proposals that are brought to them for vote.

Summary of the Change Report presented to the relevant Sub-Committee and voting under the REC

Change Report Publication and Consultation

- The Code Manager publishes a Change Report for each proposal.
- Stakeholders (Parties, REC Service Providers and others) are invited to consult on each proposal. This consultation will include the Code Manager's Minded to Position and ask stakeholders to confirm if they agree or disagree with this position.
- An updated Change Report is issued post-consultation, summarising feedback and responses.
- The Change Report will include the Code Manager's assessment and recommendation on whether the change should be made.
  For Authority-Approved changes, it will also include a view on whether the REC Objectives are better supported.
  For Self-Governance changes, it will assess the strength of the business case.
- .

Determination by Responsible Sub-Committee

- The Sub-Committee decides whether to approve or reject the proposal recommendation made by the Code Manager.
- Criteria:
  - **Authority-Approved Changes**: Must better facilitate the REC Objectives. A Sub-Committee member can either agree with the Code Manager assessment or state their own reasons why they believe the REC Objectives are or are not better facilitated. This must be documented in the minutes. The REC Objectives are:
    1. To ensure the REC operates and evolves in a manner that facilitates the achievement of its mission statement.
    2. To ensure customers interests and data is protected in the operation of the REC; and
    3. To drive continuous improvements and efficiencies in the operation of the REC and the central systems and communication infrastructures it governs.

- **Self-Governance Changes**: Must have a valid business case. A Sub-Committee Member can either agree with the Code Manager assessment or state their own reasons why they believe a valid business case is made. This must be documented in the minutes.

- Decisions are made according to the voting mechanism set out in the Responsible Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference, and this process must be documented in the minutes.

Approval or Rejection Process

- **Authority-Approved Changes**: Code Manager and Sub-Committee recommendation sent to the Authority.
- **Self-Governance Changes**: Directly approved or rejected by the Sub-Committee (subject to appeal).
- If the Authority needs more information, it can direct further steps, nullifying previous votes.

Appeals Process for Self-Governance Changes

- Any Party or person materially impacted by the outcome of the decision can appeal within 10 working days. This process is set out in section 22 of the Change Management Schedule.
- If the Responsible Sub-Committee's decision differs from the Code Manager's recommendation, the Code Manager may update their recommendation to match the Sub-Committees decision or refer the Change Proposal to the Authority.
- The Authority can approve, reject, or return the proposal for further steps.
- Appeals can be dismissed if deemed trivial or without merit.