

Submitter: Allen Davies

It is interesting that you require a particular format for submissions, I endeavoured to recreate that format without success, so I will provide you with feedback to your questions as follows and will only contain my feedback and not the question.

Question 1

I think the purpose and the scope as proposed for the IPAG are a reasonable starting point but may need to be modified further down the track.

Question 2

I see that member numbers for the IPAG as per 2.4.11 are suggested as 10 to 15 and in Appendix C 3.1 it is normally ten but the authority may appoint more or less. The more members the broader the representation if that is what is required and it appears that a broad spectrum is suggested, time will tell depending on which way you go.

Question 3

One thing that I have found over the years face to face meetings are the way to go when more than three people are involved, the RAG meeting last December using a conference call and only a singular subject was from point of view, not the best way to conduct a meeting, Using working groups is a reasonable thought.

Question 4

What is proposed appears to fit the bill.

Question 5

Ten members with an industry background meeting face to face seems to be the right answer.

Question 6

- (a) I have no problem with new terms of reference being introduced based on the feedback, but should they not then also go out again for further submissions?
- (b) Yes
- (c) Yes

Question 7

I can't disagree with the Authority's assessment at this stage, but time will be the deciding factor as to the validity of any changes.

Question 8

No I do not have any alternative proposals to suggest.

Question 9

The only comment I have to make is that they are easy to read, understand and follow.