CCDG Consultation Response Template

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | **5 July 2021** |  | Classification | **Public** |
| Document owner | **Elexon** |  | Document version | **Version 1.0** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent information | | |
| Your name |  | |
| Your company |  | |
| Type of company |  | |
| Contact details | Email | Phone |
| Confidential Y/N | *If yes, please indicate which parts of your response are confidential* | |

A webinar on the consultation will be held in early 2021 if you wish to get an overview of the changes before responding.

**Please:**

* Email your response to [CCDGsecretary@elexon.co.uk](mailto:CCDGsecretary@elexon.co.uk?subject=CCDG%20consultation%20response) by **08:00 (8am) on 2 August 2021**, using the subject line ‘CCDG consultation response’.
* Use this Word response form where possible to make it easier for the CCDG to identify and summarise views.
* Provide supporting reasons for your answers to help the CCDG understand your response.
* Identify clearly which, if any, aspects of your response are confidential. We will not publish any information marked as confidential, or share this with the CCDG. However, Ofgem will see all responses in full. We encourage you to provide non-confidential responses where possible, to inform the CCDG’s discussions.

Email Elexon’s MHHS team at [CCDGsecretary@elexon.co.uk](mailto:CCDGsecretary@elexon.co.uk) with any questions. More information can be found on the [CCDG webpage](https://www.elexon.co.uk/group/code-change-and-development-group-ccdg/)

|  |
| --- |
| Question 1. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendation for early introduction of the new Registration Data Items and processes using existing interfaces to support migration? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 2. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendation for a period of data cleanse activity of registration data items running from February 2023 to October 2024? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 3. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendation to mandate the moving of CT Advanced Meters settling NHH to Half Hourly Settlement using the existing Change of Measurement Class (CoMC) process? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 4. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendation to introduce the “one way gate” from the start of migration (milestone M11 / M12) to prevent MPANs moving back to current arrangements once migrated? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 5. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendations for the registration and migration of export MPANs? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 6. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendations for coordinating the migration to MHHS? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 7. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommendations for the runoff of current settlement arrangements? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 8. We would like to know Supplier views on the UMSO preferred approach to using one of the existing NHH MPANs. We would like to understand UMSO views on the system implications of either option. |
| **Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 9. Do you agree with the CCDG’s recommended approach for the Unmetered segment? |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| ****Question 10. Are there any additional areas that should be considered as part of the next phase of Assurance activities?**** |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |

|  |
| --- |
| Question 11. ****Is there anything else that you think the CCDG should consider for transition?**** |
| **Yes/ No or Response:** |
| **Rationale:** |