

CCDG Consultation Response Template

Date **5 July 2021**

Classification **Public**

Document owner **Elxon**

Document version **Version 1.0**

Respondent information

Your name	Tym Huckin	
Your company	Tym Huckin Ltd	
Type of company	Meter Administrator	
Contact details	Email: tym.huckin@ictis.net	Phone 0333 320 8101
Confidential Y/N	The confidential elements in this response have been removed.	

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@elxon.co.uk 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 Elxon's MHHS team at CCDGsecretary@elxon.co.uk with any questions. More information can be found on the [CCDG webpage](#)

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: Yes

Rationale: Getting the new data items in place as early as possible enables a better approach to the necessary software and process alterations

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: Yes

Rationale: This doesn't really affect us, but having migrated several systems here already, data cleansing should be done as soon as possible

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: No opinion

Rationale: We are not affected by this, nor have any connection with this process so don't really have an opinion.

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: Yes.

Rationale: There seems little point in being able to move backwards when everything is going to have to move forwards at the end of this.

Question 5. Do you agree with the CCDG's recommendations for the registration and migration of export MPANs?

Yes/ No or Response: No opinion

Rationale:

Question 6. Do you agree with the CCDG's recommendations for coordinating the migration to MHHS?

Yes/ No or Response: No opinion

Rationale:

Question 7. Do you agree with the CCDG's recommendations for the runoff of current settlement arrangements?

Yes/ No or Response: No opinion

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: n/a

Rationale: Not a supplier

Question 9. Do you agree with the CCDG's recommended approach for the Unmetered segment?

Yes/ No or Response: Yes

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: Not ones that impact us as MA/UMSDS

Rationale:

Question 11. Is there anything else that you think the CCDG should consider for transition?

Yes/ No or Response: [confidential information removed]

Rationale: