

**Feedback Form**

*Once completed, please send this form to* ***HalfHourlySettlement@ofgem.gov.uk****by 12 November 2018.*

**Organisation:**

**Contact:**

**Is your feedback confidential? YES NO**

**Unless you mark your response confidential, we will publish it on our website,** [**www.ofgem.gov.uk**](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk)**, and put it in our library. You can ask us to keep your response confidential, and we will respect this, subject to obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. If you want us to keep your response confidential, you should clearly mark your response to that effect and include reasons.**

**If the information you give in your response contains personal data under General Data Protection Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and Data Protection Act 2018, the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority will be the data controller. Ofgem uses the information in responses in performing its statutory functions and in accordance with section 105 of the Utilities Act 2000. If you are including any confidential material in your response, please put it in the appendices.**

**Question 1:** Do you have any comments on our updated analysis and thinking?

**Question 2:** Do you agree with our proposed position? If not, please explain why.

**Question 3:** Do you consider that settlement data will still need to be aggregated for submission into central settlement systems in future? In light of this, do you consider that a data aggregation role is required?

**Question 4:** Do you agree with our consideration of our proposed position against our assessment principles?

**Further comments**

**General feedback**

We believe that consultation is at the heart of good policy development. We welcome any comments about how we’ve run this consultation. We’d also like to get your answers to these questions:

1. Do you have any comments about the overall process of this consultation?

2. Do you have any comments about its tone and content?

3. Was it easy to read and understand? Or could it have been better written?

4. Were its conclusions balanced?

5. Did it make reasoned recommendations for improvement?

6. Any further comments?