

**Feedback Form**

**Electricity retail market-wide half-hourly settlement: consultation**

*Please send this form to* [***HalfHourlySettlement@ofgem.gov.uk***](mailto:HalfHourlySettlement@ofgem.gov.uk) *once completed.*

*As noted in the consultation document, no deadline for responses is being set at this time. When we set one, we will publish an update on the Ofgem website, and give at least 10 week’s notice.*

**Organisation:**

**Contact:**

**Is your feedback confidential?** NO YES

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.

**Target Operating Model (TOM)**

1. We propose to introduce MHHS on the basis of the Target Operating Model recommended by the Design Working Group last year. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Ofgem’s preferred position is that HH electricity consumption data should be sent to central settlement systems in non-aggregated form. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Settlement timetable**

1. We propose that the Initial Settlement (SF) Run should take place 5-7 working days after the settlement date. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. We propose that the Final Reconciliation Run (RF) should take place 4 months after the settlement date. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. We propose that the post-final (DF) settlement run should take place 20 months after the settlement date, with the ratcheted materiality proposals described in chapter 4. Do you agree? We welcome your views on this proposal, and in particular about its potential impact on financial certainty for Balancing and Settlement Code parties.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Export-related meter points**

1. We propose to introduce MHHS for both import and export related MPANs. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. We propose that the transition period to the new settlement arrangements should be the same for import and export related MPANs. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Transition period**

1. We propose a transition period of approximately 4 years, which at the time of analysis would have been up to the end of 2024. This would comprise an initial 3-year period to develop and test new systems and processes, and then 1 year to migrate meter points to the new arrangements. Do you agree? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. We have set out high-level timings for the main parties required to complete a successful 4-year transition to MHHS. Do you agree? We welcome your views, particularly if your organisation has been identified specifically within the timings.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What impact do you think the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic will have on these timescales?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Data access and privacy**

1. We propose that there should be a legal obligation on the party responsible for settlement to collect data at daily granularity from domestic consumers who have opted out of HH data collection for settlement and forecasting purposes. Do you agree that this is a proportionate approach? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Existing customers currently have the right to opt out to monthly granularity of data collection. We are seeking evidence about whether it is proportionate to require data to be collected at daily granularity for settlement and forecasting purposes for some or all of these consumers.  We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Should there be a central element to the communication of settlement / forecasting and associated data sharing choices to consumers? For example, this may be a central body hosting a dedicated website or webpage to which suppliers may refer their customers if they want more information. If yes, what should that role be and who should fulfil it? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Consumer impacts**

1. Do you have additional evidence which would help us refine the load shifting assumptions we have made in the Impact Assessment?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you have any views on the issues regarding the consumer impacts following implementation of MHHS? Please refer to the standalone paper we have published for more detailed information.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Programme management**

1. Do you agree we have identified the right delivery functions to implement MHHS? We welcome your views.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. We have set out some possible options for the management of the delivery functions, and a proposal on how these would be funded. We welcome your views on this.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Other**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you have any comments on the Impact Assessment published alongside this document, or any additional evidence that you think we should take into account?