

## CCDG Consultation Response Template

Date	<b>17 December 2020</b>	Classification	<b>Public</b>
Document owner	<b>Elexon</b>	Document version	<b>Version 1.1</b>

### Respondent information

Your name	Jonny Moore		
Your company	ENGIE Power Ltd		
Type of company	Supplier		
Contact details	Email: <a href="mailto:jonathan.moore@engie.com">jonathan.moore@engie.com</a>	Phone 07790 399246	
Confidential Y/N	N		

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) by **08:00 (8am) on 26 January 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](#)

### Question 1. Do you agree that the detailed MHHS TOM design is consistent with the Design Working Group's preferred Target Operating Model?

Yes

Rationale:

### Question 2. Do you have any specific comments on the proposed set of detailed data items or associated transition requirements set out for the MHHS TOM

Comments can be in relation to any or all of the areas set out by the CCDG under Section A.

**No**

**Rationale:**

**Question 3. Do you agree that the TOM should not include a process for correcting Settlement volumes associated with ETs?**

**No**

**Rationale:**

**Question 4. What impact would the lack of a process to correct ET Settlement volumes have on your organisation?**

**Response: We don't believe this will have a material impact**

**Rationale:**

**Question 5. Are there any non-Settlement reasons why your organisation would require new Related MPANs to be created in the target end state?**

**Yes**

**Rationale: Under the MRA a HH Related MPAN is defined as multiple MPANs sharing a single capacity agreement with the DNO. These have been classed as 'related' to prevent the relationship being split on a COS and the DNO not being able to charge the relationship appropriately.**

**Unless there are changes to DCUSA to prevent this charging arrangement these Advanced related MPANs will continue to be required.**

**Question 6. Do you have any specific comments on the proposed detailed processes, or associated transition requirements, set out in Section B for the MHHS TOM?**

**Yes**

**Rationale: The suggested change to the change of agent process does not detail the method of notifying SMRS of the change. To allow for bulk amendments this notification should be by data flow or other standard message.**

**The proposed changes to the MPAN topline will have a knock on effect on the 'S number' displayed on customers invoices. The significant impact of this change on the format of customer's bills should be recognised by the group.**

**Question 7. Do you agree that the detailed MHHS TOM design meets Ofgem's Design and Development Principles?**

**Yes**

**Rationale:**

**Question 8. Do you believe that all the major changes to the Industry Code documents required to deliver the MHHS TOM have been identified?**

**Yes**

**Rationale:**

**Question 9. Do you think there are any drivers for changing the scope and/or structure of the BSCPs impacted by MHHS?**

**No**

**Rationale:**

**Question 10. Do you have any other comments?**

**No**

**Rationale:**

**Transition issues.**