# Consultation on code manager selection – response template

This document provides a template for responses to our consultation on code manager selection, published on 28 November 2024.

If you are interested in responding to this consultation, please complete this word document and send it to [industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk) by the end of the day on Thursday 30 January 2025.

### Guidance

We typically publish consultation responses when we publish our decision. To ensure that we can correctly attribute your response, please ensure that you enter all relevant details in the “your company’s details” section (template part 1).

If you would like us to treat your response as being confidential, either in full or in part, please indicate this to us below. Further information on how we will treat your response, data and confidentiality can be found at the end of this document.

Please use template part 2 to provide your responses. For all questions, the template below provides space for you to enter free text comments. Most questions also ask whether you agree with our proposals. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with relevant proposals by deleting all but one of the bullets provided.

There is also a section for “general feedback” (template part 3). Pease use this section to provide any views on the overall consultation process.

### Template part 1: Your organisation’s details:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contact name** |  |
| **Role title** |  |
| **Company name** |  |
| **Telephone number** |  |
| **Email address** |  |
| **Date of submission** |  |
| **Do you want your response treated as confidential?**  **(If yes, please indicate whether you would like the whole of your response to be confidential, or just particular parts).** |  |

### Template part 2: consultation responses

#### Consultation section 2 – overview of the code manager selection process:

**Question 1 –** Do you agree with our proposed, three-stage process for assessing code manager candidates?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

**Question 2 –** Do you agree with how we have proposed to make our selection route decisions, in line with our considerations of speed of delivery and value for money?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

**Question 3 –** Do you agree with our proposal to grant code manager licences on an enduring basis?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

#### Consultation section 3 – eligibility assessment:

**Question 4 –** Do you agree with the processes and criteria that we have proposed to use during the eligibility assessment stage?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

**Question 5 –** Do you have any comments on the draft guidance published alongside this consultation, either in relation to how we have described the eligibility assessment process or the proposed content of the draft form?

Comments:

#### Consultation section 4 – licensing assessment:

**Question 6 –** Do you agree with the processes and criteria that we have proposed to use during the licensing assessment stage?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

**Question 7 –**Do you have any comments on the draft guidance published alongside this consultation, either in relation to how we have described the licensing assessment process or the proposed content of the draft form?

Comments:

#### Consultation section 5 – competitive licensing assessment

**Question 8 –** Do you agree with the processes and criteria that we have proposed to use as part of the competitive licensing assessment, including our proposal that there should only be a single competitive round rather than multiple rounds?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

**Question 9 –** Do you agree that the enabling regulations should set out how the competitive process will work, with the use of draft guidance allowing flexibility in some instances?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

**Question 10 –** Do you have any views on how we should design a potential tie-break process, such as whether to make use of existing evidence versus requesting follow-up submissions?

Comments:

**Question 11 –** Do you agree with our proposal to introduce two additional criteria as part of the competitive licensing assessment, namely “innovation” and “facilitating the move to net zero and clean energy”?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

#### Consultation section 6: implementation and assurance

**Question 12 –** Do you have any views on how we should approach the implementation and assurance stage, including any potential interaction between these two distinct processes?

Comments:

**Question 13 –** Do you agree with the proposed scope of the final readiness assessment that would be required of all candidates?

[Please delete all but one bullet]

* Strongly agree
* Agree
* Neither agree nor disagree
* Disagree
* Strongly disagree
* Don’t know/no view

Comments:

### Template part 3: 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 the following questions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Do you have any comments about the overall process of this consultation? |  |
| Do you have any comments about its tone and content? |  |
| Was it easy to read and understand? Or could it have been better written? |  |
| Were its conclusions balanced? |  |
| Did it make reasoned recommendations for improvement? |  |
| Any further comments? |  |

#### Your response, data and confidentiality

You can ask us to keep your response, or parts of your response, confidential. We’ll respect this, subject to obligations to disclose information, for example, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, statutory directions, court orders, government regulations or where you give us explicit permission to disclose. If you do want us to keep your response confidential, please clearly mark this on your response and explain why.

If you wish us to keep part of your response confidential, please clearly mark those parts of your response that you *do* wish to be kept confidential and those that you *do not* wish to be kept confidential. Please put the confidential material in a separate appendix to your response. If necessary, we’ll get in touch with you to discuss which parts of the information in your response should be kept confidential, and which can be published. We might ask for reasons why.

If the information you give in your response contains personal data under the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) as retained in domestic law following the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union (“UK GDPR”), the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority will be the data controller for the purposes of GDPR. Ofgem uses the information in responses in performing its statutory functions and in accordance with section 105 of the Utilities Act 2000. Please refer to our Privacy Notice on consultations, see Appendix 4.

If you wish to respond confidentially, we’ll keep your response itself confidential, but we will publish the number (but not the names) of confidential responses we receive. We won’t link responses to respondents if we publish a summary of responses, and we will evaluate each response on its own merits without undermining your right to confidentiality.