RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R0342 ENABLING DUAL MSA & MSS (SVA MOA) APPOINTMENTS FOR WC CONNECTION TYPES

On 07/10/2026 the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on the Change Report (For Consultation) for R0342.

The purpose of this document is to consolidate the responses and for the Code Manager to answer any questions raised within those responses.

DOCUMENT VERSION	V0.1
RESPONSE TYPE	Non-Confidential
DATE ISSUED	06/11/2026
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	REC Change Panel
LEAD ANALYST	Flo Monea

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	07/10/2026
RESPONSE DEADLINE	26/10/2026

Question 1:	Do you agree with the proposed solution? If not, please explain why?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
St Clements Services (ERDA Provider)	No. The design is unnecessarily complex with a high MPRS impact. The business objectives can be better met by simply extending or disabling LP005 - Change of Segment Failed	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	We do not agree that the proposed solution is the correct approach, we believe that further options should be considered. This REC change, in line with BSC change CP1650, does not address the full impact and proposes an unnecessarily complex change to address the issue. There is insufficient detail in order to fully impact assess but the proposed solution would require complex changes in the MPRS product, as identified via an SCS review – this change would significantly impacting the current agent appointment validation logic and choreography for the current agent appointment process. We would suggest that the change is reworked and that the solution is workshopped to address alternative approaches.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We are not supportive of this proposed solution. We have fed back on the BSC change CP1650 to advise that our service provider has that the functional requirements are not sufficient to build, test and deliver this solution.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

	In addition to this the requirements have changed since the initial impact assessment and due to the complexity, the delivery of this is not achievable by the Feb 2027 release, changes in the requirements indicate that this is not a low complexity change for SMRA, and requires further discussion on the requirement.	
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	No. Following discussion with our MPRS provider SCS, we believe that the design is complex with a high impact on the MPRS system. The objectives can be better met by simply extending or disabling LP005 - Change of Segment Failed.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we strongly support the proposed solution. We have experienced numerous issues with the SEG process as a result of appointments lapsing, which have caused a backlog of cases awaiting progression. This is therefore an existing operational problem, rather than a theoretical risk. By addressing the risk of appointments lapsing solely because the meter exchange and associated registration activities cannot be completed within the prescribed period, the proposed solution should remove a barrier to progressing these cases. It should also provide greater operational flexibility, reduce the need for Suppliers to monitor and repeatedly coordinate appointments within a narrow implementation window, and help prevent further backlogs.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, SSE agrees that the proposed solution reflects the cross-code change CP1650.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

Npower Commercial Gas Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we support the proposed solution.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

Question 2:	Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach (BIG BANG)? If not, please explain why?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
St Clements Services (ERDA Provider)	N/A	
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	N/A	
SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	No, we believe that further discussion is required on the functional requirements for this proposal	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	No. As highlighted in the response to question 1, we do not believe that the proposed solution is the best way to solve the issues.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we agree with the proposed implementation approach.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, SSE agrees with the implementation approach of big bang.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Npower Commercial Gas Limited (Energy Supplier)	We support the proposed implementation approach – given the nature of the changes required big bang approach is suitable.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

Question 3:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the costs and benefits for this change?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
St Clements Services (ERDA Provider)	[N/A]	
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	No. We do not believe that the changed proposal is the correct approach and therefore do not agree with the change managements assessment of cost impacts.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We believe that the requirements for CP1650 have changed and that this is no longer a minor change for MPRS, this increases the cost to deliver for this change. This is not currently reflected in the change.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	[N/A]	

Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we agree with the Code Manager's assessment.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, SSE agrees with the assessment of the costs and benefits.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Npower Commercial Gas Limited (Energy Supplier)	We agree with the code managers assessment of cost & benefits.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

Question 4:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the Change Path, that this Change Proposal should be subject to Self-Governance approval by the Metering Expert Panel?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
St Clements Services (ERDA Provider)	N/A	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	N/A	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We agree that this should be self governance.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	NA.	
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we agree with the Code Manager's assessment.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, SSE agrees with the assessment of the change path.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Npower Commercial Gas Limited (Energy Supplier)	We agree with the code managers assessment for the change path as set out.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

Question 5:	Do you agree with the Code Manager's recommendation that this Change Proposal should be approved for implementation on 26 February 2026? If not, please explain why?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
St Clements Services (ERDA Provider)	No. The implementation date provides insufficient time to prepare for the new appointment scenario and associated changes. It is unreasonable for a decision to be made in December 2026 with go-live at the end of February. This proposal fails to account for the scale of the change, the testing effort required to validate the new functionality, the associated regression-testing impact, and the time LDSOs will need to assure and deploy the updated MPRS code. Notwithstanding the missing details from the CP preventing a complete assessment of the change, the high MPRS impact makes it unfeasible to deliver this change such short timescales as indicated by this consultation. There is insufficient time to develop and deploy a CP of this magnitude in February. The earliest a change of this magnitude can be delivered is November 2027.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	Due to the complexity of the change, we would not support a February 2027 release, as there would be insufficient time to develop these changes, test and deliver the product ready for parties to complete their own testing and implementation	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	No, we have fed back on CP1650 that the current requirements are not sufficient to build, test and deliver this solution and as such a February 2027 release cannot be met by our service provider for implementation into the MPRS system.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	No. It is unreasonable for a decision to be made in December 2026 with go-live at the end of February. This proposal fails to account for the scale of the change, the testing effort required to validate the new functionality, the associated regression-testing impact, and the time LDSOs will need to assure and deploy the updated MPRS code. From our understanding after speaking with SCS, the earliest a change of this magnitude can be delivered is November 2027.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we agree with the Code Manager's recommendation.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, as this change needs to align with CP1650.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Npower Commercial Gas Limited (Energy Supplier)	We agree with the recommendation that this change must align as close as is possible to that proposed under CP1650 in order for REC & BSC to remain aligned.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

Question 6:	Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
St Clements Services (ERDA Provider)	The associated BSC change redlining is missing key information and does not deliver the proposed solution. Changes are required to the redlining to enable St Clements to fully assess the change from a cost and delivery perspective. It is recommended to assess the alternative approach proposed in question 1 (and the associated BSC CP1650 response) as this will meet the business objectives for less cost and with a shorter delivery time.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	We have also commented on the associated BSC change CP1650 with comments on impact and implementation timescale. Please refer to the response given by SCS, we believe that the alternative that they have suggested an alternative design which provides a simplified and less impactful solution. The change alternative would be to extend or disable' LP005 - Change of Segment Failed'.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	No further comments.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.

National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	We believe it would be worthwhile exploring the alternative approach proposed in question 1 as this will meet the business objectives for less cost and with a shorter delivery time.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We have no further comments.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	No further comments.	Noted. Thank you for your response. This has been shared with the lead code for their assessment and consideration.
Npower Commercial Gas Limited (Energy Supplier)	N/A	