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

CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESPONSES

I0213 CREATION OF A MECHANISM TO ALLOW THIRD PARTIES TO REPORT OBJECTION ACTIVITY

On 16 May 2025 the Code Manager issued an impact assessment to industry to seek feedback on the proposed solution for I0213 Creation of a Mechanism to Allow Third Parties to Report Objection Activity.

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	1.0
RESPONSE TYPE	Non-Confidential
DATE ISSUED	07 July 2025
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	REC Change Panel
LEAD ANALYST	James Hardy

DATE IMPACT ASSESSMENT ISSUED	16 May 2025
RESPONSE DEADLINE	09 June 2025

Question 1:	Do you have any comments on the proposed solutions, including any preference between solution option 1 or 2?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	Due to Ofgem rejecting R0137/R137(A) we believe this should rule out option 2 (a TPI should not be mandated/forced to join to TPI CoP to enable them to provide feedback as they are 2 separate things). Option 1 would allow any TPI to report to RECCo. It maybe that as part of the form the TPI ADR scheme membership is noted to ensure they are a registered TPI (or that the form is only available if a RECCo user account is created). This would help prevent unscrupulous information being provided.	Thank you for your response. Please be aware that under the scope of this proposal, any reports would be provided to the REC Code Manager rather than RECCo.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We believe the current approach is ambiguous and could result in unnecessary work for all parties involved. SLC 14a clearly defines a supplier's responsibilities in relation to objections and any oversight of this obligation should fall under the remit of Ofgem, as the regulator. This is also underpinned by Schedule 30: Resolution of Consumer-Facing Switching and Billing Issues, which outlines clear and structured steps. Suppliers who hold the customer relationship have full visibility of the customer's account. In all cases, they should have a valid reason for initiating the objection process. Allowing third parties to report non-compliance without access to the full context of a customer's account	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager appreciates the points you raise include these for consideration in the Business Case Assessment. The Code Manager will continue to engage with Ofgem on this Issue to clarify existing obligations in the Supplier Licences, alongside advice from REC Legal Advisers.

	history, in our view, risks generating further unnecessary and avoidable workload across the industry. Therefore, we strongly believe that before this change progresses any further, the Retail Energy Code should pause to carefully consider the level of work it will be required, the additional burden it may place on the industry and the potential imbalance this could cause to TPIs depending upon membership of the voluntary code of practice.	
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We prefer option 2 (utilisation of the voluntary TPI Code of Practice), as it uses an existing mechanism, does not incur any costs for parties and could encourage TPIs to sign up to the voluntary TPI Code of Practice. Option 1 will involve development costs which will be borne by Parties and ultimately consumers, and unnecessarily creates another channel for communication where channels already exist.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	I would welcome any way to mitigate this, but if I were asked to choose, “Option One” (portal, form) on the attached seems to be the most efficient, assuming timescales were put in place for resolution.	Thank you for your response.
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	We welcome this proposal to review how objection activities can be shared with the Code Manager. We agree that it is important for appropriate oversight to be in place within the market to monitor objections, and we support industry efforts to ensure that objections are raised appropriately. However, we note that no concerns have been raised and no evidence has been offered to date regarding the effectiveness of the current reporting system. To the best of our knowledge, the existing mechanisms within the REC for monitoring supplier objections are functioning effectively. We also note that REC Parties and other	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager appreciates the points you raise include these for consideration in the Business Case Assessment, including the existence of existing mechanisms that may be utilised. The Code Manager will continue to engage with Ofgem on this Issue to clarify existing obligations in the Supplier Licences, alongside advice from REC Legal Advisers.

	organisations involved in the switching process currently have the ability to share information with the Code Manager, either through the REC Service Desk or via their respective Operational Account Managers (OAMs), as the case may be. Furthermore, a performance assurance mechanism is already in place to monitor supplier objection activities. While we appreciate the intent behind this issue, we do not believe that a change proposal is required at this time (which might be an eventuality under Solution Option 1), given that sufficient mechanisms already exist within the Code to monitor objections and the broader switching journey. However, we are supportive of Solution Option 2 – clarifying that Third Party Intermediaries (TPIs) which are signatories to the voluntary REC TPI Code of Practice (CoP) can share information relating to objections with the Code Manager. This CoP was introduced to foster good practice for non-domestic energy brokers, and signatories can already engage with the Code Manager. As these mechanisms are already in place, we do not see any added value in pursuing Solution Option 1.	The Code Manager notes your points around the TPI Code of Practice and will share these with the wider Code Manager team and RECCo as part of ongoing activities relating to the TPI Code of Practice.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE do not support either solution. The industry has the means to identify poorly performing suppliers and the power to sanction them without the need to create additional investigation work. Under existing industry practice customers/TPIs can raise switching issues with the losing supplier through a complaints process and the ombudsman (recently expanded) for dispute resolution. Industry monitoring of the number objections should highlight suppliers that object to switches and the reasons, with possible sanctions as a deterrent.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	no	Thank you for your response.

Utilita (Energy Supplier)	Our preference would be option 2. This requires TPIs to sign up to the Code of Practice to raise objections, ensuring adherence to a certain standard. It is expected that these TPIs will be engaged with regulation and informed about the valid reasons for objections as determined by the REC. This approach minimises the risk of spurious issues being raised.	Thank you for your response.

Question 2:	Do you agree the proposed solutions address the problem statement, including if either solution addresses the problem statement more effectively than the other?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	I believe a form would be suitable as long as it contains the required fields and enables a TPI to upload any evidence they may have (ie PDF)	Thank you for your response.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We disagree that either statement addresses the problem statement. As outlined within our response to question 1, third parties who are not a REC party, may not have the full context as to the reason for the objection. This creates a large risk of generating sufficiently increased workflow, without potentially understanding the full context of the individual case. Whilst the issues described within the problem statement may be driven through objection activity, there are many other factors which may increase FTE costs, customer complaints and debt. As the supplier is the only party with access to the full context of the individual customer,	Thank you for your response. As part of the Business Case Assessment, to help determine the Code Manager's minded positioning the Code Manager will use Party impact assessment responses to assess whether the proposed solution resolves the problem statement. The Code Manager will continue to engage with Ofgem on this Issue to clarify existing obligations in the Supplier

	governance of this process should remain fully under Ofgem's remit; covered under SLC 14a.	Licences, alongside advice from REC Legal Advisers.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Both solutions address the problem statement but Option 2 does so more effectively than Option 1.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	I have long suspected that certain suppliers "blanket object" – objecting to anything leaving their supply en masse without due cause - and I would like to have a process where this can be challenged. Objections without due cause could impact our customers financially and there should be a method in place to challenge this.	Objections should be based on verifiable evidence rather than mere suspicion. The Performance Assurance function will continue to monitor for anomalies and will investigate Energy Suppliers exhibiting a high rate of objections. This process is outlined in the Performance Assurance Reporting Catalogue.
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	As stated in our response to Question 1, we do not consider the current process for sharing information objection activity with the Code Manager to be deficient. Based on our experience, the existing mechanisms provide sufficient means for identifying and addressing objection-related issues. Consequently, we see no material shortcomings that would necessitate additional intervention. However, we would welcome the clarity offered by Solution Option 2. The standards of the TPI CoP are fair and not burdensome, and the relationship which CoP signatories have with the Code Manger already provides a means for them to share any concerns with the Code Manager. In establishing expectations for TPIs, the CoP can support good standards, while also facilitating contact between TPIs and the Code Manager. We note the suggestion that Solution Option 2 would	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager appreciates the points you raise include these for consideration in the Business Case Assessment, including the existence of existing mechanisms that may be utilised. The Code Manager will continue to engage with Ofgem on this Issue to clarify existing obligations in the Supplier Licences, alongside advice from REC Legal Advisers. The Code Manager notes your points around the TPI Code of Practice and will share these

	involve amendments to the TPI CoP. We believe that process would create an opportunity to review the TPI CoP as a whole and to consider what other amendments to it would be appropriate at this juncture.	with the wider Code Manager team and RECCo as part of ongoing activities relating to the TPI Code of Practice.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	Yes, it does address the problem statement, but we do not feel there is a sufficient issue in the nondomestic supply market to warrant a new complaints process for other industry parties. The extension of more eligible customers to the ombudsman will diminish this need further.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will take this into consideration as part of our Business Case Assessment.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	yes	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	We agree that the proposed solutions address the problem statement. As mentioned, our preferred choice would be option 2 for the reasons mentioned above.	Thank you for your response.

Question 3:	Are there any alternate solutions that would better meet the needs of the problem statement?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	A 3rd option could also be delivered which would be to open up reporting via an Operational Account Manager (OAM) or submissions via the REC Service Desk to none registered TPI CoP TPI's (however we would have to consider how this could be done ensuring that data is transferred securely).	Thank you for your response. Please note that non-REC Parties, including non-registered TPI COP TPIs, already have so make submissions via the REC Service Desk.

Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We have no comments on an alternative solution.	Thank you for your response.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	No, Option 2 is a sensible approach.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	None	Thank you for your response.
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	Given that a clear mechanism to share information with the Code Manager already exists, as set out in Solution Option 2, we do not see a need to develop alternative solutions.	Thank you for your response.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	We would prefer to wait and see what the government proposals are regarding TPI regulation as this could strengthen the work between suppliers and TPIs, making a complaints process unnecessary	Noted, thank you for your response. The Code Manager remains in engagement with DESNZ regarding these proposals.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	no	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	N/A.	

Question 4:	For solution option 1, do you believe any legal text changes will be required for the REC? If so, please provide details.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	Not that we are aware of.	Thank you for your response.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Please see our response to question 1 of this response. We strongly believe that before this change progresses any further, the Retail Energy Code should pause to carefully consider the level of impact this change would have.	Please see the Code Manager's response to question 1. The Code Manager will review the Proposal Plan, if deemed necessary, following a review of the Party impact assessment.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Legal text changes would be required but we are not supportive of Option 1.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	In line with our answers elsewhere, we do not believe any legal changes to the REC are required to address the points raised by this issue.	Thank you for your response.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE do not support option 1, we have therefore not looked into low level detail of changes within the REC which may be required.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	unsure	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	N/A.	

Question 5:	For solution option 1, should the mechanism only be available for Third Parties to report objection activity or be expanded to other Parties? Please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	We believe that the mechanism should be opened up to other 3rd parties who are able to demonstrate that suppliers are abusing the objections process, please refer back to other organisations which have engaged with RECCo previously -I believe it was the Society of Independent Brewers and Associates and BIRA have been vocal on energy and suppliers behaviours previously.	Thank you for your response.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Suppliers, who hold the customer relationship have full visibility of the customer's account. In all cases, they should have a valid reason for initiating the objection process. Allowing any third parties to report non-compliance without access to the full context of a customer's account history, in our view, risks generating further unnecessary and avoidable workload across the industry.	Thank you for your response. We will consider this risk as part of the Code Manager's Business Case Assessment.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We are not supportive of Option 1. A TPI or customer wishing to report potentially non-compliant objection activity can do so by contacting the "destination" supplier who can raise a concern via their Operational Account Manager so Option 1 is not necessary.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	

Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	As outlined in our responses to Question 1 and Question 2, we do not believe that Solution Option 1 should be progressed. In any event, we are unclear as to the meaning of “other parties” in the context of this issue. We note, for instance, that not all REC Parties are directly involved in the switching/objections process. Extending any reporting mechanisms to additional parties could introduce unnecessary complexity, without delivering meaningful benefit to the process.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager appreciates the points you raise include these for consideration in the Business Case Assessment, including the existence of existing mechanisms that may be utilised.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE feel this should all be covered by Supplier Relationships so a mechanism outside of this relationship is not necessary.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	I think suppliers should also be able to report unfair objections to their transfer requests	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	Extending the solution to include other parties seems to be outside of the parameters of the problem statement. We are currently not aware of any additional parties that need or wish to have the ability to raise objections.	Thank you for your response.

Question 6:	For solution option 1, should the mechanism only be available for reporting objection activity? Please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	No, I believe the mechanism should allow other valid information to be shared which could help RECCo from a performance assurance perspective. Also it would ensure maximum return of investment for the cost to implement.	Thank you for your response.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	Please see our response to question 1 of this response. We strongly believe that before this change progresses any further, the Retail Energy Code should pause to carefully consider the level of impact this change would have.	Thank you for your response. Please see the Code Manager comments in response to question 1.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We are not supportive of Option 1. Concerns can be raised via REC Parties.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	We note that this issue is concerns objection activity. Therefore, any solution should be limited to the scope for which this issue was raised.	Thank you for your response.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	SSE do not support option 1.	Thank you for your response.

The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	It should also be available to report non-conformity of supplier liabilities to their customers/TPI's. To often, TPI's are blamed for issues which have arisen due to supplier practices such as rejecting LOAs.	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	Yes. As above, extending the solution beyond reporting objection activity is currently outside the scope of the problem statement.	Thank you for your response.

Question 7:	Do you believe that Third Party Intermediaries should sign up to the REC Voluntary Code of Practice to be able to report objection activity? Please provide rationale.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	As Ofgem have rejected the TPI CoP being mandatory I do not believe a TPI should be made to sign the TPI CoP to enable them to report supplier behaviour as this means its no longer a voluntary code. The TPI CoP and I0213 are two unrelated items and just because a TPI makes a business decision not to sign up to the TPI CoP (for example they may be part of another TPI CoP, or they may have their own in house requirements). This does not mean that the information they are wanting to provide RECCo to demonstrate suppliers' behaviours for Objections are any less valid. I would like to think that RECCO want members of the TPI CoP to do it because they are engaged with the CoP and not being forced to join it.	Thank you for your response. The relation between the two stems from a potential solution option. However, the Code Manager notes the points you raise and will take them into consideration as part of the Business Case Assessment, that will explore further all solution options. The Code Manager is aware of the comments made regarding TPIs and the TPI CoP in the decision for R0137 and will refer

	As Ofgem highlighted in the R0137 TPI CoP response ,RECCO have not been successful so far in engaging with the TPI community with formal consultations, there were only a hand full of formal responses for the formal consultation (14 responses from 2,000+ TPI's. Should RECCO make TPI CoP sign up a mandatory requirement then this may prevent TPI's from engaging with RECCO and in turn miss out on important information which could be vital to improving the industry (which is what this is about). In summary the TPI CoP is currently "voluntary" and should remain this way.	to these as part of the consideration of any solution options that are chosen. The Code Manager is also working to ensure that TPIs are provided with maximum visibility and opportunities to engage with the Change Process for I0213, including at Party impact assessment and consultation.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We are supportive of a voluntary code of practice as a method of setting an industry wide benchmark of expectations to third parties operating within the market. By only allowing third parties who have signed up to the RECs voluntary code of practice to access this functionality, there is a high risk of creating a two-tier system; providing an advantage to those who have chosen to sign up to the code. However, as also stated within our responses to previous questions, we strongly believe that strongly believe that before this change progresses any further, the Retail Energy Code should pause to carefully consider next steps and the wider implications.	Thank you for your response.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Yes, as this would help establish the credentials of the TPI with the REC when reports are being made.	Thank you for your response
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	

Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	We believe it would be both reasonable and proportionate to expect that a TPI should be a signatory to the voluntary REC TPI CoP to report specific information relating to REC Parties to the Code Manager. Signing and adhering to the CoP would demonstrate a level of commitment by TPIs to the REC, whereas REC Parties (including energy suppliers) are already substantially invested in and committed to the REC. We consider the principles in the CoP to be fair, providing a consistent framework and fostering greater accountability across the market. While we continue to believe that direct regulation of TPIs (through the introduction of primary legislation) is the appropriate and necessary solution for this element of the retail energy market, we nevertheless consider the CoP to be a relatively useful mechanism to foster common standards and promote good practice for TPIs.	The Code Manager notes your points around the TPI Code of Practice and will share these with the wider Code Manager team and RECCo as part of ongoing activities relating to the TPI Code of Practice. The Code Manager also remains in engagement with the Authority and DESNZ around ongoing considerations regarding direct regulation of TPIs, and any impact this may have on the REC.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	TPIs must be signed up to the REC code of Practice should this proposal be progressed.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	Yes, we should be proud to be ethical and work with REC/Suppliers to make being a TPI a constructive way for customers to benefit from energy contracting. We should not be actively allowing unethical and illegal practices by certain TPIs be ignored.	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	Yes. Please refer to our response to Q1.	Thank you for your response.

Question 8:	Would implementing either proposed solution incur any costs to your business? If so, please provide details and specify if different for each solution option. If preferable, please indicate which of the below ranges your costs may fall: A) Nil; B) Up to £9,999; C) Between £10,000 and £49,999; D) Between £50,000 and £99,999; or E) more than £100,000.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	B) – Whilst there is no direct financial outlay, the cost to our organisation would be time.	Thank you for your response.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We are unable to quantify the exact amount of the costs incurred, given that the volume of reported objections is unclear.	Thank you for your response.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	Option 1 would incur costs to our business in range B, as we would share the burden of the costs of implementing the objection reporting proposal envisaged under that option.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	We are not able to provide any comments as to costs at this stage.	Thank you for your response.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	The costs of dealing with each complaint is unknown as this is dependant on the resource and resolution.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	Nil	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	A) Nil	Thank you for your response.

Question 9:	Taking into consideration both the costs and the benefits seen by your organisation, do you consider this change should be made? Please specify if you have differing opinions for each solution option.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	Yes we do.	Thank you for your response.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We believe the current approach is ambiguous and could result in unnecessary work for all parties involved. SLC 14a clearly defines a supplier's responsibilities in relation to objections and any oversight of this obligation should fall under the remit of Ofgem, as the regulator. This is also underpinned by Schedule 30: Resolution of Consumer-Facing Switching and Billing Issues, which outlines clear and structured steps. Suppliers who hold the customer relationship have full visibility of the customer's account. In all cases, they should have a valid reason for initiating the objection process. Allowing third parties to report non-compliance without access to the full context of a customer's account history, in our view, risks generating further unnecessary and avoidable workload across the industry. Therefore, we strongly believe that before this change progresses any further, the Retail Energy Code should pause to carefully consider the level of work it will be required, the additional burden it may place on the industry and the potential imbalance this could cause to TPIs depending upon membership of the voluntary code of practice.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager appreciates the points you raise include these for consideration in the Business Case Assessment. The Code Manager will continue to engage with Ofgem on this Issue to clarify existing obligations in the Supplier Licences, alongside advice from REC Legal Advisers. If required, the Code Manager will review the Proposal Plan for I0213.

ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	We do not strongly feel that a change is necessary as a TPI, whether signed up to the voluntary Code of Practice or not, could raise a concern about objections with the “destination” Supplier in a switch which is being potentially unreasonably blocked by objections. That Supplier could then raise the issue with their Operational Account Manager. However, Option 2 would have the advantage of publicising and encouraging sign-up to the TPI CoP and would not incur any costs.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	
Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	We have not identified any material benefits associated with either proposed solution. Nevertheless, we are content that Solution Option 2, which would not require any changes to the REC, would clarify the facility for relevant TPIs to share information with the Code Manager.	Thank you for your response.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	No, as per previous comments provided.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	Yes, I believe it should. There have been no additional costs to ourselves.	Thank you for your response.
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	We agree that this change should be made.	Thank you for your response.

Question 10:	Do you have any other comments on this Issue?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Business Energy Direct (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	I believe suppliers may raise objections to this change as they see it as a negative change due to an increase in reporting obligations placed on them by RECCO. The purpose of the change is to allow TPI's to highlight suppliers' behaviours on objections. Whilst the exact number of contracts/switches conducted by TPI's is unknown, it is reported that 60% of supply contracts are agreed via TPI's. This means TPI's have visibility of all supplier behaviours, which is an imperative resource that RECCO should be leveraging, in doing so RECCO will understand what is happening and the findings may support some of the issues flagged in MI information they gain. If suppliers are complying with industry rules, then TPI's won't have anything to report and no additional work would be required by the suppliers.	Thank you for your response and for highlighting the potential concerns from Energy Suppliers regarding increased reporting obligations. We acknowledge your feedback, including on the purpose of the change, and will take it into consideration as part of the Business Case Assessment. Please note that the Party impact assessment is open to all stakeholders, and all responses received will be carefully reviewed and considered in the final evaluation.
Centrica (Energy Supplier)	We have no further comments.	Thank you for your response.
ENGIE (Energy Supplier)	No.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	

Scottish Power Energy Retail (Energy Supplier)	We have no further comments at this stage.	Thank you for your response.
SSE Energy Supply (Energy Supplier)	No.	Thank you for your response.
The Energy Desk (UK) (Third Party Intermediary)	n/a	
Utilita (Energy Supplier)	No further comments.	Thank you for your response.