Question	Respondent Details	Response	Code Manager comments
Do you agree with the Proposed Solution? If not, please explain why.	Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes Comments on draft legal text: 4.8 (b) We think it should say registration instead of re-registration 4.9 What endeavours are possible? The new supplier does not get that data as part of a SoLR. 4.10 (b) How does the gaining supplier know that a lost notification relates specifically to this Erroneous Switch, it could be a new contract/gain, which means it would be valid to have billed the customer and include this in any objection considerations. This is written as there can be a long lead time between acceptance and initiation.	4.8 (b) The Code Manager believes that the intent should be to return the Consumer back to their original Supplier as if they had never left – therefore believe re-registration is appropriate. This is consistent with other paragraphs in the Schedule. 4.9 Removed from Legal Text. 4.10 (b) Amended Legal Text
	Utilita Energy Limited Energy Supplier	The CoO (Change of Occupier) scenario lacks details and evidence for the need to include this in the ET cancellation process. As mentioned in previous responses we don't believe this scenario will be used often enough to justify any further valuable benefit within R0030, and may only add further confusion when billing.	Whilst the Code Manager has been unable to scale the size of the issue for the CoO scenario, the legal text states that this cancellation process may be used – leaving this to Supplier discretion. If Suppliers believe a better outcome can be achieved for Consumers, the principles set out in Paragraph 2.4 can and should be utilised.
Does the resolution outcome detailed within paragraph 5.6 provide enough clarity following the scenarios detailed within paragraphs	Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	See comments provided on relined scheduled 30 document attached.	Addressed in Q1.
	Utilita Energy Limited Energy Supplier	No further comments to make for 4.7- 4.9.	

4.7 to 4.10? Please consider the Consumer Principles and Outcomes detailed within Section 2 in your response.		If the CoO scenario is introduced, 4.10 should only ever be considered if there is an appropriate ET reason code too. For example, if the reason for the ET is an incorrect MPXN then cancellation due to CoO should not be accepted as it is irrelevant to the underlining issue. In Paragraph 5 communications sent to the Energy Consumer should remain consistent with the GSOP guidelines where the initiating supplier must contact the Energy Consumer to confirm if the ET has been resolved (accepted/rejected). Without linking into the GSOP guidance there will be scenarios where the Energy Consumer will receive communications twice from each suppliers, which is unnecessarily excessive	The Code Manager believes that the Change of Occupier scenario takes precedent over other ES reason codes. This is because the Consumer in the property is not the original contracted party of the losing Supplier. The Code Manager believes that a cancellation is an alternative outcome of the process. For example, we wouldn't expect Consumers to receive a "completed" or "rejected" communication alongside a cancellation communication.
Do you agree with the proposed implementation date and implementation techniques? If not, please explain why.	Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	It depends when this will be at change panel as a minimum 6 months is required for this change.	Proposed implementation updated to June 2023.
	Utilita Energy Limited Energy Supplier	No, there are only 5 months until February 2023, and the lead time will be less as R0030 has not reached Change Panel for final approval. The supplier response from the IA highlighted an average lead time of 6 months. These current timelines are too short or have not been adjusted due to delays in the change process.	Proposed implementation updated to June 2023.
Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the Change Path, that this Change Proposal should be subject to Self-	Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes	
	Utilita Energy Limited Energy Supplier	Yes	

Governance approval by the REC Change Panel?			
Do you agree with the Code Manager's assessment of the case for change and the minded-to position that this Change Proposal should be approved for implementation on 24 February 2023? If not, please explain why?	Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes, but as per Q3 date depends on minimum 6 months' notice.	Proposed implementation updated to June 2023.
	Utilita Energy Limited Energy Supplier	No, as discussed in Q1 and Q3.	Proposed implementation updated to June 2023.
Do you have any other comments relating to this Change Proposal?	Scottish Power Energy Retail Ltd Energy Supplier	Yes, the change has been written to allow cancellation by either supplier, therefore both flows will also require an additional reason code e.g., Y (i.e., opposite supplier to X). On the Interpretation Schedule we believe the following should be changed: "with whom they hold an Energy contract." to "with whom they last held an Energy contract."	Acknowledged – updated in Data Spec Legal review confirmed interpretation updates are not required as a result of this Change.
	Utilita Energy Limited Energy Supplier	No further comments.	