

Consultation on Switching Programme and Retail Code Consolidation – Centrica Response to questions 1.3, 1.4, 1.4, 4.3 & 4.4.

Q1.3: Do you consider that the methodology as set out above is appropriate?

Yes, we believe that the methodology as set out is appropriate.

Q1.4: Do you have any comments on the scope of services?

We support the proposed scope of services as set out and therefore do not have any further comments at this time.

Question 1.5: Do you agree with our outline proposals on the set-up of the REC Manager?

Yes, we agree with the outline proposals for the set-up of the REC Manager.

Question 4.3: Which option outlined above do you think is best suited to govern MPAS (as defined above) once the MRA has closed, and why?

Whilst we do not have particularly strong views over any of the proposed options for enduring MPAS governance, we do feel that to support the broader objectives of further harmonisation of governance arrangements, as explored within the Energy Codes Review, that DCUSA may be the most appropriate destination for the remaining MPAS provisions. This is an opportunity to think about where the Energy Codes Review may be headed and to make decisions now that facilitate future consolidation.

Question 4.4: Do you have concerns about the suitability of any of the options for the future governance of MPAS, outlined above?

We would have concerns about the use of BSC / REC for remaining MPAS provisions as it may not fully support the industry aspirations for further Code reform and harmonisation of arrangements across electricity and gas. Whether in future we see further Code Consolidation, or potentially Code Manager consolidation (e.g. a Code Manager for retail, one for settlement etc but each covering both fuels), moving MPAS governance to anywhere other than DCUSA would not support this and therefore be a prohibitive development.