
Change Management

Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Process overview	4
3	Establishing the Cross Code Steering Group.....	5
4	Change Register.....	7
5	Energy Market Architecture Repository.....	7
6	Preliminary advice and assistance.....	7
7	Submitting Issues and Change Proposals	8
8	Acceptance of Issue or Submitted Change Proposal	8
9	Initial assessment	9
10	Change Proposal Plan Progression	11
11	Proposal development.....	11
12	REC Service Provider impact assessments.....	12
13	Party impact assessments.....	13
14	Consultation with Cross Code Steering Group.....	13
15	Compliance with Change Proposal Plan	14
16	Withdrawing a Issues or Change Proposals	14
17	Alternative Change Proposals	15
18	Change Report	16
19	Industry consultation.....	16
20	Determination by the Responsible Sub-Committee.....	17
21	Approval or rejection of a Change Proposal.....	17
22	Appeal of Self-Governance Changes.....	18
23	Significant Code Reviews	18
24	Changes to Company Governance Schedule	19
25	Housekeeping Change Proposals.....	19
26	Implementation	22
27	Release Management.....	22
28	Category 3 Product.....	25

SCHEDULE 5

Change Management

Version: 3.4

Effective Date: 19 July 2024

Domestic Suppliers	Mandatory
Non-Domestic Suppliers	Mandatory
Gas Transporters	Mandatory
Distribution Network Operators	Mandatory
DCC	Mandatory
Metering Equipment Managers	Mandatory
Non-Party REC Service Users	N/A

Change History

Version Number	Implementation Date	Reason for Change
0.1	N/A	Version agreed for June 2018 industry consultation
0.2	N/A	Version agreed for June 2019 industry consultation
0.3	N/A	Version for 2020 industry consultation
0.4	N/A	Version for Oct 2020 consultation
1.1	15 January 2021	REC v1.1
2.0	1 September 2021	Changes to reflect v2.0 revisions
2.1	14 April 2022	Changes to reflect R0028
3.0	18 July 2022	Switching SCR Modification R0041
3.1	01 April 2023	R0073
3.2	03 November 2023	R0140
3.3	28 June 2024	R0070
3.4	19 July 2024	R0167

1 Introduction

- 1.1. This [REC Schedule](#) sets out the process for changing this [Code](#). A change to this [Code](#) may only be made in accordance with this [REC Schedule](#). This includes changes to the [REC Schedules](#) and the [Technical Specification](#).
- 1.2. Each change to this [Code](#) must commence with a developed [Change Proposal](#) made in accordance with the provisions of this [REC Schedule](#).
- 1.3. Each Issue and [Change Proposal](#) will be expected to focus on an issue that the [Proposer](#) seeks to address and/or an outcome they wish to effect, rather than necessarily on the detail of a potential solution. Where an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) does contain a proposed solution, that will not preclude the [Code Manager](#) from exploring and developing solutions which may better fulfil the [Proposer](#)'s intention and/or the [REC Objectives](#) more generally.
- 1.4. This [REC Schedule](#) does not deal with [Operational Switching Service Changes](#). These are dealt with in the [Switching Service Management Schedule](#).

2 Process overview

- 2.1. Whilst each [Change Proposal](#) submitted in accordance with Paragraph 7 will follow a process that is particular to its requirements, there are usually six stages to the process, as follows (subject to Paragraph 2.5):
 - (a) submission and acceptance of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) (Paragraphs 7 and 8);
 - (b) initial assessment of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) (Paragraphs 9 and 10);
 - (c) only to the extent necessary, further development of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) (Paragraph 11), impact assessment by [REC Service Providers](#) and/or [Parties](#) (Paragraphs 12 and/or 13), and/or referral to the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) or other expert groups identified by the [Code Manager](#) (Paragraph 14);
 - (d) production of the [Change Proposal](#) and its [Change Report](#) and consultation on such report (Paragraphs 18 and 19);
 - (e) approval or rejection of the [Change Proposal](#), including the appeal window (Paragraphs 20 to 22); and
 - (f) implementation and release of the [Change Proposal](#) (Paragraphs 26 and 27).
- 2.2. The Responsible [Sub-Committee](#) is the body responsible for making the decision (or

for making recommendations to the [Authority](#)) on whether to approve a [Change Proposal](#). The [Change Panel](#) is the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) for [Change Proposals](#) to change the majority of this [Code](#). However, the [REC Baseline Statement](#) identifies certain [REC Schedules](#) and other documents for which other [Sub-Committees](#) are the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#).

- 2.3. In the case of [Category 3 Products](#), changes to these shall be approved by the [Responsible Provider](#) in accordance with Paragraph 29.
- 2.4. In the case of any [Change Proposals](#) impacting Meter Product Data (an “[MPD Change](#)”) the [Change Proposal](#) shall follow the process set out in Paragraph 28.
- 2.5. In the case of a [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#), a shortened process shall apply, as set out in Paragraph 25.

3 Establishing the [Cross Code Steering Group](#)

- 3.1. The [Code Manager](#) shall establish (in accordance with the [REC Board](#)'s directions), together with the code administrators of other [Energy Codes](#), the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) to manage the interaction between this [Code](#) and other [Energy Codes](#).
- 3.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall agree the terms of reference for the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) with the code administrators of the other [Energy Codes](#). Such terms of reference must include:
 - (a) constituency of the group, including details of the organisations required to participate;
 - (b) high-level details of the provisions that will be considered by the [Cross Code Steering Group](#);
 - (c) the process for determining the matters outlined in Paragraph 3.3; and
 - (d) how and when meetings are to be convened.
- 3.3. The core roles of the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) shall be to:
 - (a) provide its views on whether a potential change to one [Energy Code](#) is likely to have an impact on the other [Energy Codes](#) or on the parties to those codes;
 - (b) determine whether a potential change to one [Energy Code](#) is likely to require a parallel or consequential change to another [Energy Code](#); and

- (c) where Paragraph 3.3(b) applies, determine which [Energy Code](#) is to be used as the lead-code for the change.
- 3.4. Where the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) determines that this [Code](#) is to be used as the lead-code for an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), then:
- (a) the [Code Manager](#) shall progress the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) in accordance with this [Code](#);
 - (b) the [Code Manager](#) shall coordinate with the code administrators of the other affected [Energy Codes](#) so that they can manage the processes under their [Energy Codes](#) in parallel with the process under this [Code](#);
 - (c) the [Change Proposal](#) shall only be approved if both (i) the [Change Proposal](#) is approved in accordance with this [Code](#); and (ii) the associated consequential changes under the other [Energy Codes](#) are all approved in accordance with those other [Energy Codes](#); and
 - (d) if the [Change Proposal](#) is approved in accordance with this [Code](#), but one or more of the associated consequential changes under the other [Energy Codes](#) are not approved in accordance with those other [Energy Codes](#), then the [Change Panel](#) may, within 30 days of the decision or other determination which triggered the application of this sub-paragraph, refer the [Change Proposal](#) and all associated consequential changes to the [Authority](#) for a decision.
- 3.5. Where the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) determines that another [Energy Code](#) is to be used as the lead-code for a [Change Proposal](#), then the [Code Manager](#) shall progress that [Change Proposal](#) in accordance with this [Code](#), but subject to the following:
- (a) the [Code Manager](#) shall progress the [Change Proposal](#) in parallel with the change under the lead-code, and as far as practicable subject to the timetable determined under the lead-code;
 - (b) the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) shall have regard to the change under the lead-code but make its decision under Paragraph 20 based on an assessment of the consequential change to this [Code](#) only;
 - (c) the [Change Proposal](#) shall only be approved if both (i) the [Change Proposal](#) is approved in accordance with this [Code](#); and (ii) the associated change to the lead [Energy Code](#) is approved in accordance with that [Energy Code](#); and
 - (d) if the change to the lead [Energy Code](#) is approved, but the consequential change under this [Code](#) is not approved, then the code administrator (or other relevant body) under the lead [Energy Code](#) may refer the decision in respect of

the consequential change under this [Code](#) to the [Authority](#); provided that such referral must be made within 30 days after the later of the approval under the lead [Energy Code](#) or the rejection under this [Code](#).

4 [Change Register](#)

- 4.1. The [Code Manager](#) shall establish and maintain a register of all current and past [Issues](#) and [Change Proposals](#) (referred to as the [Change Register](#)).
- 4.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall determine the content of the [Change Register](#).
- 4.3. Where submission of an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) is accepted under Paragraph 8, the [Code Manager](#) shall assign a unique identifier to the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), and add it to the [Change Register](#).
- 4.4. The [Code Manager](#) shall publish the [Change Register](#) on the [REC Portal](#).
- 4.5. The [Code Manager](#) shall also publish on the [REC Portal](#) details of changes and proposed changes to other [Energy Codes](#) which are related to or may have an impact on this [Code](#), and details of other matters which may affect this [Code](#), including [Significant Code Reviews](#).

5 [Energy Market Architecture Repository](#)

- 5.1. The [Energy Market Architecture Repository](#) is a digitalised graphical representation of the content of this [Code](#).
- 5.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall maintain and update the [Energy Market Architecture Repository](#) to reflect and record the effect of each and every relevant change which is implemented, whether to this [Code](#) in accordance with this [REC Schedule](#), or to any other [Energy Code](#) (provided it has been notified to the [Code Manager](#)).

6 Preliminary advice and assistance

- 6.1. The [Code Manager](#) shall provide (free of charge) advice and assistance to any interested person, consistent with (but not limited to) the requirements of the [Code Administration Code of Practice](#), which shall include:
 - (a) assistance with the development of [Issues](#) and [Change Proposals](#) and/or exploration of other possible remedies to address issues raised;
 - (b) explanation of the operation and effect of this [Code](#), including this [Change Management Schedule](#); and

- (c) acting as a ‘critical friend’ in the provision of support to any person with an interest in this [Code](#), particularly with respect to under-represented [Parties](#), small market participants and consumer representatives.

7 Submitting [Issues](#) and [Change Proposals](#)

- 7.1. Any interested person may submit an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) (referred to as a [Proposer](#)), regardless of whether or not they are a [Party](#). A [Change Proposal](#) may only be submitted if it includes a developed solution.
- 7.2. The [Code Manager](#) may prescribe what information will be required to support the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), in accordance with best practice and consistent with any requirements of the [Code Administration Code of Practice](#). The [Code Manager](#) shall set out the requirements, and publish accompanying guidance on the submission and treatment of [Issues](#) or [Change Proposals](#), on the [REC Portal](#).
- 7.3. [Issues](#) and [Change Proposals](#) must be submitted electronically via the [REC Portal](#).

8 Acceptance of [Issue](#) or a Submitted [Change Proposal](#)

- 8.1. Except in the case of an [Authority Change Proposal](#), or where otherwise directed by the [Change Panel](#), the [Code Manager](#) may refuse to accept submission of an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) if the [Code Manager](#) considers that one of more of the following apply:
 - (a) the proposal is incomplete or insufficiently clear;
 - (b) the proposal and/or issue that it seeks to address is not materially different from or could appropriately form part of an active [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) that has not yet been decided upon;
 - (c) the proposal concerns matters that are outside the scope of this [Code](#); or
 - (d) for a [Change Proposal](#) the proposal has no reasonable prospect of being approved.
- 8.2. If the [Code Manager](#) refuses to accept submission of an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), it shall write to the [Proposer](#), copying in the [Change Panel](#), setting out the reasons for refusal, and offering assistance (where reasonably practicable) to address the reasons given (such that the proposal could be re-submitted).
- 8.3. The [Change Panel](#) may, independently or on the application of any person, overrule a decision by the [Code Manager](#) to refuse submission or progression of an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), based on the same criteria as apply under Paragraph 8.1.

- 8.4. Where submission of an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) is accepted by the [Code Manager](#), unless it is clear that the scope of the proposal is limited to the provisions of this [Code](#), the [Code Manager](#) shall refer the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) to the [Cross Code Steering Group](#), so that the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) can consider the matters set out in Paragraph 3.3.
- 8.5. The [Code Manager](#) may revisit its consideration of an [Issue](#) or a [Change Proposal](#) under this Paragraph 8 if new evidence or analysis is available, whether as a result of an impact assessment or otherwise. Despite its earlier acceptance of the [Issue](#) or a [Change Proposal](#), if the [Code Manager](#) reasonably believes that any of the criteria in Paragraphs 8.1(b)(c) or (d) now apply, the [Code Manager](#) may determine that the [Issue](#) or a [Change Proposal](#) should not progress any further and Paragraph 8.2 shall apply.

9 Initial assessment

- 9.1. For each [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) accepted under Paragraph 8, the [Code Manager](#) shall undertake an initial assessment in accordance with the requirements of this Paragraph 9, and the [Change Panel](#)'s standing instructions regarding timetable and criteria.

Change Paths

- 9.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall make the initial determination of which approval route (referred to as a [Change Path](#)) each [REC](#) Change [Issue](#) [Change Proposal](#) will follow, being either:
- (a) an [Authority-Approved Change](#); or
 - (b) a [Self-Governance Change](#).
- 9.3. [Authority-Approved Changes](#) are those which satisfy one or more of the following criteria:
- (a) the changes are likely to have a material impact on existing or future [Energy Consumers](#);
 - (b) the changes are likely to have a material impact on competition in the supply of gas or electricity in Great Britain;
 - (c) the changes are likely to discriminate in their effects between one [Party](#) (or class of [Parties](#)) and another [Party](#) (or class of [Parties](#)); or
 - (d) the [Change Proposal](#) has been raised by the [Authority](#) or as a result of a direction by the [Authority](#).

- 9.4. The [Code Manager](#) may seek an informal view from the [Authority](#) regarding the most appropriate [Change Path](#).

[Urgent Change Proposals](#)

- 9.5. The [Code Manager](#) shall make the initial determination of whether an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) is to be an [Urgent Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), based on the criteria for urgency published by the [Authority](#) from time to time.

[Responsible Sub-Committee](#)

- 9.6. The [Code Manager](#) shall make the initial determination of which [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) is to make the decision for a [Change Proposal](#) under Paragraph 20, by reference to the [REC Baseline Statement](#). Where a [Change Proposal](#) affects more than one part of this [Code](#), and the different parts are identified in the [REC Baseline Statement](#) as the responsibility of different [Sub-Committees](#), then the [Change Panel](#) shall make the decision.

[Change Proposal Plan](#)

- 9.7. The [Code Manager](#) shall draft the initial [Change Proposal Plan](#) for each [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), and may make amendments to each such plan from time to time (in each case subject to Paragraph 9.9).

- 9.8. The [Change Proposal Plan](#) for each [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) shall set out:

- (a) the timetable and priority of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#);
- (b) whether the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) is:
 - (i) sufficiently developed and/or urgent to warrant it going straight to the [Change Report](#) (under Paragraph 18); or
 - (ii) in need of further development by the [Code Manager](#) and/or [Subject Matter Experts](#), and/or of an impact assessment by the [Parties](#) and/or one or more [REC Service Providers](#); and
- (c) whether the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) has cross-code impacts such that it needs to be progressed in conjunction with the [Cross Code Steering Group](#).

- 9.9. In determining the prioritisation and timetable to be followed in respect of each [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), the [Code Manager](#) shall:

- (a) (subject to (b) below) determine a reasonable timetable, having regard to the

[Issue](#)'s or [Change Proposal](#)'s complexity, importance relative to other ongoing [Issues](#) or [Change Proposals](#) and time-sensitivity; and

- (b) in the case of [Authority Issues](#) or [Change Proposals](#) and [Urgent Issues](#) or [Change Proposals](#), determine a timetable consistent with any relevant timetable issued by the [Authority](#).

10 [Change Proposal Plan](#) Progression

- 10.1. For each [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) accepted under Paragraph 8, the [Code Manager](#) shall report to the [Change Panel](#) on the outcome of the [Code Manager](#)'s assessment under Paragraph 9, and provide the [Change Panel](#) with the proposed [Change Proposal Plan](#).
- 10.2. Where a [Change Proposal Plan](#) provides for the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) to be referred to one or more [Subject Matter Experts](#) and/or provides for the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) to be referred to one or more [REC Service Providers](#) for an impact assessment, then the [Code Manager](#) shall send the updated [Change Proposal Plan](#) to the [REC Board](#) highlighting the budgeted costs for such referrals
- 10.3. The [Code Manager](#)'s initial determination under Paragraph 9 of the applicable [Change Path](#), urgency-status, [Responsible Sub-Committee](#), and [Change Proposal Plan](#) shall apply unless and until over-turned by:
 - (a) the [Code Manager](#), who shall keep the relevant issues under consideration, and who may make changes as circumstances dictate;
 - (b) the [Change Panel](#), when considering the report provided under this Paragraph 10 or following the application of a [Party](#), the [Consumer Representative](#) or a [REC Service Provider](#) (but the [Change Panel](#) cannot overrule the [REC Board](#) or the [Authority](#));
 - (c) the [REC Board](#), in respect of plans to refer an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) to a [Subject Matter Expert](#) or to a [REC Service Provider](#); and/or
 - (d) the [Authority](#), at its own volition or (where the issue has previously been determined by the [Change Panel](#) or the [REC Board](#)) following the application of a [Party](#), the [Consumer Representative](#) or a [REC Service Provider](#).
- 10.4. The [REC Board](#)'s input on plans to refer an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) to a [Subject Matter Expert](#) or to a [REC Service Provider](#) is to ensure that the [REC Board](#) has appropriate oversight of the external spend which will be incurred as a result.

11 Proposal development

- 11.1. This Paragraph 11 only applies to an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) where its [Change Proposal Plan](#) provides that further development of the [Change Proposal](#) by the [Code Manager](#) and/or one or more [Subject Matter Experts](#) is required.
- 11.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall further analyse and develop the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) in accordance with the [Change Proposal Plan](#).
- 11.3. Subject to the [Change Proposal Plan](#), the [Code Manager](#) may (and shall at the request of the [REC Board](#) or the [Authority](#)) call upon the support of [Subject Matter Experts](#) and legal and other advisors contracted to the [RECCo](#) and available on a call-off basis for that purpose.
- 11.4. The [Subject Matter Experts](#) will be a mixture of:
- (a) individuals and organisations contracted by [RECCo](#); and
 - (b) individuals made available by [Parties](#) on a voluntary basis.
- 11.5. The [Code Manager](#) shall determine which [Subject Matter Expert](#)(s) will review which aspects of each [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) (subject to the [Change Proposal Plan](#) and the budget provided for in the [Change Proposal Plan](#)).
- 11.6. The [Proposer](#) shall retain control of the legal text of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), and no variations can be made to the legal text without the [Proposer](#)'s approval. Where the [Proposer](#) does not wish to vary the legal text of its [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), the [Code Manager](#) may raise an [Alternative Change Proposal](#).

12 [REC Service Provider](#) impact assessments

- 12.1. This Paragraph 12 only applies to an [Issue](#) where its [Change Proposal Plan](#) provides that an impact assessment from one or more [REC Service Providers](#) is required or where the [Code Manager](#) determines that further development is required for a [Change Proposal](#).
- 12.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall commission an impact assessment from one or more of the [REC Service Providers](#), in accordance with the [Change Proposal Plan](#) (subject to the budgetary constraints provided for in the [Change Proposal Plan](#)).
- 12.3. Where requested to do so by the [Code Manager](#), each [REC Service Provider](#) shall, within 5 [Working Days](#) of a request, confirm whether the [REC Service Provider](#) considers that the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) would be likely to have an impact on the services it provides in its capacity as a [REC Service Provider](#).
- 12.4. Where the [Code Manager](#) requests further assessment, the [REC Service Provider](#) shall:
- (a) within 15 [Working Days](#) of a request, unless otherwise agreed with the [Code Manager](#), provide (free of charge) a preliminary assessment of the scope, cost and likely timescales for changes to its [Systems](#) which would be necessary as a result of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) being approved, together with

confirmation of the cost and timescales of providing a detailed impact assessment; and

- (b) within 40 [Working Days](#) (or in accordance with such other timetable as the [Code Manager](#) may agree) provide, at a price agreed with the [Code Manager](#), a detailed impact assessment of the scope, cost and timescales for making the changes to the [System](#)s the [REC Service Provider](#) uses (or its sub-contractors use) to provide the services it provides in its capacity as a [REC Service Provider](#) which would be necessary as a result of the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) being approved.

- 12.5. [REC Service Providers](#) shall invoice [RECCo](#) once the [Code Manager](#) confirms the impact assessment is completed to an acceptable standard and has been delivered in the agreed timetable and is for the amount quoted.
- 12.6. The performance of each [REC Service Provider](#) under this Paragraph 12 shall be subject to [Performance Standards](#) overseen by the [REC PAB](#).
- 12.7. Where a [REC Service Provider](#) informs the [Code Manager](#) that the [REC Service Provider](#) is unable to provide a view, preliminary assessment or detailed impact assessment in accordance with this Paragraph 12, or the [Code Manager](#) is unable to agree an appropriate timescale or costs with a [REC Service Provider](#), then the [Code Manager](#) may procure an independent assessment. The [REC Service Provider](#) shall provide (free of charge) all reasonable co-operation and assistance in relation to any such independent assessment, and shall be liable for any and all costs incurred by the [Code Manager](#) in respect of any activity for which the [REC Service Provider](#) would not have been paid under this Paragraph 12.
- 12.8. Where the response to [REC Service Provider](#) impact assessments identifies the need to coordinate testing activities between [REC Service Providers](#) (should the [Change Proposal](#) be approved for implementation), the [Code Manager](#) shall create a [REC Test Strategy](#), setting out the testing objectives and approach to coordinating testing activities between [REC Service Providers](#).

13 Party impact assessments

- 13.1. This Paragraph 13 only applies to an [Issue](#) where its [Change Proposal Plan](#) provides that an impact assessment from the [Parties](#) (or one or more classes of [Parties](#)) is required or where the [Code Manager](#) determines that further development is required for a [Change Proposal](#).
- 13.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall consult with and seek impact assessments from the [Parties](#) (or one or more classes of [Party](#)) in accordance with the [Change Proposal Plan](#).

14 Consultation with [Cross Code Steering Group](#)

- 14.1. This Paragraph 14 only applies to an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) where its [Change Proposal Plan](#) provides that the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) is to be consulted on the [Change Proposal](#).
- 14.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall consult with the [Cross Code Steering Group](#) in accordance with the [Change Proposal Plan](#).
- 14.3. The [Code Manager](#) shall progress the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) subject to Paragraph 3.4 or 3.5 (as applicable in accordance with the [Cross Code Steering Group](#)'s determination from time to time).

15 Compliance with [Change Proposal Plan](#)

- 15.1. The [REC Board](#), the [Change Panel](#), the [Code Manager](#), the [REC Service Providers](#) and each [Party](#) shall (insofar as within its reasonable control) complete any and all of the respective tasks assigned to them in respect of an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) in accordance with the [Change Proposal Plan](#) applying to that [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#).

16 Withdrawing [Issues](#) or [Change Proposals](#)

- 16.1. The [Proposer](#) may withdraw support for an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) on notice to the [Code Manager](#) at any time prior to publication of the proposal's [Final Change Report](#).
- 16.2. As soon as is reasonably practicable after receiving such notice, the [Code Manager](#) shall notify the [Parties](#) that the [Proposer](#) has withdrawn support for the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#).
- 16.3. Where, within 10 [Working Days](#) of the [Code Manager](#) issuing a withdrawal notice, the [Code Manager](#) receives notice from an individual or organisation that it is prepared to adopt the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#), that individual or organisation shall become the [Proposer](#) for the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#). The [Code Manager](#) may also choose to adopt an [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) that would otherwise be withdrawn, and the [Change Register](#) will be updated to reflect the new [Proposer](#) following the adoption.
- 16.4. Unless adopted under Paragraph 16.3, the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) shall be withdrawn on the expiry of the notice period under that paragraph, and the [Change Register](#) updated accordingly.
- 16.5. Where one or more [Authority Change Proposals](#) have been raised, the [Authority](#) may issue a direction under this Paragraph 16.5 that requires the withdrawal of those [Authority Change Proposals](#) and of any related [Alternative Change Proposals](#). Where the [Authority](#) so directs:
- (a) the [Significant Code Review Phase](#) shall re-commence; and
 - (b) such [Change Proposals](#) shall be deemed to have been withdrawn under this

Paragraph 16 and shall not be capable of being adopted under Paragraph 16.3.

- 16.6. Where a [Change Proposal](#) is withdrawn which already has an [Alternative Change Proposal](#) associated to it, the [Alternative Change Proposal](#) is not automatically withdrawn by the same notice and will continue to be progressed in accordance with the published [Change Proposal Plan](#).

17 [Alternative Change Proposals](#)

- 17.1. Any person may raise an alternative proposal (referred to as an [Alternative Change Proposal](#)) to be progressed alongside an existing [Change Proposal](#), subject to the rules in Paragraph 17.3

- 17.2. The following rules apply to [Alternative Change Proposals](#):

- (a) an [Alternative Change Proposal](#) must be raised and considered before publication of the [Change Report](#) for the [Change Proposal](#) (and the [Code Manager](#) can refuse to accept a proposed [Alternative Change Proposal](#) if its acceptance would prevent the [Code Manager](#) completing the [Change Report](#) in accordance with the [Change Proposal](#)'s timetable);
- (b) the [Code Manager](#) may refuse a proposed [Alternative Change Proposal](#) on the same grounds as apply to [Issues](#) [Change Proposals](#) under Paragraph 8.1;
- (c) the [Code Manager](#) may refuse a proposed [Alternative Change Proposal](#) on the grounds it is not seeking to address the same (or similar) issues as the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#); and
- (d) the [Code Manager](#) may refuse a proposed [Alternative Change Proposal](#) on the grounds that it is not substantively different from the existing [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) and/or its existing [Alternative Change Proposals](#).

- 17.3. There is no restriction on the number of [Alternative Change Proposals](#) that can be raised in relation to a [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#).

- 17.4. Refusal by the [Code Manager](#) to accept an [Alternative Change Proposal](#) does not prevent the [Proposer](#) submitting a new [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#).

- 17.5. Each [Alternative Change Proposal](#) shall be subject to the same process as applies to the [Issue](#) or [Change Proposal](#) in respect of which the [Alternative Change Proposal](#) was raised. Except where the context otherwise requires, references in this [Code](#) to [Change Proposals](#) shall be deemed to include reference to its [Alternative Change Proposal\(s\)](#).

- 17.6. The decision of the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) in respect of the original [Change Proposal](#) and its [Alternative Change Proposal\(s\)](#) shall be made at the same time, and on the basis that no more than one of the changes can be approved by the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#).

18 Change Report

- 18.1. Change Proposals may progress from their initial assessment under Paragraphs 9 and 10 to the Change Report phase (as described in this Paragraph 18). Issues may require development under Paragraphs 11, 12, 13 and/or 14 before they progress (as Change Proposals) to the Change Report phase.
- 18.2. In the Change Report phase, the Code Manager shall prepare a written report on the Change Proposal (referred to as a Change Report).
- 18.3. The Change Report for each Change Proposal shall set out:
- (a) a description and analysis of the Change Proposal;
 - (b) the proposed legal text to change this Code in order to give effect to the Change Proposal;
 - (c) the proposed implementation date(s) for the implementation of the Change Proposal;
 - (d) for Self-Governance Changes, the business case for the Change Proposal, and the Code Manager's recommendation as to whether or not the Change Proposal should be approved;
 - (e) for Authority-Approved Changes, an assessment of the Change Proposal against the REC Objectives, and the Code Manager's recommendation as to whether or not the Change Proposal should be approved;
 - (f) where relevant, the assessment of the REC Service Providers as to whether implementation of the Change Proposal would require changes to their Systems, and (if so) the likely cost of such changes, and the time period required for the design, build and delivery of the changes;
 - (g) where relevant, the outcome of any Party impact assessment undertaken by the Code Manager; and
 - (h) where relevant, a summary of any input given by the Cross Code Steering Group.

19 Industry consultation

- 19.1. The Code Manager shall publish the Change Report for each Change Proposal and consult with Parties, REC Service Providers and other interested persons regarding such report in accordance with the applicable Change Proposal Plan.

- 19.2. Following such consultation, the [Code Manager](#) shall produce an updated version of the [Change Report](#) which covers those matters required to be covered in the [Change Report](#), and also reports on the outcome of the consultation, setting out a summary of the consultation submissions and the [Code Manager](#)'s response to such submissions.

20 Determination by the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#)

- 20.1. In respect of each [Change Report](#), the [Code Manager](#) shall arrange for the relevant [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) to determine whether to approve the [Change Proposal](#). [Change Proposals](#) that are not approved are deemed rejected.
- 20.2. The relevant [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) shall make its determination in respect of each [Change Proposal](#) based on whether:
- (a) in the case of [Authority-Approved Changes](#), the approval of the [Change Proposal](#) would better facilitate the [REC Objectives](#) than not approving the [Change Proposal](#); or
 - (b) in the case of [Self-Governance Changes](#), the business case for approving the [Change Proposal](#) (which may or may not specifically refer to the [REC Objectives](#)) has been made.
- 20.3. The relevant [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) must record the outcome of its determination (based on the criteria above), and (if applicable) the reasoning for its divergence from the [Code Manager](#)'s recommendation.
- 20.4. Decisions of the relevant [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) shall be made by a majority vote.

21 Approval or rejection of a [Change Proposal](#)

- 21.1. The effect of the determination under Paragraph 20 in respect of each [Change Proposal](#) shall be (unless Paragraph 3.5 applies):
- (a) in the case of [Authority-Approved Changes](#), a recommendation to the [Authority](#) that the [Change Proposal](#) be approved or rejected; or
 - (b) in the case of [Self-Governance Changes](#), to approve or reject the [Change Proposal](#) (subject to appeals under Paragraph 22).
- 21.2. In the case of each [Authority-Approved Change](#), the [Authority](#) will determine whether to approve or reject the [Change Proposal](#).
- 21.3. If the [Authority](#) considers that it is unable to form an opinion in relation to the approval or rejection of an [Authority-Approved Change](#), the [Authority](#) may issue a direction to the [Change Panel](#) specifying any additional steps that the [Authority](#) requires in order to form such an opinion (including drafting or amending the

proposed legal text, revising the proposed implementation timetable, and/or revising or providing additional analysis and/or information). Where the [Authority](#) issues a direction to the [Change Panel](#) pursuant to this Paragraph 21.3:

- (a) the vote under Paragraph 20 shall be null and void;
- (b) the [Change Panel](#) shall (in accordance with any directions given by the [Authority](#)) determine the additional steps to be undertaken and the timetable for those steps; and
- (c) the [Code Manager](#) shall update the [Change Register](#), and progress the [Change Proposal](#) in accordance with the [Change Panel](#)'s determination.

22 Appeal of [Self-Governance Changes](#)

- 22.1. Any [Party](#) or person materially impacted by the outcome of the decision under Paragraph 20 in respect of a [Self-Governance Change](#), may (within 10 [Working Days](#) following the notification of that decision) appeal the decision to the [Authority](#).
- 22.2. If the decision under Paragraph 20 in respect of a [Self-Governance Change](#) differs from the recommendation of the [Code Manager](#), then the decision will automatically be referred to the [Authority](#) *unless* the [Code Manager](#) considers that the reasons provided by the relevant [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) are of themselves sufficient for it to change its own recommendation. In such cases, the revision to the recommendation and specifically the reasons for it will be recorded by the [Code Manager](#).
- 22.3. For each decision appealed to the [Authority](#) under Paragraph 22.1 or 22.2, the [Authority](#) will then determine whether to approve or reject the [Change Proposal](#). Accordingly, where the [Authority](#)'s determination is that the [Change Proposal](#) is to be rejected (where it has previously been approved) the [Change Proposal](#) shall be cancelled and not implemented (or, if already implemented, shall be reversed).
- 22.4. The [Authority](#) may, in respect of appeals under this Paragraph 22:
- (a) dismiss the appeal if it is brought for reasons that are trivial or vexatious, or has no reasonable prospect of success; or
 - (b) send the [Change Proposal](#) back to the [Change Panel](#) under Paragraph 21.3 if the [Authority](#) considers that it is unable to form an opinion in relation to the approval or rejection of the [Change Proposal](#).

23 Significant Code Reviews

- 23.1. During a [Significant Code Review Phase](#):
- (a) the [Change Panel](#) shall report to the [Authority](#) on whether or not the [Change Panel](#) considers that any [Change Proposal](#) on which there has not yet been a

vote prior to the commencement of the [Significant Code Review](#) (whether submitted before or after the commencement of the [Significant Code Review](#)) falls within the scope of the [Significant Code Review](#);

- (b) the [Change Panel](#) may (subject to (d) below) suspend the progress of any [Change Proposal](#) that the [Change Panel](#) considers to fall within the scope of that [Significant Code Review](#);
- (c) the [Authority](#) may (subject to (d) below) direct the [Change Panel](#) to suspend the progress of any [Change Proposal](#) and/or [Alternative Change Proposal](#) that the [Authority](#) considers to fall within the scope of that [Significant Code Review](#) (and the [Change Panel](#) shall comply with such directions); and
- (d) the [Authority](#) may direct the [Change Panel](#) to cease the suspension of any [Change Proposal](#) that has been suspended pursuant to this Paragraph 23 (and the [Change Panel](#) shall comply with such directions).

23.2. Any and all suspensions pursuant to this Paragraph 23 shall automatically cease at the end of the [Significant Code Review Phase](#).

23.3. The commencement and cessation of suspensions in respect of a [Change Proposal](#) pursuant to this Paragraph 23 shall have the effect of modifying the timetable applying to that [Change Proposal](#).

24 Changes to [Company Governance Schedule](#)

24.1. It is unlikely that [RECCo's](#) Articles of Association (as set out in the [Company Governance Schedule](#)) will need to be amended. However, where they do need to be amended this will require approval of [RECCo's](#) shareholders.

24.2. In such cases, where the [Change Proposal](#) is approved, the [Code Manager](#) shall hold a vote of [RECCo's](#) shareholders to approve the change in their capacity as such, and [RECCo's](#) shareholders shall (subject to and in accordance with their rights and obligations under the [Company Governance Schedule](#)) vote in favour of that change.

25 [Housekeeping Change Proposals](#)

25.1. A [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) can only be used to correct an error, inconsistency or factual change, including:

- (a) updating names, addresses (including email addresses) listed in this [Code](#);
- (b) correcting minor typographical or grammatical errors;
- (c) correcting formatting and consistency errors, such as Clause or Paragraph numbering; or

- (d) updating out of date references to other documents, Clauses or Paragraphs.

25.2. The [Code Manager](#) will follow a process for Housekeeping Changes that is particular to its requirements, and in accordance with the following four-stage process (which applies instead of the process described elsewhere in this [REC Schedule](#)):

- (a) acceptance of the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#);
- (b) assessment of the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#);
- (c) production of the [Housekeeping Change Report](#); and
- (d) approval or rejection of the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#).

Acceptance

25.3. Any interested person may submit a [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) via the [REC Portal](#).

25.4. The [Code Manager](#) may refuse to accept the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#), if the [Code Manager](#) considers that:

- (a) the proposal is incomplete or insufficiently clear; or
- (b) the proposal does not meet the criteria set out in Paragraph 25.1;

25.5. If the [Code Manager](#) decides that the scope of the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) goes beyond the criteria set out in Paragraph 25.1, then it will re-consider acceptance and progression of the [Change Proposal](#) (as a non-[Housekeeping Change Proposal](#)), in accordance with Paragraph 8.

25.6. If the [Code Manager](#) refuses to accept submission of a [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) it shall write to the [Proposer](#), setting out the reasons for refusal and offering assistance (where reasonably practicable) to address the reasons given (such that the proposal could be re-submitted).

Assessment

25.7. An assessment will be carried out by the [Code Manager](#), who will assess the impacted products and re-confirm the suitability of the submitted [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) to be a [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#).

25.8. [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#)s will follow the [Self-Governance Change Path](#).

25.9. The [Change Panel](#) will be the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) for determination of [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#)s.

[Housekeeping Change Report](#)

25.10. The [Code Manager](#) will prepare a written report on the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) (referred to as the [Housekeeping Change Report](#)).

25.11. The [Housekeeping Change Report](#) will set out:

- (a) description of the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#);
- (b) the proposed legal text to change this [Code](#) in order to give effect to the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#);
- (c) the proposed implementation date of this [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#); and
- (d) the [Code Manager](#)'s recommendation as to whether or not the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) should be approved.

Industry Consultation

25.12. The [Code Manager](#) shall publish the [Housekeeping Change Report](#) 5 [Working Days](#) before the [Change Panel](#) meeting at which a decision of the [Change Panel](#) is required. The publication will allow [Parties](#), [REC Service Providers](#) and other materially impacted persons to review the proposed [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) in advance of the [Change Panel](#) determination, and if necessary, raise an objection to the change being made under this Paragraph 25. The [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) will not progress to a vote at the [Change Panel](#) if (before the date on which such vote is due to be held) one or more objections is raised by a [Party](#), a [REC Service Provider](#) or the [Authority](#).

Determination by the [Change Panel](#)

25.13. Before the [Change Panel](#) makes its decision on whether to approve the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#), all of the members of the [Change Panel](#) who vote on the issue must unanimously agree that:

- (a) the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) meets the criteria set out in Paragraph 25.1; and
- (b) all [Parties](#), [REC Service Providers](#) and the [Authority](#) have been notified of the proposed [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) and its planned implementation date.

25.14. The [Change Panel](#) shall vote on whether to approve the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#). The [Change Panel](#) shall make its determination based on the business case for approving the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) (which may or may not specifically refer to the [REC Objectives](#)). The [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) shall be approved only if the members of the [Change Panel](#) who vote on the issue unanimously vote to approve the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#).

- 25.15. If one or more objections is received as referred to in Paragraph 25.12, or if the [Change Panel](#) does not agree on the matters required by Paragraph 25.13, or if the [Change Panel](#) does not approve the Housekeeping Change, then the [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#) will be rejected, and the [Code Manager](#) may consider whether the change should be accepted as a standard [Change Proposal](#) as described in Paragraph 8.
- 25.16. The [Code Manager](#) shall within 1 [Working Day](#) after the [Change Panel](#) meeting has made its determination, update the [Housekeeping Change Report](#) (recording the decision of the [Change Panel](#)) and send this to the [Authority](#), each [REC Party](#) and publish it on the [REC Portal](#).
- 25.17. [Housekeeping Change Proposal](#)s approved by the [Change Panel](#) shall be implemented by the [Code Manager](#) in the next scheduled [release](#) under Paragraph 26.

26 Implementation

- 26.1. [Change Proposal](#)s that are approved in accordance with Paragraphs 21 and 22 or Paragraph 25 (or in accordance with another [Energy Code](#) where Paragraph 3.5 applies) shall be implemented by the [Code Manager](#).
- 26.2. The [Code Manager](#) shall establish release dates for the approved [Change Proposal](#)s in accordance with the implementation dates approved as part of the [Change Proposal](#).
- 26.3. These release dates will be consistent with, but not necessarily be limited to, the scheduled release dates of revisions to the [REC Service Provider](#)'s [System](#)s. Changes to this [Code](#) which are unrelated to [System](#) changes may be made independently of [System](#) update release dates, but (for example) to coincide with the beginning of the financial year or a deadline imposed by impending regulations.
- 26.4. Urgent changes may be given effect outside of the scheduled release dates for [System](#) updates, and the [REC Service Providers](#) shall comply with the implementation date approved as part of the [Change Proposal](#).
- 26.5. The implementation of changes to this [Code](#) that necessitate [System](#) changes shall be subject to successful testing of those [System](#) changes.
- 26.6. The implementation dates approved as part of the [Change Proposal](#) can only be changed via a further [Change Proposal](#) or via direction of the [Authority](#), and subject to the normal requirements with respect to impact assessments, etc.

27 Release Management

- 27.1. The [Code Manager](#) shall set out a [Release Plan](#) for each release date which will detail, as a minimum:
- (a) the plan for making updates to this [Code](#) as a result of [Change Proposals](#) approved for that release date, including details of when pre-release information

will be published;

- (b) where changes are required to systems provided by a [REC Service Provider](#), details of the [Service Provider Test Plan](#) set out by that [REC Service Provider](#), including details of relevant [Service Provider Test Phases](#) and planned interactions with [REC Service Users](#);
- (c) where changes are required to systems maintained by the [Code Manager](#) (such as the [REC Portal](#) and [Energy Market Architecture Repository](#)), details of the [Service Provider Test Plan](#) set out by the [Code Manager](#), including details of relevant [Service Provider Test Phases](#) and planned interactions with users of those systems;
- (d) details of any new training or guidance requirements identified and the plan for delivery; and
- (e) details of any planned communications and engagement with impacted [Party](#)'s and stakeholders to support the delivery of the [Release Plan](#).

27.2. Each [REC Service Provider](#) shall provide all relevant information required by the [Code Manager](#) to produce and publish the [Release Plan](#). This includes:

- (a) the [REC Service Provider](#)'s plan for the design, build and testing of any changes to its [Systems](#);
- (b) the [REC Service Provider](#)'s plan (referred to as a [Service Provider Test Plan](#)) detailing the proposed activities in testing and implementing changes to its [Systems](#), including:
 - (i) Required [Service Provider Test Phases](#) and [Test Environments](#);
 - (ii) planned timescales and schedules for each [Service Provider Test Phase](#);
 - (iii) where relevant, confirmation that the plan aligns with the [REC Test Strategy](#) set out by the [Code Manager](#);
 - (iv) entry and exit criteria for each [Service Provider Test Phase](#);
 - (v) the approach to the use of [Test Data](#) in each [Service Provider Test Phase](#);
 - (vi) details of key personnel relevant to the plan and associated roles and responsibilities;

- (vii) any risks, issues, assumptions or dependencies identified in the development of the plan; and
 - (viii) the approach to managing defects identified in testing including associated acceptance criteria for resolving defects; and
 - (c) details of any restricted or confidential information in the [Service Provider Test Plan](#) that should not be shared with other [REC Service Providers](#) and/or [REC Service Users](#) as part of the [Release Plan](#).
- 27.3. Each [CSS User](#) that requires a connection to a [CSS Test Environment](#) shall request access via a [Switching Service Request](#), in line with the Environment Management Plan.
- 27.4. Each [REC Service Provider](#) shall take reasonable steps to deliver changes to its systems and processes in accordance with the [Release Plan](#) and shall notify the [Code Manager](#), in a timely manner, of any risks, issues or dependencies that may impact its ability to deliver in accordance with the [Release Plan](#).
- 27.5. The [Code Manager](#) shall publish the [Release Plan](#) (and any subsequent updates to that Release Plan) on the [REC Portal](#).
- 27.6. Where a [Change Proposal](#) is approved for implementation on a date for which a [Release Plan](#) has already been published by the [Code Manager](#), the [Code Manager](#) shall update the [Release Plan](#) and publish the updated version on the [REC Portal](#).

Meter Product Data Change Proposal

- 27.7. The [Code Manager](#) shall publish a timetable for the submission, approval and implementation of [MPD Change Proposals](#).
- 27.8. Any interested person may submit an [MPD Change Proposal](#), regardless of whether or not they are a [Party](#). Such submission should be made using the submission form published by the [Code Manager](#) on the [REC Portal](#).
- 27.9. Upon receipt of an [MPD Change Proposal](#), the [Code Manager](#) shall review the [MPD Change Proposal](#) and, within 5 [Working Days](#) either
- (a) where the request is incomplete, insufficiently clear or outside the scope of an [MPD Change Proposal](#), reject the [MPD Change Proposal](#); or
 - (b) accept the [MPD Change Proposal](#).
- 27.10. Where the [Code Manager](#) rejects an [MPD Change Proposal](#), they may request additional information or supporting information required for this to be accepted and may accept the [MPD Change Proposal](#) on receipt of an updated submission.
- 27.11. Where the [Code Manager](#) accepts an [MPD Change Proposal](#), this will be presented to the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) (as set out in the [REC Baseline Statement](#)) at

their next scheduled meeting. The [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) shall determine whether each [MPD Change Proposal](#) should be approved for implementation or rejected.

27.12. [MPD Change Proposals](#) approved by the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#) shall be implemented by the [Code Manager](#) in the next scheduled [MPD Release](#), unless another more suitable date is agreed by the [Responsible Sub-Committee](#).

27.13. The [Code Manager](#) will notify [REC Parties](#) of approved [MPD Change Proposal](#).

28 [Category 3 Product](#)

28.1. All [Category 3 Products](#) shall be maintained by the [Responsible Provider](#) set out in the [REC Baseline Statement](#).

28.2. Where a [Responsible Provider](#) makes a change to a [Category 3 Product](#) they are responsible for, they shall submit a [Category 3 Change Proposal](#) to the [Code Manager](#). This shall, as a minimum, include:

- (a) details of the proposed changes to the [Category 3 Product](#) and updated drafting;
- (b) the reason for the change;
- (c) the proposed implementation date for the change; and
- (d) confirmation of whether a period of consultation is required prior to approval of the change.

28.3. On receipt of a [Category 3 Change Proposal](#), the [Code Manager](#) shall within three [Working Days](#) or a mutually agreed upon date with the [Responsible Provider](#) review the proposed changes to determine that these are:

- (a) clear, fully formed and do not require additional development or clarification;
- (b) do not conflict with or contradict the obligations and processes set out in this [Code](#);
- (c) do not require changes to this [Code](#) that have not been approved;
- (d) do not require changes to other [Category 3 Products](#) that have not been identified; and
- (e) do not introduce or infer new or amended obligations on [Party's](#) or [REC Service Providers](#), except where these apply exclusively within the scope of that [Category 3 Product](#) (e.g. amending a process or interface set out in that [Category 3 Product](#)).

- 28.4. Where the [Code Manager](#) is not satisfied that the criteria in Paragraph 29.3 has been met, it shall reject the [Category 3 Change Proposal](#) and inform the [Responsible Provider](#) of the reason for this.
- 28.5. Where the [Code Manager](#) is satisfied that the criteria in Paragraph 29.3 has been met, it shall;
- (a) accept the [Category 3 Change Proposal](#);
 - (b) where requested by the [Responsible Provider](#) or where it determines a period of consultation is necessary to consider material impacts as a result of the change, consult with [Parties](#) and/or other relevant stakeholders on the proposed change;
 - (c) implement the new version of the [Category 3 Product](#) on the date agreed with the [Responsible Provider](#); and
 - (d) notify [Parties](#) and/or [REC Service Users](#) of the updated [Category 3 Product](#).
- 28.6. Where the [Code Manager](#) identifies the need for a new [Category 3 Product](#) to be added to the [REC Baseline Statement](#), it shall consult with the proposed [Responsible Provider](#) prior to submitting a [Category 3 Change Proposal](#) to update the [REC Baseline Statement](#).