			Form version 2.1
Change Proposal reference (To be completed by the TP Sec.)	MCCP160	Version No.	D.1

PART A — SUBMISSION					
A.1. GENERAL DETAILS					
A.1.a.	TITLE	Provision of Information	on on Registration Car	ncellation	s
A.1.b.	COMPANY	Business Stream			
Change Proposals must be authorised by the person designated by the signatory to the Market Code Framework / Accession Agreement					
	AUTHORISED SIGNATURE	NAME Duncan Innes			
A.1.d. (CONTACT NAME	Duncan Innes	CONTACT EMAIL; TEL./MOB.	Duncan stream. 0131 33	
	ASSOCIATED MCCP / OCCP				
	A.1.f. ASSOCIATED DOCS.				
3	PROPOSED URGENCY	Non-urgent			
	REASONS FOR URGENCY				
The CMA CEO will review this information and make a decision as to whether to take this MCCP / OCCP forward as urgent as defined under Market Code Part 8.9.1					

A.2. MCCP/OCCP DETAILS

A.2.a. ISSUE OR DEFECT WHICH THIS MCCP / OCCP SEEKS TO ADDRESS Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (b) and 8.8.1 (ii) (b)

Currently, an outgoing LP that cancels a registration request is required to provide a justification as to why the rejection should be upheld. If this is for an outstanding debt, a standard summary table of information should be provided by e-mail to the CMA within 24 hours of the rejection from the incumbent LP to the new LP.

There is a material data protection issue in allowing customers' personal information (e.g. billing details, debt details) being shared with another organisation ahead of that organisation being the new contracted party. This would still apply in the event of the information being provided by an intermediary or third party such as the CMA. The only way to mitigate this issue would be for the customer to sign a declaration granting such access, although for the purposes of the proposal this would seem to be a meaningless exercise since the purpose is to give the incoming LP advance warning of potential issues.

Whilst the Data Protection Act only covers sole traders, these make up a considerable proportion of the market, and there would seem little sense in removing the reporting requirement for these customers but leaving it in for others. In addition, even though companies are not covered by the DPA, LPs still have an obligation to respect the confidentiality of their account data.

A.2.b. DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE MCCP / OCCP AND HOW IT MEETS THE MARKET CODE / OPERATIONAL CODE OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE MARKET DOCUMENTS Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (c) and 8.8.1 (ii) (c)

General Description

This paper proposes that the requirement on the incumbent LP to provide detailed information to the CMA on the reasons for a cancellation should be removed from CSD0103.

Principles and Objectives affected

PRINCIPLE	AFFECTED (Y/N)	DESCRIPTION
Proportionality	N	
Transparency	N	
Simplicity, Cost-effectiveness, and Security	Υ	This removes a process which creates additional work for both the incumbent LP and the CMA, for no benefit.
Non-exclusivity	N	
Barriers to Entry	N	

Customer Contact	N	
Non-discrimination	N	
Non-detrimental to SW Core Functions	N	
MC / OC OBJECTIVES		

A.2.c. IMPACT Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (d), (f) and (g), and 8.8.1 (ii) (d) and (f)		
CONFIGURED ITEM	IMPACTED (Y/N)	DESCRIPTION
MC / OC	N	
CSDs	Υ	Removal of relevant section from CSD0103
Wholesale Services Agreements	N	
Licenses	N	
CMA Central Systems	N	
CMA business processes	Υ	CMA would no longer need to deal with these forms
Trading Party systems	N	
Trading party business processes	Υ	Incumbent LPs would no longer need to include this step in their transfer processes.

The following text should be deleted from CSD0103, p5-6:		
The Outgoing Licensed Provider is also required to provide a more detailed explanation behind the included cancellation code within 24 hours of the rejection by the Outgoing Licensed Provider. If this is for an outstanding debt, a standard summary table of information should be provided by email to the CMA within 24 hours of the rejection from the incumbent LP. This table should include the following as a minimum:		
SPID		
Reason for transfer rejection		
Date of invoice in dispute		
Total outstanding amount on account		
Original due date of invoice		
Date reminder sent		
New due date specified in reminder		
A.3. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS		
A.3.a. PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE OR LEAD TIME Timescale must not overlap with the period of consultation with the Commission and should take account of the impacts identified in Section A.2.c. Any quoted lead time should commence from date of Approval.		
November 2015		
A.3.b. ANY LIMITATIONS OR DEPENDENCIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION		
A.4. ANY OTHER COMMENTS		

Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (d) and 8.8.1 (ii) (d)

A.2.d. DRAFT LEGAL TEXT

PART B — TP ASSESSMENT				
B.1. ASSESSMENT PROCESS				
B.1.a. ASSESSMENT START DATE	2015-06-25	ASSESSMENT END DATE	2015-08-20	
B.1.b. IMPACT ASSESSMI	ENT REQUIREMENT	IA NOT REQUIRED		
B.1.c. CONSULTATION RE	EQUIREMENT	TP CONSULTATION NOT RE	TP CONSULTATION NOT REQUIRED	
B.1.d. ASSOCIATED DOCI	JMENTS			
B.2. ASSESSMENT DETAI	LS			
	ATION AND IMPACT hat originally submitted)			
	B.2.b. DRAFT LEGAL TEXT (if different from that originally submitted)			
B.2.c. TP ASSESSMENT Taking into account complexity, importance and urgency, and having regard to whether or not such proposal is within the relevant Objectives and Principles as required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (v) and 8.8.1 (iv)				
Impact on Principles and Objectives (if different from that originally submitted)				
Cost Estimate				
Benefit Estimate (L: < 10k, M: £10k to £100k, H: > £100k)				
B.3. TP DECISION	B.3. TP DECISION TP APPROVED			
B.4. FINAL TP VIEWS to look a			ed to remove the obligation, however asked CMA ok at incorporating the information into the flows go between parties.	
B.5. PLANNED IMPLEMEN	3.5. PLANNED IMPLEMENTATION DATE November 2015			

WITHDRAWN BY PROPOSER?	YES/NO
COMMENTS	
DATE OF WITHDRAWAL	

PAF	PART C — COMMISSION APPROVAL		
C.1.	DATE FINAL REPORT ISSUED TO COMMISSION	2015-09-01	
C.2.	APPROVAL STATUS	APPROVED CHANGE	
C.3.	DATE OF APPROVAL STATUS	2015-09-17	
C.4.	COMMISSION RESPONSE REFERENCE		

PAF	PART D — IMPLEMENTATION		
D.1.	IMPLEMENTATION DATE	2015-12-01	
D.2.	. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS (MC version, CSD versions, CMA Central Systems release number, etc.)		
CSD	CSD0103 v3.0		