DECISION ON MARKET CHANGE REQUEST 5005

New Retail Market Procedure – MP NI 40

DECISION PAPER
15 December 2025

www.uregni.gov.uk

Utility Regulator

About the Utility Regulator

The Utility Regulator is the independent non-ministerial government department responsible for regulating Northern Ireland's electricity, gas, water and sewerage industries, to promote the short and long-term interests of consumers.

We are not a policy-making department of government, but we make sure that the energy and water utility industries in Northern Ireland are regulated and developed within ministerial policy as set out in our statutory duties.

We are governed by a Board of Directors and are accountable to the Northern Ireland Assembly through financial and annual reporting obligations.

We are based at Millennium House in the centre of Belfast. The Chief Executive and two Executive Directors lead teams in each of the main functional areas in the organisation: CEO Office; Price Controls; Networks and Energy Futures; and Markets and Consumer Protection. The staff team includes economists, engineers, accountants, utility specialists, legal advisors and administration professionals.

Utility Regulator

OUR MISSION

To protect the short and long-term interests of consumers of electricity, gas and water.

OUR VISION

To ensure value and sustainability in energy and water.

OUR VALUES

ACCOUNTABLE: We take ownership of our actions.

TRANSPARENT: Ensuring trust through openness and honesty.

COLLABORATIVE: Connecting and working with others for a shared purpose.

DILIGENT: Working with care and rigour.

RESPECTFUL: Treating everyone with dignity and fairness.

ABSTRACT

Market Change Request 5005 (MCR 5005) proposes a market solution that would allow an electricity supplier to voluntarily exit certain market sectors (i.e. domestic or non-domestic sectors) rather than exiting the entire market. Additionally, MCR 5005 proposes the creation of a new market procedure (MP NI 40) that would facilitate the transfer of Customers from the 'Exiting Supplier' to a 'New Supplier' via a 'Customer Bulk Transfer'.

As per the Market Registration Code (MRC) Change Control Procedure, the Utility Regulator (UR) is required to approve (or otherwise) MCR 5005 as proposed by the Central Design Authority (CDA).

This paper sets out the UR decision on the proposed Market Change Request having considered the responses received to the consultation published in June 2025, along with UR views on the proposed change.

AUDIENCE

This document is likely to be of interest to all electricity Suppliers, government, industry groups, consumer bodies, network and transmission system operators and all consumers of electricity in Northern Ireland.

CONSUMER IMPACT

The proposed market change will impact consumers who are being transferred over to a New Supplier from an Exiting Supplier during the market exit process as detailed in the consultation published in June 2025.

Contents Page

Executive Summary

On 30 June 2025, we published a consultation paper[1] which sought responses in relation to the creation of a new market procedure (MPNI 40 – Customer Bulk Transfer). The consultation follows the submission of a Market Change Request (MCR 5005) for approval by the Central Design Authority (CDA) to the Utility Regulator (UR). The current retail market arrangements do not provide a mechanism for a 'bulk transfer' of customers in the scenario where a supplier voluntarily decides to partially exit[2] certain market sector(s). This new procedure intends to create an enduring market solution to address this specific issue.

As part of the consultation, UR posed several questions to the stakeholders and wider public to gather views on the steps detailed in the new procedure (MPNI 40), consumer protection provisions and any other matters that the UR should consider in its decision to approve or reject this proposal. The consultation received six responses from different stakeholders that operate within the electricity market, including suppliers, network operator and the Consumer Council for Northern Ireland (CCNI).

This decision paper outlines a comprehensive summary of the responses received from stakeholders, the UR position in relation to those responses and our final decision on approval (or otherwise) of MCR 5005.

[1] MCR 5005 Consultation Paper

[2] MP NI 40 specifically refers to partial market exits; however, a supplier may use the procedure to exit all market sectors they participate in resulting in a complete market exit.

1. Background and Introduction

Background

1.1 The Central Design Authority (CDA) Board was established through the Market Registration Code (MRC). It provides a forum for key participants (NIE Networks and Suppliers) operating in the electricity retail market in Northern Ireland to engage on specific issues, which are generally technical in nature. In line with the MRC Change Procedures (Schedule 5), Participants to the MRC can raise Change Requests for consideration at the CDA Board.

1.2 MCR 5005 was raised by a Participant with the purpose of establishing a new market procedure (MP NI 40) which would allow for the 'Bulk Transfer' of customers from one supplier to another. The current retail market procedures do not contain a mechanism to allow for the 'Bulk Transfer' of Customers in the scenario of a voluntary partial exit. MPNI 40 is a proposed market procedure that details the step-by-step process required to complete the Bulk Transfer of customers from the Exiting Supplier to a New Supplier; it is intended to offer an enduring solution should such events occur.

1.3 MP NI 40 is not being proposed as a mandatory market procedure for all suppliers. It has been proposed on a transactional basis, meaning that MP NI 40 will only be enacted when a supplier has chosen to exit a certain market sector(s), and an Exiting Supplier and New Supplier have entered into a Commercial Agreement to carry out a Customer Bulk Transfer.

1.4 Following consideration, the CDA Board has decided by consensus that MCR 5005 should be implemented and has subsequently submitted a Change Report to the UR for approval (or otherwise).

1.5 In relation to the MCR 5005 Change Request proposed by CDA, the UR published a consultation in June 2025 to seek views on whether the Change Request should be approved or rejected.

1.6 Overall, we received six responses to our consultation paper, with representations from industry (electricity suppliers and electricity Distribution Network Operator) and consumer bodies.

1.7 Non-confidential submissions were received from the following organisations:

- Consumer Council for Northern Ireland (CCNI)
- Northern Ireland Electricity Networks (NIE Networks)

- Budget Energy
- Click Energy
- Electric Ireland
- Power NI

1.8 All non-confidential responses have been published as annexes to this paper and can be found on our website.

Structure of this Paper

1.9 Section 1 outlines the background and key information on MCR 5005 and UR's consultation on the same.

1.10 Section 2 provides a summary of responses received to each question posed in the consultation paper and UR comments on the responses received.

1.11 Section 3 provides an excerpt of the UR decision on the market change request and in extension a decision on whether to approve (or otherwise) the new retail market procedure MP NI 40.

1.12 In addition, a glossary of the terms is provided at the last section of this paper.

2. Consultation Responses

2.1 This section covers the key areas where we sought responses from stakeholders in the consultation paper. Subsequently, 'UR Comment' provides a view on the responses received to each question.

2.2 We thank all stakeholders for their engagement and providing responses to the consultation paper. We have received a number of written and verbal feedback during this process and have considered all responses while reaching our decision.

2.3 For transparency, we have summarised the responses to the consultation paper and our comments in the applicable sections of this paper. It is not possible to detail every comment and respond to each one individually. As a result, we have included those comments that are most significant or opinions that have been shared by several respondents. All non-confidential responses to the consultation are published alongside this decision paper.

Question 1.
Do you agree with proposal outlined in MCR 5005 and the proposed creation of a new market procedure (MP NI 40)? Please provide rationale.

Responses

2.4 All six respondents agreed with the proposal outlined in MCR 5005 and the creation of a new market procedure as a practical, long-term and structured process that enables suppliers to exit specific sectors voluntarily, and in a controlled and orderly manner without triggering a full market exit (the Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) process).

2.5 Two respondents commented that the proposed procedure would allow to maintain market stability while avoiding unnecessary disruption for customers ensuring continuity of service or supply.

2.6 One respondent mentioned that they support the inclusion of assurance testing and governance arrangements in the procedure that would allow the UR to monitor the process and uphold market integrity.

UR Comment

2.7 All six respondents were in favour of the proposed creation of the new retail market procedure (MPNI 40) as outlined in MCR 5005. It is evident from the responses received that the industry consider merit in the creation of the procedure to allow a Customer Bulk Transfer and the UR has not received any consultation responses that implied otherwise.

2.8 We view this as an enduring in-market solution that would address the gap in the current retail market procedures. Additionally, we consider it appropriate that the procedure is proposed on a 'transactional basis', meaning that it would only be enacted in the scenario whereby a supplier chose to partially exit.

2.9 It is important to note, that the introduction of this new procedure does not remove compliance with existing licence obligations, and suppliers must ensure compliance with these obligations, in addition to any other legal obligations, in the event that this procedure is enacted.

Question 2.
Are there any steps within MP NI 40 that require amendment or clarification? Please provide rationale for any changes.

Responses

2.10 Five out of six respondents have commented that the steps laid out in the current approach provides transparency and is fit for purpose for all concerned parties, hence does not require any further amendments or clarifications at this stage.

2.11 One respondent has stated that the steps allow for engagement with the Market Entry Process Coordination Team (MEPCT) to ensure all appropriate Assurance activities are undertaken and provide confidence to all stakeholders that the process will be implemented to market satisfaction.

2.12 Another respondent has mentioned that the steps are logically structured, sequential in nature, and consistent with the format adopted in other established market procedures, notably MP NI 4 (Supplier of Last Resort) and that the procedure employs terminology and language that are well established within the industry and aligned with those used across existing market documentation.

2.13 One respondent has proposed the following amendments to the procedure:

a) A clear step should be included that would allow either party (either exiting or new supplier) to withdraw from MP NI 40 before the Bulk Transfer Date. This reflects the realities of negotiation and avoids parties who have entered into commercial negotiations being locked into a process where terms can no longer be agreed or unforeseen issues arise.

b) UR oversight: Clarification is required on the criteria for when the UR may suspend or halt the MP NI 40 process. This will provide greater transparency and certainty for all parties.

c) Glossary reference: The term "Bulk Transfer Date" could be revised to reflect operational realities and provide flexibility rather than tying the process to a single day. This would accommodate transfers taking place over a defined period or in stages.

UR Comment

2.14 We note that most responses agreed that no changes are required to MPNI 40, commenting that the steps within the procedure are well thought out and, from a technical perspective, closely align to MPNI 4. Additionally, the step for mandated assurance testing within the procedure provides comfort that any supplier who wishes to enact the procedure has the appropriate systems in place prior to any Customer Bulk Transfer taking place.

2.15 One respondent had proposed the inclusion of an additional step within MPNI 40 to allow either the Exiting or New supplier to withdraw from the procedure in advance of the Bulk Transfer Date. However, we envisage that any unsolved negotiations would be settled between the parties prior to signing any commercial agreement and before enacting MPNI 40. Therefore, we do not believe an additional step for withdrawal is required in the procedure.

2.16 The proposed mechanism for the UR to suspend or halt the MP NI 40 process was detailed within the MRC and not within the procedure. However, upon further consultation with the CDA Board regarding the proposed drafting of the MRC, the UR has decided to remove the sections related to the issuance of a direction that would suspend or halt the MPNI 40 process as the UR considers that the onus is on the suppliers to ensure compliance with existing licence conditions and any contractual obligations pertaining to the Commercial Agreement that they have signed.

2.17 Although the UR does not have the vires to stop or suspend a commercial agreement between suppliers, we may intervene where actions under such agreements breach legal or regulatory obligations. Additionally, we still consider the criteria for UR oversight essential to ensure consumers are protected during a bulk transfer, and this view was also reiterated by three out of six respondents.

2.18 In relation to the proposed definition of the Bulk Transfer Date, this is a separate matter to the consultation on MCR5005. Any proposed changes to definitions within the Glossary (MPNI 39) of the MRC should be raised via the relevant Change Procedures under the MRC. Notwithstanding this, the new market procedure, MPNI 40, has been designed on the basis that all customers will be transferred on one date, which is similar to the technical process within market procedure MPNI 4.

Question 3.
Are there any additional consumer protection provisions that should be added to MP NI 40, or considered alongside the procedure, to prevent consumer detriment and/or harm element in the event this procedure is implemented? Please provide rationale.

Responses

2.19 Two respondents have commented that the consumer protection provisions outlined within MP NI 40 are appropriate and adequate. Whereas two respondents have mentioned that the consumer protection provisions should be part of the commercial agreement and should be governed by the existing market rules and licence obligations. We have also received a response that states that the consumer protection matters must be part of the MRC and another response that mentions that it should be central to MPNI 40.

2.20 Two out of six respondents have acknowledged that there are several safeguards already in place in the procedure such as: UR oversight with the authority to suspend or stop the process if necessary, the option for customers to opt out of the bulk transfer, and assurance activities via MEPCT testing to ensure readiness. In addition to the mechanisms included in MPNI 40, there are amendments being made to the MRC which will include provisions to ensure regulatory oversight prior to and during the implementation of the procedure.

2.21 Respondents have provided the following suggestions to be considered alongside the procedure to prevent customer detriment and/or harm:

a) A set time limit from when a supplier announces they are exiting the market until the Bulk Transfer process begins i.e. 12 months.

b) Offer customers a clear opt in/opt out option for the Bulk Transfer by issuing plain, accessible information and a simple way to opt out and to choose an alternate supplier.

c) The Exiting Supplier must ensure ongoing compliance with existing licence conditions and/or Codes of Practice to ensure that consumers are adequately protected during the Bulk Transfer process.

d) UR governance over the process with autonomy to stop or suspend the process at any time by providing reasons for doing so to ensure transparency. In addition, the respondent has said that the UR must have total access and oversight on Exiting and New Supplier customer communications, terms and conditions. Another respondent has also commented that the UR oversight must focus on compliance without introducing excessive administrative burdens.

e) Credit and debt handling: Customers should be made aware of how credit and debt balances will be managed during and after the transfer. For prepayment customers, the credit balances will not automatically transfer to the new supplier. The respondent has also mentioned that the credit and debt arrangements should be agreed upon between the suppliers and clearly communicated to the customers. Another respondent has commented that the credit and debt arrangements should form part of the commercial agreement between the Exiting and New Supplier and that the commercial agreement must not infringe upon the electricity supply licence conditions.

UR Comment

2.22 As per the amendments proposed in the MRC, the Exiting Supplier is required to engage with the UR at the earliest opportunity to set out its detailed strategy for partial market exit. During this engagement we anticipate that an overall timeframe would be established and communicated to all relevant stakeholders by the Exiting Supplier. The UR do not intend to impose a mandatory time limit on suppliers to account for any unforeseen circumstances that may arise during the implementation of the procedure. However, should there be deviation from the timeframe that is presented to the UR, we must be informed, and further engagement would likely take place at this stage to understand the impact (if any) on consumers.

2.23 We agree that customers must be given clear opt in/opt out option for the bulk transfer and this must be done by issuing plain, accessible information and a simple way to opt out and to choose an alternate supplier. In addition, Step 12 of MPNI 40 includes a 21-day period for customers to opt out as stated below:

“After entry into a Commercial Agreement, the Exiting Supplier must notify all customers who will be the subject of the Customer Bulk Transfer process to give them an opportunity to opt out of the transfer during a minimum 21-days contract variation period (21 business days)”.

2.24 We must emphasise that both the Exiting Supplier and New Supplier are bound by their supply licence obligations regardless of the Commercial Agreement and the onus is on licensees to ensure compliance with their licence conditions at all times during a partial market exit.

2.25 In relation to credit and debt handling, we would assume this may form part of the commercial agreement between the Exiting and New supplier. However, as mentioned above, suppliers must still comply with applicable licence conditions in relation to dealing with credit balances and debt handling. Furthermore, the amendment to the MRC provides UR with the ability to request such information it considers necessary for the purposes of ensuring consumers are protected any time before or after the initiation of MP NI 40. This may include, but not limited to, customer communications, arrangements for dealing with customer debt, customers with credit balances and terms and conditions.

2.26 We note that the responses included references to the UR oversight mechanism pertaining to the implementation of MP NI 40. To be clear, oversight on the consumer protection aspects is included in MRC and does not form part of the procedure itself.

Questions 4 and 5.
Are there any other factors in relation to this proposal that you think should be considered? Please provide rationale. Do you have any other comments in relation to the proposal?

2.27 A number of respondents have commented on additional factors and have provided further comments on the proposal that are worthy of consideration as part of MPNI 40. These are summarised as follows:

Implementation Complexity and Post Implementation Review

Responses

2.28 Two respondents have commented on the time and effort that will be required as part of introduction of MP NI 40 and the operational coordination that would be required later as part of its implementation.

2.29 Additionally, two respondents have proposed a post implementation review following the first use of MPNI 40. One respondent felt that a post implementation review would enhance transparency, support continuous improvement, give both suppliers and consumers' confidence in the robustness of the procedure, help identify lessons learned and inform process refinements which could address operational considerations for any future use and has urged the UR to commit to reviewing MPNI 40 usage over time and reporting on frequency, volume and market impact.

UR Comment

2.30 We have considered the responses and support the proposal of a post implementation review by CDA following the first use of MPNI 40. Following such review, should there be a requirement to amend the procedure and/or MRC, this should be done via the applicable change procedures.

Data Quality

Responses

2.31 Given the reliance on accurate customer data for a smooth transfer, a complete series of data checks between the Exiting Supplier and NIE Networks prior to the Bulk Transfer Date is required to ensure a smooth transfer of data.

UR Comment

2.32 We agree on the importance of suppliers ensuring that customer data is up to date, as this will assist with any bulk transfer and ensure that customers can be contacted quickly in the event of any issues and to offer customer support. It is important to note that licensees already have existing obligations, for example under applicable data protection legislation, to ensure that any customer data they hold is up to date and accurate.

System Changes and Testing

Responses

2.33 Four respondents have commented on System Changes and Testing that would be required as part of MP NI 40. Suppliers may need to consider implementing appropriate systems and processes to act as Exiting Supplier or as New Supplier in accordance with the requirements of MPNI 40. This is very likely to result in considerable costs to electricity suppliers, NIE Networks and Secure Meters. Additionally, system change, and testing may be required on NIE Networks system to facilitate the new process.

2.34 Participation in MPNI 40 should remain voluntary. Non-participating suppliers should not be required to make system changes or undertake assurance testing.

UR Comment

2.35 MP NI 40 is being proposed as a transactional procedure and will only be initiated in the event that a supplier voluntarily choses to complete a partial market exit. As part of that decision, suppliers (exiting supplier and new supplier) will need to consider the cost of any system changes in their decision. We consider the requirement of assurance testing as an essential step in the process to provide comfort that any supplier who wishes to utilise the procedure has the appropriate systems and processes in place.

Associated Costs and Cost Socialisation

Responses

2.36 Out of six respondents, two respondents supported the argument that NIE Networks could recover the operational costs through existing price control mechanisms. The respondents commented that the ongoing operational costs and time needed to implement the IT changes from NIE Network's perspective will be minimal. Whereas three respondents commented that the costs should not be passed on to the wider market base through higher tariffs or increased standing charges and must be absorbed by the suppliers involved in the process.

2.37 One respondent has commented that the costings in the impact assessment provided by the suppliers to CDA illustrate the scale of resource commitment required and reinforces the need for proportionate assurance requirements, realistic timelines and flexibility in implementation to avoid cost burden on suppliers and a potential impact on operational priorities and overall market sustainability.

2.38 One respondent strongly opposed any proposal to socialise costs arising from MP NI 40 across the wider market or through the PSO and stated that MP NI 40 is intended to facilitate a commercial agreement between two suppliers, and that the costs should remain with those parties. They also commented that MP NI 40 is fundamentally different from SoLR, which protects customers in the event of supplier failure and does not indicate market failure hence should not trigger mechanisms designed for such scenarios. The respondent also stated that they do not support creating a new licence condition to allow recovery of costs. They have also suggested that if the costs were to be socialised, further consultation will be required on cost recovery mechanisms and any associated licence condition changes.

2.39 A respondent has stated that any socialised costs that may arise from NIE Networks' involvement in the development or implementation of MPNI 40 could appropriately be recovered through the PSO mechanism, in line with the provisions of Condition 33 of the NIE distribution licence as the proposed procedure provides additional optionality to all suppliers and all customers.

UR Comment

2.40 We note from the responses that there will be initial technical costs associated with the implementation of the procedure to allow Secure Meters and NIE Networks to designate an Exiting and New supplier within the systems. These are unavoidable costs associated with the implementation of MPNI 40.

2.41 In addition, MPNI 40 has been presented as a new market procedure that will be an enduring solution, to be utilised by any supplier now or in the future. NIE Networks in its role under the Market Registration Arrangements have an existing allowance under RP7[3] and have outlined that operational costs associated with MPNI 40 would be recovered through existing price control recovery mechanisms. To note, these recurring costs would only be applicable in the event the procedure is enacted.

2.42 Any costs incurred by suppliers in relation to MPNI 40 (i.e. required system upgrades, additional resources etc.) would be a matter for the supplier to consider separately.

2.43 We note that a respondent has commented on cost recovery mechanism through Condition 33 of the NIE distribution licence. To be clear, Condition 33 relates to cost recovery mechanism for SoLR process and cannot be used to recover costs pertaining to voluntary partial market exit pertaining to MP NI 40.

Distinction between SoLR and MP NI 40

Responses

2.44 A respondent stated that allowing costs to extend beyond the participating parties would set an undesirable precedent, risk distorting competition and could deter new entrants. They mentioned that MP NI 40 provides a practical route for partial exits, repeated use or cost socialisation could affect market diversity and reduce consumer choice and has encouraged the UR to monitor these risks and maintain conditions that support competition, supplier sustainability and long-term market stability.

[3] NIE Networks RP7

UR Comment

2.45 Our electricity SoLR decision paper[4] considers that trade sales are in general more desirable than regulatory intervention, especially where discussion takes place with the UR on how customer interests are protected through the sale. However, this may not always be possible, and UR may have to revoke a defaulting supplier's licence.

2.46 Additionally, the SoLR decision paper states that the SoLR function does not extend to serving customers that another supplier no longer wishes to serve and seeks to transfer to another supplier with a duty to supply. We are clear that the SoLR function will only apply where the supply licence of another supplier has been revoked.

Supplier's Role and Customer Service

Responses

2.47 One respondent has commented that the transfers could increase volumes of customer calls and has indicated the need for clear and consistent communications and allowances for reporting variations by the UR to accommodate the time frame of the transfer.

2.48 A respondent has commented that the customers should be given adequate cooling-off period should they wish to move away from the New Supplier. The respondent also stated that adequate checks and balances need to be put in place to ensure that all customers have transferred successfully and that no customers have been left with the Exiting Supplier.

2.49 We have also received a comment from a respondent indicating that it is imperative that electricity Suppliers adhere to the proposed UR amendments to the MRC, comply with the UR's directions and provide any information that the UR deem necessary. They have also stated that the Electricity Suppliers should remain mindful that they must comply with the MRC as outlined in their electricity supply licence even though MPNI 40 is initiated by a Commercial Agreement between the Exiting and New Supplier.

UR Comment

2.50 We would emphasise the importance of supplier communications and the need for clarity for consumers who may be subject to a bulk transfer. As mentioned previously, UR can request a copy of these communications under the MRC provisions. UR recognises the bulk

[4] Supplier of Last Resort in Electricity

transfer process detailed in MP NI 40 has been based on an existing market process (MPNI 4) which provides a technical solution to transfer over successfully to the New Supplier. However, we would reiterate that the Exiting Supplier must ensure data quality at the start of the process for a smooth Bulk Transfer at later stages.

2.51 To note, MP NI 40 includes a 20-day lock in period which is modelled after MP NI 4 process. The customers who were part of the Bulk Transfer are allowed to switch to another supplier (from the New Supplier) should they wish to after this 20-day period.

2.52 One respondent has commented in relation to UR allowances for reporting variations. We are not clear on the context of this part of the response; however, we would like to clarify that the onus is on the suppliers to ensure that they have the resources available to deal with any increased customer contact resulting from voluntary partial market exit. Suppliers must adhere to any applicable licence conditions and/or codes of practice.

Alternative Approach

Responses

2.53 One respondent has proposed an alternative approach that involves splitting the customer database between credit and prepayment customers. They have proposed using the current "Change of Supplier" (CoS) process to reduce the implementation effort, as suppliers already have the necessary systems and procedures in place for customer acquisition. However, they have stated that this would only work for credit customers and that a new process (as outlined in MP NI 40) would still be necessary for prepayment customers that mirrors the existing "Supplier of Last Resort" (SoLR) framework and involve coordination between the Exiting Supplier, the New Supplier, NIE Networks, and Secure Meters.

UR comment

2.54 UR has considered the alternative approach put forward by the respondent and have decided to mandate the use of MPNI 40 in the event of planned market exits. This ensures that UR will have oversight of the process and that consumers are protected during the bulk transfer process.

2.55 Additionally, we would reiterate that the use of MPNI 40 does not remove suppliers' responsibility to ensure compliance with legal and/or regulatory obligations.

Recertification

Responses

2.56 One respondent has commented that once the Exiting Supplier has exited the market sector, they should not be allowed to re-enter the market at any stage in the future.

UR comment

2.57 It is the UR's duty under legislation to promote competition and ensure consumer protection within the energy markets. Hence, we would have to assess the re-entry of suppliers on a case-by-case basis once they have decided to voluntarily exit the market. All decisions will be made after careful consideration of the merit of the application and the applicant's ability to carry out market functions and ensure consumer protection.

Alignment with Existing Procedures

Responses

2.58 One respondent supports aligning MP NI 40 with broader certification and assurance procedures, including MP NI 501–508 and the Market Registration Code.

UR comment

2.59 We agree that the assurance activities associated with MPNI 40 should be incorporated into the existing market procedures.

UR's Role

Responses

2.60 One respondent has urged the UR to give the procedure due consideration given the renewed focus within the UR on prioritising consumer protection especially in vulnerable circumstances.

UR comment

2.61 The UR has given due consideration to the procedure and the consultation responses and would like to reiterate that use of MPNI 40 does not remove suppliers' responsibility to ensure compliance with existing licence conditions, market rules and Codes of Practice. Additionally, the provisions included within the MRC, ensure that UR have oversight and can request information it deems appropriate to ensure that the consumers are protected at all stages during a bulk transfer.

3. Conclusion

Decision

3.1 We would like to thank all stakeholders for their responses and engagement in relation to our consultation on MCR 5005. We have carefully considered the responses, issues raised, and arguments put forward by respondents.

3.2 The UR has decided to approve MCR 5005 as it considers the new market procedure, MPNI 40, as an enduring and practical solution to aid partial market exits.

3.3 This decision paper will be published through our normal channels. Additionally, we formally wrote to CDA Board on 05 December 2025 to notify them of our decision.

3.4 As per the requirements of the MRC, CDA will be required to complete the necessary actions to implement this Change Request, MCR 5005.

Table 1: Glossary

Terms	Description
CDA	Central Design Authority
CDA Board	A forum for key participants operating in the electricity retail market in Northern Ireland.
Change Report	Means as defined in paragraph 3.16 of Schedule 5 of the MRC.
Change Request	A request made by a Participant to change the Code Procedure and made on the form that the Central Design Authority makes available pursuant to paragraph 1.7 of Schedule 5 of the MRC.
Commercial Agreement	A formal agreement between an Exiting Supplier and a New Supplier in relation to a Customer Bulk Transfer.
CoS	Change of Supplier
Customer Bulk Transfer/Transfer of Customers/Bulk Transfer of Customers	The transfer (in a single operation or transaction) of the registration, from the Exiting Supplier to the New Supplier, of the Meter Points which relate to or fall within the market sector for which the Exiting Supplier's Certification is, or is to be, removed.
Customer Bulk Transfer Date	As the case may be, the date on which the Customer Bulk Transfer is, as agreed in or under the Commercial Agreement, due to take place or the date the Customer Bulk Transfer actually takes place.
Exiting Supplier	A Supplier who intends to exit an individual market sector(s) (referred to as a partial market exit), through decertification, therefore requiring a bulk transfer of their customers by NIE Networks to a New Supplier.
MCR 5005	Market Change Request 5005
MEPCT	Market Entry Process Co-ordination Team
MP NI 40	Retail Market Procedure NI 40
MRC	Market Registration Code

Terms	Description
New Supplier	A Supplier that is requesting Registration to a Meter Point or that has an effective Registration that may be cancelled OR; A Supplier who has a Commercial Agreement in place with an Exiting Supplier and who in conjunction with that Exiting Supplier, initiates and completes the MP NI 40 process.
NIE Networks	Northern Ireland Electricity Networks
Partial Market Exit	Voluntary exit from an individual market sector(s).
PSO	Public Service Obligation
Supplier	A retailer of electricity to a Customer
Supply Licence	Granted by the UR to a Supplier as per Article 10 (1) (c) of The Electricity (Northern Ireland) Order 1992.
SoLR	Supplier of Last Resort
UR	Utility Regulator
UR Bulk Transfer Assurance List	A list of assurance requirements that the UR expects the Exiting and New Suppliers to complete prior to initiating the Bulk Transfer process to ensure consumer protection.
MEPCT	Market assurance body