

DCUSA and SPAA RFI Responses 'Dissemination of Energy Theft Tip Offs' – collated comments

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	1. Do you agree that where the relevant Supplier cannot be identified, Tip Offs should be issued to the relevant Gas Transporter and/or Electricity DNO? If not, please provide rationale.	Working Group Comments
British Gas	Non-confidential	Yes this appears to be the most sensible option where the Supplier cannot be identified	Noted
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	<p>The answer to this question is split into two parts:</p> <p>Firstly is the Energy Theft Tip Off Line (ETTOL) proving a service on behalf of the supplier to enact SLC27 and if not how can such an arrangement be facilitated and</p> <p>What is meant by 'issued'</p> <p>On the first:</p> <p>SLC27 of the Distribution Licence states:</p> <p>27.1 This paragraph applies if the licensee, in the course of providing services to any Authorised supplier of electricity to premises directly connected to the licensee's Distribution System, has reason to believe that there has been:</p> <p>(a) damage to any electrical plant, electric line, or Metering Equipment through which such premises are supplied; or</p> <p>(b) interference with the Metering Equipment through which such premises are supplied so as to alter its register or prevent it from duly registering</p>	<p>The group noted that the respondent agreed with the solution.</p> <p>It was agreed that Schedule 23 of the DCUSA and Schedule 33 of the SPAA need to be updated to clarify the Supplier and Network Operators obligations.</p>

		<p>the quantity of electricity supplied.</p> <p>It is obvious that we are not at the customer's premises by the nature of the request so it is not a distribution service we are offering to the supplier i.e. we did not identify theft ourselves by undertaking work on site. So what service are we providing to the supplier that would enact this Licence obligation? You could argue that we are providing information to a party (ETTOL) acting on behalf of suppliers as a consequence of the contract in place for the provision of the theft tip off line. However, is the contract between ETTOL and DCUSA/SPAA or ETTOL and suppliers? If, as we suspect, it is with the former what rights are in place to form a relationship whereby they are providing a service to the supplier either in the tip off line contract or already in DCUSA or as part of the supplier's licence obligation? Once this is known then the answer may well be yes we are providing a service to the supplier and we can undertake such an action under this Licence obligation.</p> <p>If the answer is no, then we need to discuss this further. We own address data and the core MPAN under our Master Registration Agreement obligations. It is our responsibility to maintain this and as such provide a service to both the customer and supplier. If ETTOL is not acting on behalf of the supplier and is granted access to ECOES we need some governance arrangements to allow us to provide the information to ETTOL. This may well be the MRA rather than DCUSA.</p> <p>A legal interpretation would be helpful here.</p> <p>Secondly, the use of the word 'issued'. Please see</p>	
--	--	---	--

		our response to Q3 on this point.	
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	<p>Yes, we do agree that where a supplier cannot be identified by the ETTOL service provider the tip-off should be issued to the relevant Distributor, particularly in order to seek distributor assistance in identifying the supplier based on any information the distributor holds. IDNOs should also be considered, not just DNOs, and so the use of the word 'Distributor' instead of DNO is better. If the distributor identifies a supplier for the premise we believe they should share the information to the ETTOL for the ETTOL to send the tip off to the correct party.</p>	<p>The group noted that the ETTOL service provider will use DES and ECOES to identify Suppliers using a partial address. It was noted that the Gas Transporter for an address can be identified on DES and similarly the Distributor for an address can be identified on ECOES.</p> <p>The group noted that some IDNO networks can be tiny, therefore it can be difficult to identify when a tip off should be sent to an IDNO. However, in this situation the DNO would be sent the tip off and would feed back that to the ETTOL service provider .</p>
RWE Npower	Non-confidential	<p>Yes, we agree in principle that the GT/DNO should pick up stray leads, but there needs to be clarity around the process that will be adopted by the tip-off line service provider in seeking to identify the relevant supplier before the tip-off is referred to the GT or DNO as appropriate. That process needs to be robust, as the referral to the GT/DNO should be a last resort and not present an onerous activity.</p> <p>It is also important to develop a process for use by the GT or DNO in the event that they identify the relevant supplier during their investigation of a tip-off. This process should enable the GT/DNO to then pass the information to the relevant supplier. We believe that obligations exist in the Gas and Electricity Theft Codes of Practice to pass leads to</p>	<p>The group agreed that only a small number of tip offs will be issued to the Network Operators for further investigation.</p>

		<p>the correct party, but it may be necessary to review the wording to ensure it is fit for purpose here.</p> <p>If these processes are put in place, this should keep the number of tip-offs that need to be investigated by the GTs/DNOs to a minimum.</p>	
SmartMOp	Non-confidential	Yes	
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	We agree, provided that this is only for situations where the Supplier genuinely cannot be identified after the ETTOL has made all reasonable efforts to do so.	Noted
SP Distribution plc & SP Manweb plc	Non-confidential	Yes we strongly support this practice	Noted
UK Power Networks comprising Eastern Power Networks plc, London Power Networks plc and South Eastern Power Networks plc	Non-confidential	If the tip-off is insufficiently detailed such that the ETTOL service is unable to identify the premise (from which the supplier can then be found) it is highly unlikely that a GT/DNO would be able to locate the premises either. Expecting them to be able to do so from very vague or high level information is unrealistic. Issuing tip-offs to the RELEVANT GTs/DNOs is also not quite as simple as it sounds because of the growth and overlapping nature of iGT/IDNO networks within the GT/DNO "areas". It will only complicate matters further if the ETTOL, unable to identify the supplier, then issues the tip-off to a GT/DNO whose network does	Noted

		<p>not connect to that premise.</p> <p>Care must also be taken in two other situations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tip-offs relating to part of a multi-occupancy premises which may be fed from a single point of connection sharing a supply with other premises and not requiring its own MPAN. • Premises fed from non-DNO owned private networks; in particular blocks of flats with rising and lateral mains. In these situations the local DNO may not own the distribution network local to the customer premise and so may not be able to identify the supplier because they do not hold the relevant network records (and so cannot improve upon the current SMRS address). 	
Zog Energy Ltd	Non-confidential	Yes, tip offs should be issued to the relevant gas transporter and /or electricity DNO.	Noted
UK Healthcare Corporation Ltd	Non-confidential	I agree	Noted
Undisclosed	Anonymous	Yes, we believe that DNOs and Transporters should receive Tip Offs directly to them which cannot be directed to Suppliers e.g. unregistered. Although the quality and accuracy of the tip offs is yet to be determined we believe it would be prudent to utilise as many Tip Offs as possible.	Noted

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	2. If you do not believe that Tip Offs should be issued to the relevant Gas Transporter and/or Electricity DNO, please provide details of an alternative approach for dealing with Tip Offs that cannot be matched to the relevant Supplier.	Working Group Comments
British Gas	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	See response to Q1. It is sensible for dialogue to be undertaken with the respective distributor to identify the relevant supplier.	Noted
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
RWE Npower	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
SmartMOp	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	Not applicable (see Q1).	Noted
SP Distribution plc & SP Manweb plc	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
UK Power	Non-confidential	As noted above there are situations where it would	The group agreed that only a small number

Networks comprising Eastern Power Networks plc, London Power Networks plc and South Eastern Power Networks plc		<p>be appropriate to pass the tip-off to a GT/DNO however this must be considered a last resort action by the ETTOL and not the default action for any vague or incomplete tip-offs received.</p> <p>The processes put in place by the ETTOL to receive, record, filter and direct tip offs must be appropriate, robust and fit for purpose.</p> <p>We would expect performance standards to be placed on the ETTOL in this regard and adhered to. The consultation paper suggests that 90%+ of premises have a PAF (or UPRN) matched address - this does not set a standard for identifying premises addresses to MPANs. It is perfectly possible to correctly identify premise addresses/MPAN from ECOES even when there is not a PAF match. It is a reasonable expectation that no more than 1-2% of tip-offs would be referred to GTs/DNOs under such a mechanism.</p>	<p>of tip offs will be issued to the Network Operators for further investigation.</p> <p>Performance standards to be discussed as part of the commercial arrangements with the ETTOL service provider.</p>
Zog Energy Ltd	Non-confidential	N/A	Noted
UK Healthcare Corporation Ltd	Non-confidential	Click here to enter text.	Noted
Undisclosed	Anonymous	NA	Noted

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	3. Do you agree that obligations on Gas Transporters and Electricity DNOs to investigate theft or identify the relevant Supplier should be included in the	Working Group Comments
---------	----------------------------	--	------------------------

		relevant industry Codes? If not, please provide rationale.	
British Gas	Non-confidential	<p>We believe that the Gas Transporters and Electricity DNOs already have a duty under the DCUSA and SPAA to investigate theft where it is their responsibility to do so.</p> <p>The Theft Code of Practice in SPAA already includes an obligation to notify the relevant Supplier under Schedule 33 3.1 of suspected theft:</p> <p>"On receipt of information Parties must assess whether or not there is a Serious Safety Concern. When a suspected Theft of Gas incident is identified, the Transporter must notify the relevant Supplier. It must undertake reasonable endeavours to pass the information to the relevant Supplier within two Working Days."</p> <p>The DCUSA Theft Code of Practice includes the following obligation under Schedule 23 6.1:</p> <p>"If the Distributor (or its Revenue Protection Agent) becomes aware of any suspected or actual incidence of Theft of Electricity which is not Theft in Conveyance, the Distributor shall ensure that the Supplier is notified of such incidence and provided with all relevant information known to the Distributor (or its Revenue Protection Agent) promptly and in all cases not later than the next Working Day after becoming aware of the same. Neither the Distributor (nor its Revenue Protection Agent) shall undertake any future visits or attempt to remedy the situation unless requested and authorised by the Supplier."</p>	The group noted that there are existing obligations on the Network Operators to cooperate and investigate energy theft in the DCUSA and SPAA codes.

		If necessary these clauses could be amended or added to, to make them more specific to Tip Offs.	
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	<p>Picking up from Q1 and the use of 'issued' and the use of 'investigate theft' in this question, it begs a need for further information here with regard to what you are alluding to. Our obligation under SCL27 is to notify the supplier where we suspect theft. If the legal interpretation to Q1 supports us receiving the information from ETTOL we would expect to notify the supplier once we have identified the MPAN associated with the address information received. We would not see our obligation under SLC27 being any greater than this when you consider that should the tip off line identify the supplier from the ECOES search they undertake based on the address data they received they pass this onto the supplier concerned. In other words, the 'investigation' is limited to identifying the supplier from the information received from ETTOL.</p> <p>We also see no reason why such an obligation needs to be codified since we have a Licence obligation to do so.</p> <p>If the answer to Q1 was no, we need an obligation to provide information to ETTOL for them to onwardly provide to the prospective supplier as per Q1. This should be done during the telephone call we receive from them in identifying the supplier in question and dealt with there and then rather than having significant volumes to handle if left to the end of a week/month. The response needs to be swift on any tip off lead.</p>	The group noted that there are existing obligations on the Network Operators to cooperate and investigate energy theft in the DCUSA and SPAA codes.

Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	No, we do not support additional obligations as we do not believe they are necessary. In addition, obligations in SLC 27 and the revenue protection code of practice (to cooperate with other parties) may already be sufficient to support the provision of assistance to the ETTOL in identifying supplier involvement	Noted
RWE Npower	Non-confidential	Yes, with robust processes in place to ensure that the tip-off line provider only refers tip-offs where the supplier cannot be identified and where, as a result of the GT/DNO investigation, the relevant supplier is subsequently identified, to allow the GT/DNO to pass on the tip-off to that supplier.	Noted
SmartMOp	Non-confidential	Yes	Noted
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	<p>We agree but believe that the existing DCUSA provisions are clear and adequate and there must be no blurring or confusion of established responsibilities as a consequence of introducing the ETTOL.</p> <p>We would also wish to be assured that the ETTOL will be obliged to make all reasonable efforts to identify the relevant Supplier in every case and their performance monitored in this regard. The DNOs must not become a default investigation service through lack of diligence by other parties.</p>	Noted
SP Distribution plc & SP Manweb plc	Non-confidential	Yes	Noted

UK Power Networks comprising Eastern Power Networks plc, London Power Networks plc and South Eastern Power Networks plc	Non-confidential	<p>DNOs already have obligations in these areas so it is not necessary to revise industry Codes in this respect (it is likely that GTs have similar obligations but we cannot comment on the details for this).</p> <p>However, changes to industry Codes in this respect may be useful as it would enable the inclusion of performance standards for the ETTOL such as those mentioned above and the creation of a new charging mechanism for GTs/DNOs to recover the costs from the relevant suppliers of any work undertaken to analyse or investigate the tip-off and identify the supplier.</p>	The group agreed that clarifications should be added to Schedule 23 of the DCUSA and Schedule 33 of the SPAA with a new Schedule developed to cover the ETTOL.
Zog Energy Ltd	Non-confidential	Yes the obligations should be included in the relevant industry codes.	Noted
UK Healthcare Corporation Ltd	Non-confidential	I agree	Noted
Undisclosed	Anonymous	Yes	Noted

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	4. If you agree that obligations on Gas Transporters and Electricity DNOs should be included in the relevant industry Codes, please confirm which Codes you believe are most appropriate for the gas and electricity obligations respectively?	Working Group Comments
British Gas	Non-confidential	See response to Q 3	Noted
Electricity North	Non-confidential	As indicated above, the MRA would be the one	The group felt that arrangements relating to

West		identified for the scenario where ETTOL is not legally operating on behalf of the supplier.	the ETTOL should be kept in the SPAA and DCUSA.
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	We do not agree with the requirement for additional obligations.	Noted
RWE Npower	Non-confidential	DCUSA and SPAA	Noted
SmartMOp	Non-confidential	Mocopa, GIUSP	The group felt that arrangements relating to the ETTOL should be kept in the SPAA and DCUSA.
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	See answer to Q3. In our view, there are already adequate obligations on DNOs in DCUSA to investigate theft.	Noted
SP Distribution plc & SP Manweb plc	Non-confidential	We would be inclined to suggest DCUSA is the most relevant Industry code for this to be included in. The basis for this is the extensive work that has been carried out on DCP209 which detailed the process to be undertaken by Suppliers and Distributors in relation to resolving 'unregistered customers'. We see a significant amount of crossover in this area and the ETTOL in terms of how the process may work in practice.	Noted
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	As noted in (4) we don't see this as an absolute necessity but if Code changes were to be	Noted

comprising Eastern Power Networks plc, London Power Networks plc and South Eastern Power Networks plc		progressed then logically they would fall into SPAA and DCUSA.	
Zog Energy Ltd	Non-confidential	Standard Condition 7 – Gas Transporter Licence Condition. Standard Condition 27 – Standard Distribution Licence.	The group felt that arrangements relating to the ETTOL should be kept in the SPAA and DCUSA. These should reflect the requirements in the Transporter and Distribution Licences.
UK Healthcare Corporation Ltd	Non-confidential	Not sure	Noted
Undisclosed	Anonymous	It would be sensible to keep them within SPAA/DCUSA codes e.g. Theft Code of Practice or the creation of a Theft Tip Off Line Schedule.	Noted

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	5. Do you have any other comments?	Working Group Comments
British Gas	Non-confidential	No	Noted
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	Schedule 25 still states that the tip off line is being provided by the TRAS Service provider. A review of the schedule is required to align with the DCUSA/SPAA decision to separate the two.	This will be amended as part of the CP to introduce the ETTOL into SPAA and DCUSA.
Northern	Non-confidential	The distributor may have evidence that a particular	The feedback mechanism will be considered

Powergrid		supplier has been involved in a particular supply, for example a record of a supplier requesting an MPAN for a particular address or a record that a particular supplier had been previously registered to an address, but was not currently registered to it. We believe it is more efficient to support the ETTOL by providing it with feedback on information we hold. If the request comes from the ETTOL the information should go back to the ETTOL for them to liaise with the correct party rather than requiring the distributor to pass the information to the supplier.	further by the ETTOL service provider.
RWE Npower	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
SmartMOp	Non-confidential	None	Noted
Southern Electric Power Distribution plc and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution plc	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
SP Distribution plc & SP Manweb plc	Non-confidential		Noted
UK Power Networks comprising Eastern Power Networks plc, London Power Networks plc	Non-confidential	No.	Noted

and South Eastern Power Networks plc			
Zog Energy Ltd	Non-confidential	No.	Noted
UK Healthcare Corporation Ltd	Non-confidential	None	Noted
Undisclosed	Anonymous	As this is now a separate contact to the TRAS we propose that cost allocating between parties should be reviewed to include all parties if DNOs/Transporters are included (TRAS is funded by Suppliers only); a standard rationale could be applied initially because volumes are unknown, then a review could be completed after the 1 st year (based on actual Tip Off volumes) to apportion the costs between Suppliers and DNOs/Transporters.	The group concluded that the cost recovery mechanism for the ETTOL service should reflect that used for the TRAS i.e. costs shared between suppliers based on market share.