

DCUSA DCP 248 RFI responses – DNOs

Company	Confidential/Anonymous	1. How many PC 5-8 sites do you have that will be need to be charged on a site specific basis (i.e. CT metered) as a result of P272?	Working Group Comments
Summary: 79,500 sites will need to be charged on a site specific basis as a result of P272.			
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	Electricity North West had approximately 6,500 MPANs registered as PC 5-8 with CT meters installed when we initiated our communication process in relation to P272 in July 2015.	
Confidential	Confidential	We would have approximately 120 sites that would be charged on this basis.	
GTC	Non-confidential	As at 22/12/2015 we have 172 supply points which have been identified as needing to be charged on a site specific basis as a result of P272. This figure (and the rest of the figures in this response) is a combined total across Independent Power Networks Limited (IPNL) and The Electricity Network Company Limited (ENC)	
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	12,329	
SP Distribution / SP Manweb	Non-confidential	SPEN have approximately 8,000 PC 5-8 CT metered sites which will be moving to HH tariffs.	
Western	Non-	19371	

Power Distribution	confidential		
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	Approx 21.5k	
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Approx 11,500	

Company	Confidential/Anonymous	2. How many of these customers have you formally written to via either letter or email to inform them of the need to agree a Maximum Import Capacity as a result of P272?	Working Group Comments
Summary: 70,000 customers have been formally written to either via letter or email to inform them of the need to agree a Maximum Import Capacity as a result of P272.			
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	Electricity North West contacted all of the customers identified in response to Question 1 during the 3 month period from August to October 2015, highlighting the implications of DCP179 and providing details of their registered MIC and the related peak demand recorded during the most recent 24 month period. Approximately 700 of the MPANs were sent an electronic form of the letter via email during August, with the remainder	

		contacted via post during September and October 2015 (the final batch of letters was issued on 8 October 2015). Subsequently, we have been contacted by energy consultants, representing approximately 100 customers on the original list to date, and have provided them directly with copies of their clients' letters.	
Confidential	Confidential	We have written to all of our customers that would need to agree a MIC.	
GTC	Non-confidential	As at 22/12/2015 we have formally written to 141 customers to inform them of the need to agree a Maximum Import Capacity. The remaining 31 customers have been sent formal letters in the intervening time between 22/12/2015 and this RFI being submitted on 07/01/2016	
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	4,605	
SP Distribution / SP Manweb	Non-confidential	All originally identified customers have been formally written to. A small number of additional customers have been identified and will need to be contacted.	
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	All the above sites had letters or emails sent out.	
UK Power Network	Non-confidential	100&	

s			
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Approx 10,000 (some larger customers were grouped)	
Company	Confidential/Anonymous	3. How many of these customers have formally responded to your communication and agreed a Maximum Import Capacity with you (whether to accept the MIC value proposed in your letter or to agree a different MIC value)? <i>Note: Please do not include any customers which you have deemed to have formally accepted a proposed MIC value by virtue of not responding within any deadline included in your communication with the customer – these are captured by question 4 below.</i>	Working Group Comments
Summary: 6400 customers have formally responded to the communications issued by the respondents. However one respondent noted that zero responses were received due to their letter stating the MIC value that would be used and asked customers to contact them only if they wished to query or vary it.			
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	The customer responses to our letter have come into our business in a variety of ways. Either directly to the Charging team (which is minimal) or to our terms and conditions team responding to requests for increase/decrease in capacity as part of business as usual (where the letter directed them) so it is difficult, post the sending of the letters, to accurately assess the	

		volumes directly attributable to the P272 specific customer communication. Feedback internally within the business indicates that we have had approximately 150 queries, general enquiries and requests (c2%), for further explanation of the letter, plus approximately 12 requests to amend (increase/decrease) the registered MIC. However, as indicated within our consultation response, we manage this process on a day to day basis and provided screen shots from our IT sharepoint site where we capture the records of capacity modification request letters.	
Confidential	Confidential	To date, we have not received any formal communication/responses back from any of the customers to whom we have written.	
GTC	Non-confidential	As at 22/12/2015 we have received 4 replies to the letters we have sent to consumers.	
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	1,475	
SP Distribution / SP Manweb	Non-confidential	We have had in excess of 600 formal responses. In some cases, one response may have been received but applies to a number of premises (e.g. retail sites).	
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Approx. 1300 have responded either via consultants or groups of customers (e.g. Energy manager of a store chain or pub chain). Plus an estimated 2,500	

UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	Our letter stated the MIC value we would use and asked customers to contact us if they wished to query or vary it. Hence we did not request formal responses from customers.	
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Approximately 400	

Company	Confidential/Anonymous	4. How many of these customers have not responded to your communication but have a deemed MIC value proposed in your letter.	Working Group Comments
Summary: 28,500 customers did not respond to the communications issued by the respondents, however three respondents confirmed that their letter stating the MIC value that would be used and asked customers to contact them only if they wished to query or vary it.			
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	Our communication notified customers of the MIC value recorded on our system and stated that no action was required unless they had an issue with the registered value and wished to increase or decrease it in order to avoid unnecessary capacity charges (including excess capacity charges following the implementation of DCP179). We have not created a deemed value so the answer is zero.	
Confidential	Confidential	As above, we have not received any correspondence back from customers regarding our letter that was sent	

		to them.	
GTC	Non-confidential	All letters that we sent to customers propose a deemed MIC value.	
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	2,825	
SP Distribution / SP Manweb	Non-confidential	All customers had a letter containing a MIC and for those who have not yet responded this will apply. This process is currently underway as sites have started to move to HH.	
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	This is the difference between the amount of letters that have been sent out and the number that have responded.	
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	N/A – given answer to Q3.	
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Non-confidential	Approximately 10,100	

Company	Confidential/ Anonymous	5. Please provide any commentary on the information you have provided which you believe will help the Working Group to interpret the data.	Working Group Comments
<p>Summary: The below comments were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four respondents experienced issues obtaining the correct contact details which resulted in a number of letters being returned as undelivered or an inability to engage with the customer. • Customers base their requirements on other business areas besides billing and as such the MIC value can intentionally be in excess of their recent peak demand. • Customers are more engaged with their MIC values as the migration progresses. • One respondent noted that 34% of their customers have agreed connection agreement based MICs. 			
Electricity North West	Non-confidential	A far better question would have been what value did the customer request compared to the MIC value in the letter. Our evidence, as shown in our earlier consultation response, is that customers base their requirements on other business areas besides billing and as such the MIC value can intentionally be in excess of their recent peak demand.	
Confidential	Confidential	We currently have no further commentary to add.	
GTC	Non-confidential	Of the 172 supply points that we were required to agree a MIC for we had to address 118 letters to the "owner/occupier" of the address as we were not given express permission by the supplier to use their consumer information. This was either a refusal to allow us to use the information or a lack of response by the	

		<p>supplier to our request to use the information.</p> <p>Of the 141 letters that were sent by 22nd December 87 were addressed to the owner/occupier because we did not have specific customer information from the supplier. Of these 87 letters 17 have been returned as undelivered whereas only 2 of the 54 letters sent to specific addressees have been returned undelivered.</p> <p>Until such time as we have received all customer information from all suppliers we are likely to continue to experience a degree of difficulty engaging with end consumers on this change.</p>	
Northern Powergrid	Non-confidential	<p>We have contacted 4,605 customers (~95% via email) of which 2,825 have not responded therefore we are deeming these customers to have by default accepted the proposed MIC until we hear otherwise. We have had a number of customers (305) who have responded but do not agree with the proposed MIC, and we are awaiting a further response (there is no question to capture this category).</p> <p>We intend on contacting ~3,500 customers using postal addresses, where we have not been provided or able to identify an email point of contact, in the coming weeks. This will leave ~4,500 customers without sufficient contact information to engage with via either email or post, so potentially we need to revert back to asking suppliers for this information again or send to site addresses – which is an option we have been very reluctant to fall-back on given our efforts to ensure the customer receives the information and provide a quick and convenient medium to engage with us to answer any queries.</p> <p>We consider the response rate of ~40% to reflect</p>	

		<p>positively on our approach to customer engagement and do not wish to compromise this as a result of disappointing supplier co-operation, by defaulting to using site addresses. We have identified ~30% of our points of contact (~10% of the total) following proactive engagement with our customers, namely phoning them directly – this is a significant resource burden and supplier co-operation could ensure we contact the remaining customers promptly and further reduce the percentage of customers we are deeming to have accepted the proposed MIC as a result of failure to respond due to failure to receive our communication.</p> <p>We would also welcome suppliers' views on the proposed MICs which we provided early in this process, as we are using this information in conjunction with our own analysis in our proposals to customers.</p>	
SP Distribution / SP Manweb	Non-confidential	Approximately 900 letters were undelivered and returned, the addresses for these letters were either sourced from supplier contact information or our own billing details.	
Western Power Distribution	Non-confidential	<p>It should be noted that approximately 6,500 customers have agreed connection agreement based MICs i.e. these customers have been previously engaged with. Therefore it could be argued that between 35% and 55% of the customers have been engaged in the process.</p> <p>The letter from WPD does also specify that if the customer is content with their deemed capacity then no further action needs to be taken. Therefore there will be</p>	

		potentially a significant number of customers who have read the letter and decided that no further engagement is required.	
UK Power Networks	Non-confidential	Our recent experience suggests that customers have been more engaged with their MIC value as the P272 migration has commenced.	
Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution	Non-confidential	We had a significant number of letters returned as undelivered. We contacted the current suppliers for updated customer contact information but only two suppliers responded to us.	