

<b>Question 7: Do you agree with the Working Group's conclusions on which scenarios should result in UMeTS services as set out in Section 4.1 of the consultation document? If not, please explain with reasons</b>	
British Gas	<p>With effect from June 2008 British Gas will offer all its' prepayment customers a dedicated 24 hour call centre facility.</p> <p>In view of this we would support the scenarios set out in section 4.1 for CREDIT Meter customers only. With regard to prepayment customers we would want all calls to be referred to the Supplier in all situations. If the distributor inadvertently finds themselves on site we would want the engineer to obtain authorisation from British Gas before carrying out any work on the metering equipment of a prepayment customer.</p>
CE ELECTRIC UK	<p>No, we do not agree with the working group (majority) conclusions on the scenarios to include in UMeTS. If DCP 008A were adopted into DCUSA we believe that these conclusions would result in a considerable number of metering jobs being completed by distribution staff when there are currently no obligations in the distribution licence for a distributor to provide these services. Distribution staff should be engaged in distribution system fault resolution, leaving the resolution of metering faults to experienced meter operators. All calls where it is established that a metering fault is the cause of the supply interruption should be referred back to suppliers so that the appointed meter operator can visit the customer to rectify the metering fault. Where it is not possible to identify a metering fault during the customer telephone call, the distributor should attend site. If a metering fault is then identified during the site visit this should be referred back to the supplier for a meter operator visit. The only possible exception to this is where the customer is deemed to be vulnerable and the site visit takes place outside the operating hours of meter operators. In these (limited) situations the supply might possibly be restored by the distributor using a single-phase single-rate credit meter if the distributor had the correct equipment available. However, our preference is still that a meter operator should attend to rectify the metering fault as a matter of urgency in these situations, even though it may be outside the current normal operating hours of some of them.</p> <p>In summary, our view of the 8 identified scenarios is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scenario 1 Refer to supplier</li> <li>Scenario 2 Refer to supplier</li> <li>Scenario 3 Refer to supplier</li> <li>Scenario 4 Refer to supplier</li> <li>Scenario 5 Refer to supplier</li> <li>Scenario 6 Refer to supplier</li> <li>Scenario 7 Refer to supplier</li> </ul>

	<p>Scenario 8 Refer to supplier / UMetS applies</p> <p>This approach will ensure that, in the majority of cases, the appointed meter operator will visit the customer to rectify the metering fault using experienced staff carrying the correct metering equipment. This will prevent the need for follow-up visits by meter operators to carry out further metering work incurring more cost and causing further disruption to customers.</p>
Central Networks	Please see above, we believe that by treating all customers equally well, the number of scenarios is reduced from eight to four.
E.ON UK	The conclusions of the working group seem to be reasonable.
EDF Energy Customers Plc	We agree with the Working Group's conclusions as set out in Section 4.1 of the consultation document and as reflected in DCP 008A.
EDF Energy Networks	<p>No</p> <p>We believe all perceived metering faults should be referred to the supplier. This supports competition in metering and it is for suppliers to determine the level and hours of service they wish to provide.</p> <p>We believe that once on site, distributors should endeavour to restore supply in all circumstances. This results in a better level of customer service.</p> <p>Customers do not understand the differences between distribution and supply and if distributors are to not restore supply it is the distributor's reputation that is at risk as he will look bad in walking away.</p>
Electricity North West Limited	No. The reasoning is explained in Paragraph 5.6 of the consultation document and in our response to the second question [question 2]above.
energywatch	<p>See also "Other Comments". (Question 10)</p> <p>If the definition of vulnerable (including consequential vulnerability from a prolonged loss of supply - see above) is adopted then energywatch would support DCP008A with regard to the scenarios. However given that each decision on how to proceed is likely to be subjective, the scenarios in DCP008C appear to limit consumer detriment.</p>
ESP Electricity Ltd	No. ESP believes that the Electricity (Standards of Performance) Regulations 2005 fully covers the requirements for fault restoration and associated standards of service.
IPNL	No
Npower Group	Having participated in the DCP08 Working Group we understand the rationale behind the DCP08A scenarios, however DCP08A is not our preferred solution.
Scottish Power	No. SPERLs view is that if the DNO is at a customers premises then UMeTS should apply regardless if the

Energy Retail Limited	customer is vulnerable or not (No 5). The end user does not differentiate between industry parties and would expect their supply to be restored on the first visit. Failure to replace the meter in this scenario exposes the customer to greater inconvenience and is therefore more likely to raise a complaint either against the supplier or DNO.
SP Distribution / SP Manweb	Yes
SSE Energy Supply Limited	From a Supplier perspective, we would suggest in column 3 lines 1, 2, & 3 remain 'Refer to Supplier' but from line 4 through to 8 should all be 'UMeTS applies'. This would mean a change on Line 5 (Site Visit – Metering Fault Identified – Not Vulnerable) to UMeTS applies, the rationale being that it would be inappropriate when the distributor is already on site to leave the customer off supply for a further period of time until the Supplier could arrange for their meter operator to visit site.
SSEPD	We agree that the UMeTS scenarios are adequate for the DCP 008 analysis
The Electricity Network Company Ltd	No <b>Scenario 4 and 6</b> relate to out of hours calls. Given that the distributors service standards are prescribed by the Standards of Performance, and that the standards state that where a call is received out of working hours it shall be deemed to have been received at the next period of working hours. As such we question why the Supplier cannot deal with such calls on the same basis. We do not accept that the requirement to attend should be any more onerous than those prescribed in the regulations <b>Scenario 7 and 8.</b> We have proposed a solution where the supply to the class or classes of customer described could be restored with the absence of metering. Please see our proposal above.
Western Power Distribution (South West) plc and Western Power Distribution (South West) plc	No, we believe UMeTS should only apply to vulnerable customers out of hours i.e. scenarios 4 and 8.