

06 June 2022

Rachel Clark  
Deputy Director Retail, Settlement Reform  
Ofgem,  
10 South Colonnade,  
Canary Wharf,  
London E14 4PU

Email: [alisonrussell@utilita.co.uk](mailto:alisonrussell@utilita.co.uk)

Dear Rachel,

Re: Statutory Consultation on proposals to modify the electricity supply licence condition 47: "Smart Metering – Matters Relating to Obtaining and Using Consumption Data"

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments on Ofgem's consultation on the Statutory consultation on proposals to modify the electricity supply licence condition 47: "Smart Metering – Matters Relating to Obtaining and Using Consumption Data". This letter forms Utilita's non-confidential response.

Utilita has been operating successfully in the market since 2008. We have a predominantly prepay client base, most of which have smart meters installed. We provide a high-quality service to a sector of customers who are traditionally poorly served and the continuation of excellent supply services to our prepayment customers is paramount.

In light of the proposed change to SLC 47, we believe that the MHHS programme will need to revisit their benefits case, clearly stating the advantages of this proposal over the use a single system framework, as we feel this is lacking within the consultation document. The proposal made within this consultation would undermine the expected benefits of MHHS and its interactions with the Smart Programme.

As MHHS is to be mandated, the most pragmatic approach would be to ensure suppliers are able to collect HH granularity consumption data, on an opt-out basis for all consumers. This would allow for the largest proportion of MPANs settled on a HH basis, therefore giving the highest chance of successfully delivering the benefits towards energy efficiency, net-zero and innovation laid out in the original business case. For avoidance of doubt, this would only apply for the processing of this data for settlement purposes, and would not impact upon consent to marketing uses.

It is not practical nor cost effective to maintain two systems of consent for consumers. However, given the current revisions to the price cap based on market volatility, full consideration should be given to any necessary amendments needed to ensure the framework does not negatively impact suppliers.

Yours sincerely,

*By email*

Alison Russell  
Director of Policy & Regulatory Affairs