

# Decision

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

---

Publication date:	27 May 2026
Contact:	Daniel Newport
Team:	Retail Price Protection
Email:	<a href="mailto:priceprotectionpolicy@ofgem.gov.uk">priceprotectionpolicy@ofgem.gov.uk</a>

---

On 25 March 2026, we consulted on proposals to update the gas and electricity Typical Domestic Consumption Values (TDCVs) used in the default tariff cap. The proposals were informed by the latest consumption evidence and aimed to ensure TDCVs reflect the most current view of household energy use

We received responses from suppliers, an industry body and a consumer group. We have carefully considered all feedback alongside the consumption data and analytical evidence on recent trends in household energy use.

There was broad support for updating TDCVs. Having assessed the consultation responses and the available evidence, we have decided to proceed with updating the TDCV values. This document sets out our decision, the reasoning underpinning it, and discusses our considerations on stakeholders' feedback we received through the consultation process.

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

© Crown copyright 2026

The text of this document may be reproduced (excluding logos) under and in accordance with the terms of the Open Government Licence.

Without prejudice to the generality of the terms of the Open Government Licence, the material that is reproduced must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the document title of this document must be specified in that acknowledgement.

This publication is available at [www.ofgem.gov.uk](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk). Any enquiries regarding the use and re-use of this information resource should be sent to [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Background .....	4
Our decision .....	4
Context and related publications .....	5
Decision-making stages .....	5
<b>2. Review of TDCV</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Background .....	6
Decision.....	6
Summary of responses and considerations .....	7
Proposed TDCV figure and methodology.....	8
Consumption trend and data .....	10
Weather correction and seasonal normal adjustment .....	12
E7 consumption split .....	12
Other considerations .....	13
Implementation .....	14
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Implications for communicating the amount of a ‘typical’ bill.....	15
Implications for benchmark consumption in the price cap.....	16

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

# 1. Introduction

## Background

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to communicate our decision to update the Typical Domestic Consumption Values (TDCVs), so they continue to reflect the most current data on household energy use. TDCVs are used widely across the energy sector by industry, the media and consumer organisations to provide a consistent reference point for communicating prices and bills when a customer's actual usage is not known.
- 1.2 When communicating the price cap, we use TDCVs to translate the unit rates and standing charges set by the cap into an illustrative annual bill for the typical customer. This helps consumers understand how changes in market costs affect typical bills and provides a stable basis for comparing movements in the cap over time. TDCV is also used as an input assumption in the price cap methodology, used to define price cap benchmark consumption.
- 1.3 We review TDCVs every couple of years as part of a process to ensure our understanding of typical consumption keeps pace with changes in domestic energy use. We have carried out TDCV reviews over time and updated the values where the evidence supports doing so.
- 1.4 Household energy consumption has changed materially in recent years. Long-term trends in energy efficiency, evolving patterns of energy use within the home, climatic changes and more recent behavioural responses to affordability pressures have likely all contributed to sustained reductions in typical household demand. Updating the values now will ensure that they remain representative of the levels of energy a typical household is expected to use today.
- 1.5 This decision document sets out why we are updating TDCVs, our consideration of responses to our March 2026 consultation, and how we have taken that feedback into account alongside the latest consumption evidence. We discuss views on the drivers of recent changes in demand, the appropriateness of the underlying methodology and data (including timeliness and any key assumptions), and the implications of updating benchmark consumption in the price cap. We also set out our implementation approach, along with views on future reviews.

## Our decision

- 1.6 Having considered the responses to our March 2026 consultation, we have decided to update the gas and electricity TDCVs with the proposed values set out in our consultation. We consider this is a technical change which supports clearer, more consistent communication of prices which better reflect the most up to date domestic consumption behaviour. This decision to update the TDCVs will impact the benchmark consumption used as an input into the price cap methodology, as set out in our [November 2025 decision on benchmark](#)

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

[consumption](#). This allows the price cap to continue reflecting recent trends in consumption.

- 1.7 We have decided to maintain our proposed position not to carry out an update of the Economy 7 (E7) consumption split. Similarly, we have decided to maintain our proposed approach on applying the seasonal normal adjustment to the TDCV for gas.

## Context and related publications

- 1.8 This decision document should be read in conjunction with our March 2026 consultation: [Review of typical domestic consumption values](#)
- 1.9 As part of our wider [price cap programme of work](#), we published the November 2025 [Energy Price Cap benchmark review decision](#), where we committed to aligning future updates to benchmark consumption with changes in TDCV. This decision should be considered alongside the benchmark review decision, which sets out the basis for any future adjustments to benchmark consumption within the cap.
- 1.10 We have carried out several TDCV reviews over the years, which can be found published on our website. The most recent was carried out in 2023 and can be found here: [Decision for Typical Domestic Consumption Values 2023 | Ofgem](#).

## Decision-making stages

**Stage 1** Consultation opened: 25 March 2026

**Stage 2** Consultation closed and deadline for responses: 20 April 2026

**Stage 3** Responses reviewed and decision published: 27 May 2026

**Stage 4** Implementation of new TDCV values: 1 July 2026

## 2. Review of TDCV

### Background

- 2.1 TDCVs are industry standard estimates of the annual gas and electricity consumption of a typical domestic customer. They are used widely across industry, government and the media as a common reference point for communicating prices and bills where a customer's actual consumption is not known. We use TDCVs to calculate the typical annual bill figures published alongside price cap updates.
- 2.2 In March 2026, we consulted on proposals to update the gas and electricity TDCVs to reflect the latest available evidence on household energy consumption, based on the historic framework used for TDCV review. In the consultation we discussed how domestic consumption has fallen materially since the last review and set out our view that the existing TDCVs no longer provided the most representative view of typical household usage. We therefore proposed updated TDCVs for gas, electricity single-rate and electricity multi-rate customers.
- 2.3 In addition to their role in communication, TDCVs are used as an input into the price cap methodology, where they inform the benchmark consumption applied in cap calculations. Appendix A gives a summary of the impacts on the price cap levels for communication purposes and also the implications of changes to benchmark consumption in the price cap.
- 2.4 We asked stakeholders for views on the following areas:
  - Proposed TDCV figures and associated methodology;
  - Trend in consumption over time, along with any suggestions for alternative data of evidence that may bring insight for future reviews;
  - Weather correction and seasonal normal adjustment we are proposing to apply to the TDCV for gas; and
  - E7 consumptions split and the merits of maintaining a defined consumption split.

### Decision

- 2.5 We have decided to proceed with the proposed changes to the TDCV figures as set out in our March 2026 consultation ([Review of typical domestic consumption values | Ofgem](#)). We have decided to maintain our proposed approach to apply the seasonal normal adjustment to the TDCV for gas. The table below sets out the finalised TDCV figures, to be implemented from 1 July 2026.

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

**Table 1: Finalised TDCV figures**

### Electricity — Profile Class 1 (Standard single-rate meters, kWh per year)

Usage Level	2023 TDCV	2026 TDCV	Change
Low	1,800	1,600	-200
Medium	2,700	2,500	-200
High	4,100	3,800	-300

### Electricity — Profile Class 2 (Multi-rate meters, kWh per year)

Usage Level	2023 TDCV	2026 TDCV	Change
Low	2,200	1,900	-300
Medium	3,900	3,400	-500
High	6,700	6,100	-600

### Gas (kWh per year)

Usage Level	2023 TDCV	2026 TDCV	Change
Low	7,500	6,000	-1,500
Medium	11,500	9,500	-2,000
High	17,000	14,000	-3,000

- 2.6 We have decided to proceed with our proposed approach relating to the E7 consumption split. This means there will be no updates to the consumption split as part of this review, remaining unchanged from our previous review.

**Table 2: E7 Consumption split**

	Consumption split (GB)
Peak (day time usage)	58%
Off-peak (night time usage)	42%

## Summary of responses and considerations

- 2.7 We received eleven responses to our consultation, comprising nine suppliers, one consumer group and one industry body. Overall, there was significant support for our proposals, with strong backing for the introduction of the new TDCV values, with an emphasis on implementation timing. There was some concern around the methodology over-stating consumption given recent trends, along with the need for careful communication of the new figures. There were calls for us to re-visit the methodology based on concerns around review frequency and cost reflectively issues. We discuss in further detail these points and more below.

## **Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision**

### **Proposed TDCV figure and methodology**

2.8 Overall, stakeholders supported updating TDCVs and agreed that using a common set of figures remains important for tariff comparability and for communicating the price cap. There was also broad recognition of the appropriateness of implementing new TDCVs in light of the continuing downward trend in consumption over the past few years. We consider that a standard set of values supports consistent consumer and market communication, and we consider that updating now is appropriate given the evidence of materially lower consumption since the last review.

### **TDCV values**

- 2.9 Several stakeholders argued that the proposed TDCV values may still be too high, due to the methodology we employ. Two stakeholders argued that we should include very low (including nil) consumption meter points in the dataset, and that excluding these observations may overstate consumption. We consider that TDCVs should reflect the consumption of a typical household. Including nil or extremely low consumption observations risks capturing unrepresentative properties and could bias the estimate away from typical household energy use.
- 2.10 Our approach is to make proportionate adjustments so the TDCV best reflects the typical consumer. For this reason, we use the median as a mechanism to reduce the influence of unrepresentative meter points. We consider it analytically appropriate to apply an additional adjustment at the low end of consumption which further helps to ensure the estimate is representative of the typical consumer. This uses the well-established adjustment from DESNZ's sub-national consumption dataset to address very low (including nil) consumption meter points. Even with the exclusion of the extremely low consumption meter points, the adjustment does not materially shift the TDCV values toward mean consumption.
- 2.11 Two stakeholders discussed the thresholds we use in considering changes to TDCV. While one supplier agrees with the current thresholds of 100kWh for electricity and 500kWh for gas, another suggests these should be lowered to 50kWh and 100kWh respectively as a better balance of transparency and accuracy.
- 2.12 We consider the current materiality thresholds remain appropriate in the context of overall consumption levels, remaining broadly proportionate and well established. They continue to strike a balance between reflecting genuine shifts in demand and avoiding frequent, marginal updates without materially improving accuracy. However, we recognise that consumption patterns are evolving and as part of any future review of the TDCV methodology, we will keep the question of threshold levels under consideration to ensure they remain fit for purpose.

## **Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision**

2.13 One supplier raised concerns about the rounding approach applied to TDCVs, suggesting that values may have been rounded upwards rather than to the nearest increment. In response, we clarify that TDCVs have been rounded to the nearest values (100 kWh for electricity and 500 kWh for gas). This approach does not round values upwards, but instead rounds to the closest multiple, either up or down as appropriate.

### **Use of Median average**

2.14 There was broad support across suppliers in using the median to represent a typical household. We continue to consider median the most appropriate basis for estimating the consumption of a typical household. As highlighted by several stakeholders, using the median limits distortion from high-consumption properties and potential non-domestic customers captured in the data.

2.15 The consumer group supported using median TDCVs for typical bill communication but raised cost reflectively concerns where using median masks actual consumption, resulting in over-recovery from consumers. While we recognise these concerns, as noted in our November benchmark consumption decision, these are best addressed within the overall design of the cap. In our 2018 decision ([Appendix 2 - Cap level analysis and headroom](#)) we recognised that as mean consumption was likely above median consumption, recovering some fixed costs through the unit rate would confer some benefit, on average, to suppliers. We took this into consideration when setting the level of the cap; without this benefit, we might have considered setting a higher headroom allowance.

2.16 Additionally, the cap applies only to standard variable tariffs, rather than the market as a whole. Some high usage customers may be more likely to be on fixed tariffs. For example, consumers with low carbon technologies such as EVs would have incentives to select fixed tariffs associated with that technology. This further contributes to the median being a more representative measure of typical SVT consumption.

2.17 We also note the broader context of supplier financial performance, which indicates that suppliers have not systematically over-recovered costs under the cap ([State of the market report - retail](#)); this supports our view that continued use of median consumption does not create a material risk of over-recovery. Taken together, we consider the use of median consumption remains appropriate. It provides a clear and consistent basis for communicating typical bills and for setting benchmark assumptions within the cap, while supporting the cap's ability to meet its statutory objectives.

### **Review frequency and cost recovery**

2.18 There was a broad theme across several suppliers calling for more frequent TDCV reviews. They argued that current review cycles are too slow to keep pace with

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

rapidly changing consumption patterns. Others emphasised the importance of ensuring benchmark consumption does not remain materially out of step with observed consumption, while others highlighted the current methodology may be too backward looking. Views varied on the appropriate frequency for reviews. The consumer group supported maintaining a two-year cycle for TDCV review.

- 2.19 We consider that our current approach continues to strike an appropriate balance between keeping values broadly aligned with underlying consumption trends and maintaining a stable and predictable benchmark for use in the price cap and consumer communications. While we recognise concerns regarding potential future trends in consumption, we do not consider there is sufficient evidence to incorporate an assumption of further reductions as part of this decision. The underlying data already includes an adjustment to incorporate the impact of recent climatic changes. It also captures recent behavioural change in response to higher prices, which could partially rebound in some circumstances or constrain the potential of further reductions in the near-term. We will however keep this under review in the context of any future updates.
- 2.20 We also note that TDCV is intended to provide an indicative estimate of typical consumption, rather than a precise measure, and therefore the aim of the framework is to ensure the values remain broadly representative rather than to update them in response to marginal changes in the underlying data. It's worth noting that the outcome of any review may lead to either upward or downward adjustments in TDCVs.
- 2.21 However, we recognise the general concern raised around timings and predictability of the TDCV review cycle. Our current approach is to review TDCVs every two years, in line with our established framework, and to communicate clearly the timing and scope of future reviews. We will monitor consumption trends on an ongoing basis which can help inform whether changes to the review cycle or broader methodology are appropriate.
- 2.22 One supplier suggested the introduction of a mechanism to make ex-post adjustments to the price cap to allow recovery of previously under-recovered supplier allowances. We do not consider it appropriate to include a retrospective cost recovery. We set the cap on an ex-ante basis. Whilst ex-post adjustments have occasionally been applied in the past, these are exceptional and not standard practice.

## Consumption trend and data

- 2.23 Stakeholders broadly agree with our assessment on the drivers of the trend in consumption. The consumer group emphasised the link between sustained high energy prices and affordability pressures, stating that falling consumption is an economic response by consumers to higher prices. There was recognition that structural changes such as efficiency improvements and climatic changes have contributed to the longer term trend.

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

- 2.24 Some stakeholders argued that the proposed TDCV values may still be too high given evidence of downward pressure, and we should make greater use of recent supplier and industry evidence when finalising the figures. Sources suggested include Xoserve Annual Quantity (AQ) data and supplier data collected via our powers.
- 2.25 We consider the AQ data to be a reliable industry standard for average gas consumption. However, we consider the DESNZ dataset allows us to better understand the consumption of the typical household. Comparing the two datasets historically, the AQ is more closely aligned to the mean consumption. Rather than being used as a direct input for TDCV estimation, the AQ may be more appropriate from a complementary perspective to corroborate the general trend we're seeing.
- 2.26 It's worth noting, the most recent average AQ published has highlighted nearly 1% month on month increase in annual consumption ([Figure 1 of Demand Estimation Sub-committee update](#)). While this may not necessarily suggest a significant rebound will occur, it could be indicating a broadly flat outlook with further fall off being less likely. This is an example of the complementary intelligence that can be gained.
- 2.27 We consider it appropriate to retain our current approach using the industry recognised and transparent evidence base that the sub-national dataset provides. This is a widely recognised and accredited dataset that provides a consistent and comparable view of the evolution of consumption data over time, and allows us to better understand consumption of the typical household. However, we will continue to monitor these complementary sources and as part of any future review we will consider if any changes to the data source is appropriate.
- 2.28 A number of stakeholders argue that a universal TDCV is becoming less representative of actual consumption and therefore likely less cost reflective. For example, one supplier recognised the widening gap between mean and median usage, with concern that this could increase further with wider EV adoption. They highlighted that higher usage properties are more likely to be on a fixed tariff, meaning segmentation of benchmarks is likely to become more important over time.
- 2.29 We recognise these points and agree that the distribution of consumption is evolving. We also recognise that because TDCVs now inform benchmark consumption in the cap, a more segmented approach could in principle improve cost reflectivity for some customer groups, relative to a single universal benchmark. However, any such benefit would need to be weighed against the additional complexity, transparency, distributional and communication risks that segmented benchmarks would introduce. We consider that retaining a single set of typical values for this update remains appropriate in the context of this review.

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

2.30 The consumer group also noted their concern around the combination of increased electrification and self-rationing further widening this gap. They noted this is likely to be particularly pronounced for multi-rate customers where the gap between low usage storage heater homes and high usage EV homes may be more pronounced. They recommend we explore this further. We will consider what role the cap plays in setting rates for low carbon technologies in our review of how we adapt the wholesale allowance to accommodate Market wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS).

## Weather correction and seasonal normal adjustment

2.31 Of the eleven stakeholder responses received on this topic, eight were supportive of the current approach to Seasonal Normal Composite Weather Variable (SNCWV) and the associated adjustment methodology, while three respondents did not provide a view.

2.32 Among those responses, several raised concerns regarding the frequency of SNCWV updates, noting that household heating patterns and demand behaviours may evolve over time. Some stakeholders suggested that the seasonal normal should be monitored periodically to ensure it remains representative, with a number calling for more frequent review cycles, including proposals for updates every two years.

2.33 We recognise the importance of ensuring the seasonal normal remains reflective of the current consumption patterns. However, the methodology and update timetable are set through Xoserve's governance forums ([Demand Estimation Subcommittee](#)), rather than through this review process.

2.34 Having considered the feedback, we consider it appropriate to maintain our proposed approach and will carry out an adjustment to apply the latest view of seasonal normal to allow for the most up to date view of weather correction for the gas dataset. Further detail on this adjustment can be found in our [Review of typical domestic consumption values](#).

## E7 consumption split

2.35 We will not implement a change to the E7 peak/off-peak consumption split as part of this review. Consistent with the consultation, we consider that any amendment to the E7 split should be viewed as part of a wider, holistic assessment in context of MHHS.

2.36 We had six responses on the topic of E7 consumption split, all supportive of our proposals. Stakeholders agreed that the E7 split should be reviewed as part of the broader MHHS related work rather than through a standalone change. One supplier supported retaining a defined E7 split, noting that while any changes should form part of a broader review, maintaining a consistent peak and off-peak split in the interim provides stability and clear communication. We consider this

## **Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision**

feedback reinforces our view that a comprehensive review, informed by data under MHHS, is the appropriate route for any potential future changes.

### **Other considerations**

#### **Communications**

- 2.37 Stakeholders raised concerns about how changes to TDCVs would be communicated to customers. For example, the consumer group noted that where reductions in TDCVs coincide with increases in underlying prices, there is a risk that headline bill figures could be misinterpreted as indicating falling prices, when in reality they reflect less consumption.
- 2.38 The importance of clearly explaining the drivers of changes in the price cap was emphasised by several stakeholders. Suggestions included improving transparency in communications, considering transitional approaches to presenting updated TDCVs, working closely with industry to ensure consistent messaging and as consumption patterns evolve use segmented communication for different consumer types.
- 2.39 We recognise the importance of clear communication where changes in TDCVs affect headline bill figures. Consistent with our approach in previous updates, we will implement the revised TDCVs from 1 July 2026 and use that date as the clear point from which communications based on typical bills will move to the new values.
- 2.40 This will provide a single, transparent implementation point for Ofgem, suppliers and other industry stakeholders using TDCVs in customer communications. From that date onwards, our communications on typical bills and related price cap messaging will be based on the updated TDCVs. All communication of annual bill levels prior to 1 July 2026 will be based on the current TDCVs.
- 2.41 A supplier expressed a preference that the new TDCV could be adopted by industry in advance of the proposed implementation date, with consistent approaches being enforced to avoid individual suppliers gaining advantage by using lower TDCV quotes earlier.
- 2.42 This comment underlines the importance of TDCVs as a common reference point for customers comparing tariffs where actual consumption is not known. We consider that 1 July 2026 allows an appropriate lead time for market participants to adapt to the change. Our expectation is that any updated TDCVs are applied by all industry participants from this clear and common implementation point, rather than through staggered or supplier-specific adoption.

#### **Payment method specific approach**

- 2.43 As part of their responses to the TDCV review consultation, some suppliers took the opportunity to show their support for moving toward a payment method

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

specific approach for benchmark consumption. As part of our benchmark consumption consultation last summer, we gathered views on the introduction of payment method specific consumption benchmark within the price cap. We welcome the further feedback now provided through this review and will use this to inform any further thinking we may do across related workstreams.

## Implementation

- 2.44 We will implement the updated TDCV values for communication purposes from 1 July 2026. From that point forward, all annualised price cap levels will be quoted using the new TDCVs. Any references to historic annualised price cap levels will be converted (eg [retail data portal](#)) to allow for a consistent period on period comparison of the price cap levels. Our expectation is that all market participants would similarly start using the new TDCVs from implementation date and not before it.
- 2.45 In keeping with our [November 2025 decision on benchmark consumption](#), amendments have been made to the price cap annex models to allow us to apply the latest TDCVs, in order to allow for the change to benchmark consumption. The revised values have been incorporated into the price cap annex models, and these changes have been reflected in the final version of the models published as part of the latest [price cap announcement](#).
- 2.46 Stakeholders were broadly supportive of implementation from July 2026 and emphasised the importance of timely updates. Several suppliers highlighted the need for clear messaging to ensure consumers understand the impact of updated consumption assumptions on headline bills. We consider that our implementation approach provides a proportionate transition, and we expect suppliers and other industry participants to ensure that their communications reflect the approach set out above.

## Appendix A

### Implications for communicating the amount of a ‘typical’ bill

Updating the TDCVs will lower the reported ‘typical’ annual bill. This reflects revised assumptions about typical usage rather than a reduction in energy prices. Based on the new TDCVs, we estimate the April 2026 to June 2026 price cap would have been £1,489 for a medium usage customer on a dual fuel standard variable tariff paying by direct debit. This is compared to the current April 2026 to June 2026 price cap set at £1,641 using the current TDCV. The tables below illustrate this effect across fuels and payment methods, demonstrating how headline typical bills would have been lower under revised assumptions.

**Table 3: Impact on annual headline cap levels**

Payment Method	<i>kWh</i>	Current typical gas bills	Typical gas bills using proposed TDCVs
Direct Debit	Low	£537	£455
	Medium	£766	£659
	High	£1,082	£920
Standard Credit	Low	£587	£501
	Medium	£829	£715
	High	£1,162	£991
Prepayment	Low	£521	£443
	Medium	£742	£639
	High	£1,047	£892

Payment Method	<i>kWh</i>	Current typical electricity PC1 bills	Typical electricity PC1 bills using proposed TDCVs
Direct Debit	Low	£653	£607
	Medium	£875	£831
	High	£1,220	£1,154
Standard Credit	Low	£709	£660
	Medium	£943	£896
	High	£1,308	£1,237
Prepayment	Low	£640	£595
	Medium	£855	£812
	High	£1,190	£1,126

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

Payment Method	<i>kWh</i>	Current typical electricity PC2 bills	Typical electricity PC2 bills using proposed TDCVs
Direct Debit	Low	£716	£651
	Medium	£1,108	£1,001
	High	£1,754	£1,631
Standard Credit	Low	£775	£707
	Medium	£1,189	£1,076
	High	£1,871	£1,741
Prepayment	Low	£700	£638
	Medium	£1081	£977
	High	£1707	£1588

## Implications for benchmark consumption in the price cap

From July 2026, revised TDCV values will be reflected in the benchmark consumption assumptions used in the cap, as we set out in our [November 2025 decision](#) on aligning benchmark consumption with changes in TDCV.

This approach ensures the price cap remains aligned with changes in typical energy use while maintaining appropriate recovery of costs.

Updating the benchmark consumption values with the new TDCV values set out in Table 4, would apply an increase of 0.19p/kWh and 0.07p/kWh to the unit rate for the typical electricity and gas consumer respectively. The tables below show how these updated values feed through into the price cap calculations.

**Table 4: Impact on unit rate (based on April – June 2026 cap levels, ex VAT)**

Payment Method	Gas - Current TDCV unit rate (p/kWh)	Gas - Proposed TDCV unit rate (p/kWh)	Difference (p/kWh)
Direct Debit	5.47	5.54	0.07
Standard Credit	5.76	5.83	0.07
Prepayment	5.27	5.34	0.08

Payment Method	Electricity PC1 - current TDCV unit rate (p/kWh)	Electricity PC1 - proposed TDCV unit rate (p/kWh)	Difference (p/kWh)
Direct Debit	23.50	23.69	0.19
Standard Credit	24.81	25.00	0.19
Prepayment	22.79	22.98	0.19

## Review of typical domestic consumption values: decision

Payment Method	Electricity PC2 - Current TDCV unit rate (p/kWh)	Electricity PC2- Proposed TDCV unit rate (p/kWh)	Difference (p/kWh)
Direct Debit	21.98	22.22	0.24
Standard Credit	23.19	23.44	0.25
Prepayment	21.31	21.55	0.24

The impact of these changes is expected to be consistent across payment methods and regions. The figures above for gas are inclusive of the adjustment for the new seasonal normal. The changes are intended to maintain the recovery of fixed costs which are recovered volumetrically, given the impact of reduced demand. The aim is not to increase the total amount that a default tariff customer pays toward fixed costs which are recovered volumetrically, relative to the situation before consumption fell. Further detail can be found in our [review of typical domestic consumption values](#).