

Sarah Brooks
Head of Consumer Policy
Ofgem
9 Millbank
London
SW1P 3GE

Legal and Regulatory
British Gas
1st Floor, Lakeside West
30 The Causeway
Staines
Middlesex
TW18 3BY

14 May 2015

British Gas' response to Review of the Priority Services Register – Update and Next Steps

Dear Sarah

This is the British Gas response to Ofgem's open letter on 'Review of the Priority Services Register - Update and Next Steps', published on 26 March.

We appreciate Ofgem laying out its thinking in this open letter and the early engagement that has taken place with your team to fully understand the intended approach. We continue to be supportive of taking all appropriate steps to recognise vulnerability, based upon the transaction and / or the discussion with the customer. However, as we explain further below and in the annexes, these issues are characterised by a degree of operational complexity which should be taken into account when the licence conditions are drafted and in Ofgem's approach to monitoring and enforcement in this area.

As we set out in our original consultation response letter, dated 16 September 2014, we agree that there are certain groups of consumers who need (and should rightly expect) minimum levels of priority service across the industry. And, we further agree, that when information becomes clear from the customer interaction which may suggest some form of vulnerability, we should capture and act upon it. By capturing this information, suppliers are able to offer the most appropriate products and services according to the individual customer's needs at the point of interaction.

We agree that any changes to the Priority Service Register (PSR) licence requirements must be clearly focused on improving the experience of consumers in relation to their safety, ability to access services and communication with energy companies. And we support Ofgem's intent to move to a needs-based eligibility model for PSR services, with a "core" group defined primarily to offer the right services to vulnerable consumers who are most in need of support. Ofgem has confirmed the intent that this "core" group will comprise of those consumers on means tested benefits who fall within the current Supply Licence Standard Condition 26 (customers who are of pensionable age, disabled or chronically sick).

We note and support Ofgem's proposal to extend the "core" group to new categories, where the customer is on means tested benefits and owns their own home, to include 'families with children under 5' and 'pregnant women'. We also agree with the suggested refinement of pensionable age to 'aged 75 and over'.

We are very keen to work with Ofgem on any proposed licence changes to incorporate the vision that the PSR should deliver the appropriate protections for consumers falling within the "core" group. Also, we believe we are well placed (and would be happy to lead) the industry on data sharing to help achieve a more joined-up and effective approach to identify and share vulnerable customer needs data, across suppliers, DNOs and GDNs.

We note that there are no specific considerations given to Data Protection compliance in the open letter, and suppliers will need to be extremely careful about the capturing and storing of information relating to pregnancy. Being a statement of an individual's health or condition - this type of information is classed as 'sensitive' under the Data Protection Act 1998 and will place suppliers in the position of having to be particularly careful when processing this data. Ofgem's Impact Assessment (IA) will need to consider and satisfy that this data sharing serves a wider consumer benefit and is indispensable to securing that benefit. Ofgem will need to be able to demonstrate that sharing this data is appropriate and necessary, and provide a consolidated view or steer across both sector-specific and data protection regulation to provide industry stakeholders with a degree of comfort that there will be no

questions subsequently about the compatibility of processing this type of personal information with data protection principles.

Ofgem proposes to require suppliers to proactively and regularly identify any consumers who need access to priority services (and for the relevant services to be offered to them and taken up). If by 'proactive' Ofgem means (as we understand it does), active listening and appropriate questioning in a non-intrusive way combined with appropriate data sharing, then that is exactly what we are seeking to do and we support this proposal.

However, if by 'proactive identification', Ofgem means asking specific questions upfront and on every interaction, including inbound / outbound calls by way of rigid scripts, then we would vigorously object to this proposal. It is not a supplier's role to undertake such questioning, nor is it appropriate, reasonable or proportionate to probe, or to ask intrusive personal questions where this is not obviously necessary. Nor do we believe that this approach would be in the best interest of our customers (taking into account Ofgem's wider objective of promoting consumer engagement).

Therefore, it is critical that the licence condition is framed in such a way and is appropriately worded to ensure that this expectation is not set or, that Ofgem provides appropriate guidance accompanying any proposed new licence condition. When considering the licence drafting, Ofgem could seek to use wording that would oblige suppliers to take 'reasonable, appropriate and proportionate steps' to recognise and record vulnerability, where they are made aware or have reason to believe a customer is in a vulnerable situation. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Ofgem to, (i) develop a common understanding about the challenges faced by suppliers in the sphere of vulnerability, and (ii) how that might affect the proposed licence condition wording in advance of the next stage of the consultation process.

Our key remaining concerns are that whilst we can provide the facilities that enable our customers to bring their service needs to our attention, we cannot force our customers to engage with us. In addition, and importantly, many customers have concerns about what their personal information will be used for, even when it's being collected for legitimate and helpful purposes.

We recognise that, as part of Ofgem's formal consultation process, Ofgem will need to fully consult interested parties on its proposals through the appropriate process. Whilst, on this occasion, we have welcomed Ofgem's early thoughts (via the open letter) ahead of formal consultation, we would expect Ofgem to pose its questions clearly and appropriately through the formal consultation process. And, given that the proposed changes to the licence condition are important, it is critical that Ofgem carries out a full Impact Assessment of its proposed changes, including a cost benefit analysis.

We understand that Ofgem will require information from British Gas to inform an Impact Assessment – the earliest possible view of what information is needed for this purpose would be appreciated. Specifically, we will need time to perform an internal financial impact assessment on the proposal to extend Free Gas Safety Checks (FGSCs) to further groups of consumers, as this may incur significant additional costs.

Our detailed responses to your questions and proposals are outlined in Annex 1 and we have set out some further legal analysis in Annex 2.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if it would be useful to discuss our letter in more detail. We remain committed to working positively with Ofgem in the delivery of these proposals, and in providing the right outcomes for all consumers.

Yours sincerely



Nigel Howard
Head of Consumer Regulation
British Gas

Annex 1 – British Gas’ responses to specific proposals and questions asked in the open letter

Eligibility

Ofgem proposes to:

- Require all energy companies to proactively identify vulnerable customers;
- Move towards a needs-based model of eligibility, with “core” eligible groups specified for safety services;
- Add ‘families with children under 5’ and ‘pregnant women’ to “core” eligible groups and refine pensionable age to ‘aged 75 and over’.

We support the prescription of a minimum set of services by Ofgem, which should be common across all suppliers.

Q. Do stakeholders agree that ‘families with children under 5’ should be added as a specified eligible “core” group to receive additional help during interrupted supply and for the provision of free gas appliance safety checks?

Yes, we are in agreement that “families with children under 5” should be added as a specified eligible “core” group, to receive additional help during interrupted supply and for the provision of free gas safety checks (FGSCs), in line with current licence requirements where it has been identified that they are in receipt of means tested benefits and own their own home.

Q. Do stakeholders agree that the specified eligibility covering elderly people for the services related to safety should be changed from ‘pensionable age’ to ‘75 and over’?

We are in agreement that the eligibility covering elderly people for services related to safety should be changed from “pensionable age” to “75 and over”, where it has been identified that they are in receipt of means tested benefits and own their own home. For GDNs and DNOs where there is a supply interruption, means tested benefits criteria should of course not be applied.

Q. Do stakeholders consider that pregnant women should be added as a specified eligible “core” group receiving free gas safety checks?

We are in agreement with adding “pregnant women” to the PSR, as a specified eligible “core” group, where it has been identified that they are in receipt of means tested benefits and own their own home, but only, as we note in our covering letter, where the customer has offered up this information or we have become aware of this information.

To reiterate our key concern, we strongly believe that the word ‘proactive’ is problematic and risks being interpreted as requiring potentially intrusive questioning rather than active listening. Such probing is neither appropriate nor reasonable for a supplier. Based on our discussions with Ofgem, it is clear that this is not Ofgem’s intent, but that it is expected that this information should only be captured and acted upon when a customer volunteers information which may suggest some form of vulnerability or where it becomes evident from the interaction. Where vulnerability has been identified through this means, obligations to maintain this information should similarly be subject to what is reasonable in the context of good customer service.

Services

Ofgem proposes to:

- Retain a set of prescribed services to provide a minimum level of protection to vulnerable customers;
- Expect energy companies to offer other services to customers where need is identified and where practical to do so;
- Require GDNs to provide advice and information about interrupted gas supply;
- Work with energy companies and consumer groups in evaluating the costs and benefits of our proposed eligibility and services model.

We support the prescription of a minimum set of services by Ofgem and believe that these should be common across all suppliers. However, we agree with Ofgem that it is not the role of the regulator to prescribe additional services, as this is an area where suppliers should be encouraged to innovate in order to differentiate between them.

Any change to the current PSR model, covering eligibility and services should be fully explored and we are fully supportive of working alongside Ofgem, energy companies, network operators, charities and consumer groups to evaluate the cost impact of proposals for changes to the Supply Licence for energy companies. In line with Ofgem's own guidelines, and as noted above, an Impact Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis must be carried out where the (financial) materiality of the proposed change is high.

We are happy with the inclusion of requiring GDNs to provide advice and information about interrupted gas supply to bring them in line with existing requirements on DNOs. We will continue to support and work with the existing Industry Group to review how this can best be achieved.

Customer identification and data sharing

Ofgem proposes to:

- Expect all energy companies to proactively identify and record vulnerable customer data and share this with each other and more widely with other utilities;
- Require GDNs to have a mechanism to record and share data;
- Expect the ENA CSWG to take the role in developing "needs" codes and the industry mechanisms for data sharing, working with industry and consumer groups;
- Introduce requirements for energy companies to signpost to relevant schemes in other sectors.

We recognise that where a customer (or an authorised third party) volunteers information which may suggest some form of vulnerability, or it becomes clear during the conversation, we should record it so that it can be referenced and acted upon and this is currently the process that we follow. We have briefed our customer contact staff and engineers on what to ask and what to look for, including eligibility for the PSR. Our frontline agents are currently receiving this training, covering:

- recognising and listening for different types of vulnerability during a call,
- how to record it, and
- how to pass on to our expert teams who are highly trained to deliver tailored and specialist advice to customers in vulnerable circumstances.

Through our Quality Assurance process, agents' performance is monitored for adherence to recognising, recording and referring customers in vulnerable situations. Further one to one coaching is provided to agents who are not meeting expected standards in this area.

As explained above, we believe the definition of proactive identification of vulnerable customers should be reframed. Not all customers who would be considered eligible under Ofgem's proposals may consider they need or want additional services from their energy supplier.

We currently use information provided to us (such as DWP data for WHD Core Group) to flag a customer account with financial vulnerability. And, we also use this data to promote the PSR to encourage a customer to make contact with us. We also promote the PSR in any price notification letters and on our bills. On this latter point, we have asked Ofgem if we could promote the PSR on our customers' annual statements (the licence currently does not allow for this), to help further proactive notification. We still await a response.

We recognise the importance of data sharing between suppliers, DNOs and GDNs to ensure a more joined-up and effective approach to identifying vulnerable customer needs in order to ensure those consumers specified as "core" groups receive additional help during interrupted supply.

We are already working with The Energy Networks Association (ENA) Customer Safeguarding Working Group (CSWG) to develop the model and process for data sharing to achieve this.

However, we would suggest that more thought is given to the costs and impacts versus the benefits to consumers of sharing information more widely across supplier bases and even to other utilities. Specific considerations are:

- As a starting position, and in line with data protection law, data should also only be shared that is going to be used by recipients and at the appropriate level of detail to ensure customer's requiring additional help can quickly and easily be identified.
- The benefits of data sharing would quickly be undermined if there is not an appropriately robust means of maintaining the data in line with customer's needs as they may change (specifically, please also see our comments in relation to expectant mothers in our covering letter).

Improving the take-up of services

Ofgem proposes to:

- Keep 'Priority Services Register' as the joint brand name;
- Expect energy companies to consider further work in promoting customer awareness and uptake of PSR services;
- Produce information materials for advice providers to communicate the PSR and services.

We support maintaining the joint brand name as 'Priority Services Register'. This name is recognised by and is familiar to our energy customers and will continue to help with visibility and understanding of the services on offer. In fact, we have proactively moved towards this branding as a direct result of customer feedback via consumer groups that this was an area of confusion.

We have already undertaken a significant amount of work in exploring ways to promote customer awareness and uptake of the PSR, both from an industry perspective and within British Gas. We have shared our original thoughts with Ofgem and are happy to discuss these further, if required to update on our progress.

We welcome the proposal for Ofgem to produce materials for advice providers on the services available to consumers from energy suppliers. This generic material will help to provide a consistent message for consumers to help raise awareness of the PSR, alongside the individual suppliers' and consumer group materials.

Compliance and monitoring

Ofgem proposes to:

- Adopt a principles-based approach to regulation of energy companies' compliance to PSR;
- Replace supplier independent audits with SOC panel reporting and mystery shopping together with revised Social Obligations Reporting;
- Use RIIO stakeholder engagement incentives to monitor networks performance.

Compliance and monitoring in this area is already significant and onerous (specifically, via Social Obligations reporting and formal bi-annual Social Policy meetings) and therefore we are pleased that Ofgem have chosen not to implement supplier independent audits and instead are looking to adopt a principles-based approach. However, whilst we are happy with Ofgem's proposed approach, we are concerned about the use of the language in the open letter – especially, in relation to 'principle based regulation' (PBR), when it is not obviously the case and will ultimately create more confusion or uncertainty on the part of suppliers. (see Annex 2).

We would, however, like the opportunity to explore further with Ofgem why it intends to use the SOC panel reporting (which we discuss further in Annex 2). We would be keen to find a solution that focuses on outcomes and not individual issues, i.e. focusing on systemic failings rather than individual issues.

Annex 2- PSR Open Letter – British Gas Legal Response

Summary

Within this section we provide more detailed comments on the application of the legal framework to the policy proposals Ofgem has set out in its open letter. We believe that these considerations should assist both Ofgem and industry stakeholders in delivering the most efficient and welfare-enhancing outcome for consumers. Accordingly, we have focussed on the following questions, which we see as key for Ofgem to fully consider in order to satisfy its duties¹:

1. Is the form of the intervention proportionate to the outcome being desired?
 - Is there clear evidence of consumer harm given that this is an ex ante intervention?
 - If there is clear evidence of consumer harm, is Ofgem's proposed form of intervention the least onerous way of realising the stated outcome?
 - Specifically, has Ofgem considered alternatives when thinking about the obligations it intends to impose on suppliers? Has any balancing exercise been performed that takes into account the need to avoid consumer disengagement?
 - One means of establishing whether the proportionality analysis is robust is the use of the IA in which the benefits and disbenefits of particular courses of action can be weighed up and analysed (ideally in a quantitative assessment). Given the facts in this case and the consumer segment involved, Ofgem's own thresholds for the use of an IA would plainly be triggered.

2. Is the proposed approach sufficiently clear and appropriate (so that it promotes legal and regulatory certainty)?
 - How does Ofgem intend to resolve the tension between PBR and prescription in this case that will, if unaddressed, ultimately lead to confusion and inconsistency?
 - Ofgem must be clear as to what it means when it intends to adopt a PBR approach – from the perspective of legal and regulatory certainty, it is important PBR does not result in the scope of obligations being redefined or expanded on a retrospective basis;
 - Any proposal to expand the scope of the Standards of Conduct (SOC) to apply to vulnerability must be subject to a separate consultation since the SOC serve a different policy purpose and are plainly intended (under the current scope) to apply to all consumers.

3. Is the process likely to result in a robust and safe decision – if not, why?
 - We assume that the open letter was the precursor to a full consultation. The open letter and 'workshops' are a welcome step, but cannot be a substitute for a consultation document underpinned by an IA that is then subjected to a cross-industry consultation;
 - Absent a further consultation, Ofgem risks reaching a decision without having fully subjected its proposals to rigorous scrutiny. In such circumstances, Ofgem could not safely conclude that its proposed approach would be consistent with its duties and obligations.

¹ Specifically its primary duty to protect the interests of existing and future customers and its duty to have regard to the Principles of Better Regulation

Is the form of the intervention proportionate to the outcome being desired?

Ofgem's principal objective is to act in the manner best calculated to protect the interests of existing and future consumers. In addition Ofgem has a general duty to have regard to the needs of customers who are disabled, chronically sick, of pensionable age, on low incomes and living in rural areas.

In carrying out its functions, Ofgem must equally have regard to the Principles of Better Regulation under which regulatory activities should be transparent, accountable, proportionate, consistent and targeted only at cases in which action is needed². Specifically, proportionality emphasises the importance of well-targeted and evidence-based regulation where costs are identified and minimised and remedies are appropriate for the risk posed. By adhering to this principle, regulation is more likely to deliver positive customer outcomes and value for money.

In the context of its Priority Services Review, the form of intervention proposed by Ofgem should be the least onerous way of realising its stated outcome and Ofgem should consider a range of alternatives when thinking about the scope and substance of the obligations it intends to impose on suppliers, specifically its proposal to require suppliers to proactively and regularly identify any consumers who need access to priority services. For example, as set out in our covering letter we question whether it is necessary or appropriate to require all suppliers to ask questions of every customer about a potential vulnerability in any given interaction (if this is Ofgem's intention). We also consider it critical that a balancing exercise is undertaken that takes into account the operational challenges faced by suppliers in delivering an obligation (as currently framed) as well as the potential risk of consumer disengagement (a clear concern in RMR) resulting from that obligation. To that end, and as we describe below, we would positively support Ofgem undertaking the necessary enquiries amongst suppliers to enable a detailed understanding of some of these operational issues to be developed before any final decision and licence conditions are adopted.

One means of establishing whether the proportionality analysis is robust is the use of the Impact Assessment, in which the benefits and disbenefits of particular courses of action can be weighed up and analysed (ideally in a quantitative assessment³).

Ofgem has a statutory duty under the section 5A of the Utilities Act 2000 to produce an impact assessment when regulatory interventions are considered to be "important". Ofgem has set out what "important" means in its Impact Assessment Guidance (last updated in 2013) and specifically refers to "social impacts" including effects on fuel poverty, people with disabilities and/or with protected characteristics as being "significant"⁴. A proposal to change the licence requirements on energy companies in relation to Priority Services clearly falls within this category.

Equally in its original Consumer Vulnerability Strategy, paper Ofgem recognised that, if intervention were necessary to deliver specific actions for consumers in vulnerable positions "*Such intervention requires an evidence base, should be targeted at a specific issue or situation and should be designed to be effective in addressing those issues identified.*"⁵.

As we set out in our response to Ofgem's Simplification Plan 2015-16, to ensure that Ofgem is intervening on the right issues and offering proportionate solutions to problems identified, we believe that the production of impact assessments should be a default requirement for regulatory interventions. In the rare instances when an intervention is deemed to be sufficiently small as not to warrant an impact assessment, Ofgem should explain why it believes the intervention will have a small impact and why regulation is thus necessary at all.

² Gas Act 1986 section 4AA(5A), Electricity Act 1989 section 3A(5A)

³ E.ON UK plc v. Gas and Electricity Markets Authority (CC02/07)

⁴ Ofgem's Impact Assessment Guidance, paragraph 2.13.

⁵ Ofgem Consumer Vulnerability Strategy, para 5.7

Given the facts in this case and the consumer segment involved, Ofgem's own thresholds for the use of an IA would plainly be triggered. Such an IA will help to assist Ofgem in determining the overall welfare loss or gain for consumers arising from its proposed course of action, ensuring that any new regulation is well-targeted, simple and avoids creating additional unnecessary costs for suppliers and consumers, and thus is consistent with the principle of proportionality. The prospects for general consumer welfare will accordingly be improved following an intervention.

Is the proposed approach sufficiently clear and appropriate (legal and regulatory certainty)?

1. Principles based regulation versus prescriptive regulation

We support the objectives that Ofgem is trying to achieve with its proposals to move from a solely defined category approach in providing priority services to one that is appropriate to the specific needs of customers – “delivering the right services to the right people”. However, the proposed regulatory scheme that is designed to achieve this is confusing, perhaps largely because of the way that it is described. On this basis, we are finding it difficult to ascertain whether it will achieve the policy intent.

Ofgem states in its open letter that its proposed approach to compliance with any new PSR obligations is “principles-based”. Whilst we agree that its proposed approach to compliance is similar to Ofgem's approach for understanding what suppliers are doing to embed the SOC, for example via a challenge panel, we would query whether this might be described as “principles-based”. Part of the reason for our hesitancy is that Ofgem has recently stated its ambition to rely more on principles over time, and its thinking on this matter is to be defined further over time. On this basis, we believe that there is a risk that referring to the proposed PSR approach as “principles-based” might pre-judge this thinking.

To this end, we would also clarify that, based on current proposals, we would not consider Ofgem's proposed design of the PSR obligations (as distinct from compliance) to be “principles-based”. As currently designed, Ofgem's proposed PSR obligations on suppliers prescribe inputs (e.g. proactive identification) to achieve outcomes rather than setting out the outcomes (e.g. minimise health and safety risks) to be achieved. These proposed obligations are different to the principles-based approach adopted for the SOC, which specify outcomes such as ensuring the provision of complete and accurate information. In this regard, it is worth noting that in its consultation process for the SOC, Ofgem stated that it “will not be prescribing how suppliers should give operational effect to the SOC”.

Ofgem must be clear upfront as to what it means when it intends to adopt a principles-based approach, and how it intends to resolve the tension between principles based regulation and prescription that will ultimately lead to confusion and inconsistency on the part of suppliers. We would be concerned from the perspective of legal and regulatory certainty if principles-based regulation were to result in the scope of obligations being expanded or redefined on a retrospective basis.

2. Monitoring and enforcement

Whilst we support an approach to monitoring compliance that is similar to the SOC challenge panel, we question whether it is appropriate to use the SOC panel itself to monitor suppliers' compliance with any new regulatory regime for vulnerable customers. The remit of the SOC 'Challenge Panel' is, rightly, to help Ofgem understand how suppliers are embedding the SOC's and to assess suppliers against key criteria. It is important to note that the SOC's have an entirely different purpose from that now contemplated in the open letter. Indeed Ofgem's policy documents on SOC emphasise that its purpose is to protect the interests of all consumers. They make no mention of the SOC being aimed at meeting subsidiary duties specifically, such as to have regard to the needs of customers who are disabled, chronically sick, of pensionable age, on low incomes and living in rural areas.

This conclusion is reaffirmed in the draft impact assessment to the 1 December 2011 document⁶, which states in relation to the objectives of eradicating fuel poverty and protecting vulnerable consumers that “these factors are not a focus of the proposals. The proposed SOC’s do not make specific provision to ameliorate fuel poverty or include specific protection for vulnerable customers. They should benefit all consumers.”⁷ We would be concerned that by using the SOC panel to monitor suppliers’ compliance with obligations other than the SOC, this may unintentionally expand the scope of the SOC. On this basis, to the extent that Ofgem sees value in a monitoring panel, then it should set up a separate panel, specifically focussed on vulnerability rather than confuse the remit of the SOC Challenge Panel.

Equally, any proposal to expand the scope of the SOC to apply to vulnerability should be subject to a separate consultation since the SOC are plainly intended (under the current scope) to apply to all consumers.

Similarly, we would also clarify that Ofgem has not proposed a specific approach to the enforcement of any PSR obligations.

For the SOC, Ofgem introduced a bespoke enforcement process – the reasonable person test – and agreed to look at contemporaneous documentation to determine whether a breach has occurred. If Ofgem is considering a particular approach to enforcement for the PSR, we would welcome early sight of any proposals.

Is the process likely to result in a robust and safe decision – if not, why?

In situations where Ofgem considers that regulatory intervention is justified as being cost effective and delivering value for money, it is important that Ofgem consults in a fair, open and transparent manner with stakeholders on its proposed intervention.

In the context of the PSR review, Ofgem issued a consultation document on 30 June 2014 with a deadline for response of 22 September 2014. The circa 3 month response period is the maximum that Ofgem would normally allow and recognises that the issues raised are expected to be of wide significance and interest⁸.

We welcome Ofgem’s continued engagement with its stakeholders in this complex and important area. However we are concerned that Ofgem’s choice of an open letter as its next step of the process lacks clarity and certainty, particularly as Ofgem has used that letter to seek further views from interested parties in matters of key policy. Given the materiality of the issues at stake we are assuming that the open letter is a precursor to a formal consultation process in the near future to include, both (i) a call for evidence to help guide an impact assessment and (ii) early sight of its proposed changes to Supply Licence Condition 26 and 29, or the introduction of any new Supply Licence Conditions. To the extent that the responses to the consultation process or the outcome of the impact assessment raises material issues Ofgem should consult again.

Equally, whilst we welcome Ofgem’s proposals for workshops these should not be a substitute for a consultation document underpinned by an Impact Assessment that is then subjected to a cross-industry consultation. It is important that Ofgem recognises that the process is not the end, but the means to delivering an appropriate solution to the harm identified thus far. Without a robust consultation process Ofgem risks reaching a decision without having fully subjected its proposals to rigorous scrutiny.

Specifically, in the context of the supply licence conditions, it is vital that Ofgem consult at an early stage on, rather than wait until the final stages of the consultation process to issue the draft wording for the first time. This will allow for proper, timely consideration of purpose and effect of the draft

⁶ <https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/ofgem-publications/39649/rmr-domestic-ia-december-2011.pdf>

⁷ Paragraph 1.54

⁸ Guidance on Ofgem’s Approach to Consultation 20 December 2011 para 23

wording, allowing suppliers to engage in constructive debate, suggest improvements and help avoid the potential unintended consequences of unclear drafting.