



SSC04i

PR24 Data tables commentary – Summary tables

Contents

Contents	1
SUM1	2
SUM2	3
SUM3	4
SUM4	5

SUM1

Line Reference	Commentary
All lines	Table linked to OUT1. Please see Outcomes table commentary for detail of process and assumptions.

SUM2

Line Reference	Commentary
All lines	All data linked to other tables, please see relevant commentary for details.
SUM2.8	PCC given in MI/p/d. Should be multiplied by 1000 to give our PCC target correctly.
SUM2.26	Total RCV closing position is not being calculated in the formula.

SUM3

Line Reference	Commentary
All lines	All data linked to other tables, please see relevant commentary for details.

SUM4

This table links to CW1a, instead of CW1. CW1 represents our business plan in full, considering the impact of power cost RPE mechanism and our frontier efficiency challenge to the relevant area.

Line Reference	Commentary
SUM4.1	Line refers to WINEP investment. This is a statutory requirement, and therefore no discretionary expenditure.
SUM4.2	Line refers to WRMP investment. This is a statutory requirement, and therefore no discretionary expenditure.
SUM4.3	Line refers to resilience investment. This is not a statutory requirement so included in discretionary expenditure. This investment has been appraised through our value framework and delivers best value for our customers. It has been supported by our customers, who recognise the need to invest in long term supply resilience to ensure intergenerational fairness of customer bills.
SUM4.4	Line refers to net zero investment. This is a not a statutory requirement, and therefore no discretionary expenditure. This investment has been appraised through our value framework and delivers best value for our customers. It also helps us to deliver against the public interest commitment and long-term government net zero targets and is supported by customers.
SUM4.5	<p>This investment related to the following schemes is included as discretionary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive replacement of vulnerable customer’s lead supply pipes • A trial to determine whether we could drive efficiency by removing lead on a geographical basis, while also separating shared supplied and installing meters • Costs to stretch our leakage target from 8% to 15% in South Staffs, and 18% to 20% in Cambridge. <p>These investments are non-statutory but driven by customers support as a result of our YWYS and AAT engagement work</p>
SUM4.7	We have submitted a best value, efficient plan to deliver the service our customers expect from us. This means that none of our base expenditure is considered discretionary.
SUM4.9	The costs line excludes data from third party services before deducting grants and contributions. As we have significant diversions costs due to HS2 under third party expenditure, which is covered by contributions, we end up with a negative totex position with is incorrect.
SUM4.10	Error in above line carries through to total costs.