# Challenges in Pricing <br> Retail Electricity Efficiently 

Steve Puller (Texas A\&M and NBER)

## There is a Mix of "Deregulated" and Regulated Retail Electricity




## Two Major Themes of My Talk

1. Sending "the right" consumption signals through prices is difficult

- What signals do (residential) consumers respond to, and what are the implications for how we set tariffs and bill consumers?
- (These are fundamental complications on top of net metering, incorporating carbon costs...)

2. Opening retail markets to competition can have "growing pains"

- Consumers face choice frictions
- Evidence from first four years of retail choice in Texas


## Topic \#1: Sending the "Right" Consumption Signals

- Textbook prescription
- Set marginal price equal to marginal social costs
- Why?
- If price is too high, then consumers don't use one more kwh even if it is more valuable than it costs
- Complications:
- Fixed costs, equity, ...
- "Solution" = Two-part tariff
- "connection" charge to cover fixed cost and usage charge with marginal price set to marginal cost


## Sample Residential Tariff Function



## Front

## Back



## Zoom of Back

Duke Energy.
Page 2 of 2

| Name | Service Address | Account Number |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Current Customer | 12345 Your St | 1212-1212-12-4 |
|  | Your City ST |  |


| Explanation of Current Charges |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gas  <br> Meter \# 111111111 <br> CCF Usage - 103 <br> Mmm dd - Mmm dd 31 Days | Duke Energy <br> Rate RS - Residential Service <br> Fixed Delivery Service Charge <br> Usage-Based Charge <br> 103 CCF @ $\$ \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xxxxxxx}$ <br> Rider MSR-G <br> Gas Delivery Riders <br> Gas Cost Recovery <br> 103 CCF \$ $\mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xxxxxxx}$ | (20) | \$ xx.x.x |
|  | Total Current Gas Charges |  | \$ Xx.ycx |
| Mmm dd - Mmm dd 31 Days | Duke Energy <br> Rate RS - Residential Srve <br> Distribution - Customer Chg <br> Delivery Charges <br> Distribution - Energy Chg <br> 859 kWh () $\$ 0.01994900$ <br> Rider TCR <br> Delivery Riders <br> Total Delivery Charges <br> Generation Charges <br> Generation - Energy Chg <br> 859 kWh @ $\$ 0.04418000$ <br> Rider FPP <br> Rider AAC <br> Generation Riders <br> Total Generation Charges | (22) $\$ x . x x$ $\begin{array}{r} x . x x \\ x . x x \\ x . x x \\ \$ \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx} \end{array}$ $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx} \\ & \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx} \\ & \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx} \\ & \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx} \\ & \mathbf{\$ x . x x} \end{aligned}$ | $\$ \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx}$ $\$ \mathrm{x} . \mathrm{xx}$ |
|  | Total Current Electric Charges |  | \$ Xx.xox |

## npower

## Electricity summary <br> Electricity account

|  | Last reading | This reading | Electricity units used | Cost split | Charges |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tariff - Go Save Electricity / Monthly Direct Debit |  |  |  |  | Meter: 504C26072 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & \text { Howr } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 / 10 / 11 \\ 27350 \\ \text { Customer reading } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 / 12 / 11 \\ & 28472 \\ & \text { Actual } \end{aligned}$ | 1122 kWh |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & \text { Hour } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 / 12 / 11 \\ 28472 \\ \text { Actual } \end{gathered}$ | 31/12/11 28819 Estimate | 347 kWh | first 157 at $16.650 p$ neod 1312 at 10.550 p | $\begin{array}{r} £ 26.14 \\ \mathbf{£} 138.42 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & \text { Hour } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { PC } \begin{gathered} 31 / 12 / 11 \\ 28819 \\ \text { Estimate } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 / 03 / 12 \\ 30372 \\ \text { Actual } \end{gathered}$ | 1553 kWh | first 158 at 17.710 p next 1395 at 14.010 p | $\begin{array}{r} £ 27.98 \\ £ 195.44 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  | Cost of electricity used this period Monthly Direct Debil Discount Subtotal (excluding VAT) |  | £387.98 |
|  |  |  | . 240.00 |
|  |  |  | +£347.98 |
|  |  |  | VAT at $5.0 \%$ on $£ 347.98$ | + $\$ 17.39$ |
|  |  |  | Total electricity charges this period | £365.37 |

Tariff - Go Save Electricity / Monthly Direct Debit

Total electricity charges this period
£365.37

## Your meter reading

* Price Change Please note - there's been a price change during this bill period. We've split your fuel usage over the different prices.


## How your Direct Debit account adds up

| Your Direct Debit account | Electricity account |
| :---: | :---: |
| Balance on last bill | £183.69 debit |
| Payment received with thanks on 24/10/11 | \$35.00 credit |
| Payment received with thanks on 23/11/11 | ¢98.00 credit |
| Payment received with thanks on 23/12/11 | \$ $\mathbf{8 9 8 . 0 0}$ credit |
| Peyment received with thanks on 23101/12 | ¢98.00 credit |
| Peyment received with thanks on 23102/12 | 498.00 crodit |
| Payment recelved with thanks on 23/03/12 | \$ 198.00 credit |
| Account balance before charges | C341.31 credit |



# Format of Mandatory "Facts Label" in Texas 

## Electricity Facts Label (EFL)

## Star Electricity, Inc. d/b/a StarTex Power <br> CNP Service Area <br> 3 MONTH RESIDENTIAL FIXED RATE <br> 4/30/2014

| Electricity Price | Average Monthly Use | 500kWh | 1,000kWh |  | ,000kWh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average price per kWh | $12.8 ¢$ | $9.9 ¢$ |  | $9.5 ¢$ |
|  | This estimated average Price per kWh disclosure is an example and is calculated using: (i) a Fixed Energy Charge of $5.18 申$ per kWh, (ii) the applicable Transmission and Distribution Service Provider ("TDU") tariff as established by the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("PUCT"), (iii) a monthly Base Charge per ESI-ID of $\$ 0.00$ (NOTE: A Minimum Usage Fee of $\$ 9.95$ will apply if usage is less than or equal to 999 kWh in a billing period), and (iv) all recurring charges. This average Price disclosure does not include applicable federal, state, and local taxes or any fees (including gross receipt tax reimbursement) or other non-recurring amounts charged by StarTex Power or a governmental entity. Your actual Price for electricity may vary according to your exact monthly usage and TDU pass-through charges. <br> Some locations may be subject to a TDU Underground Facilities and Cost Recovery Charge authorized by their city that is not included in this average price disclosure. See your TDU's tariff for a list of cities and authorized charges. |  |  |  |  |
| Other Key Terms and Questions | See Terms of Service statement for a full listing of fees, deposit policy, and other terms. |  |  |  |  |
| Disclosure Chart | Type of Product FIXED RATE |  |  |  |  |
|  | Contract Term |  | $3 \mathrm{MONTH}(\mathrm{S})$ |  |  |
|  | Do I have a termination fee or any fees associated with terminating service? |  | YES. \$100 |  |  |
|  | Can my price change during contract period? |  | YES, but only for the very limited reasons |  |  |
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## Bill Saliency

- Some bills don't even have sufficient information to determine marginal price!
- Bills tend to display total expenditures and "breakdown of expenditures" more saliently than marginal price schedule
- Even worse if electric bills combined with gas, water, sewage, ...


## How Do Consumers Respond to Tariff Function?

- Suppose we observe consumers responding to higher total bill by consuming less, ceteris paribus
- To what price is consumer responding?
- Average?
- Marginal?
- Ito (AER, 2014) exploits spatial discontinuity results suggest that consumers respond to average price rather than marginal or expected marginal price


# Saliency of Retail Energy Marginal Prices vs. Expenditures 

## Electricity

## Gasoline


The amount enclosed includes the following donation: FPL Care To Share
s $\qquad$ Make check payable to FPL in U.S. funds
and mail along with this coupon to: FPL
GENERAL MAIL FACILITY MIAMI FL 33188-0001

Account number $\quad$ Total amount you
12345-6789
Your electric statement
For: Sep 172010 to Oct 182010 (31 days)
Customer name: JANE CUSTOMER

| Amount <br> of your <br> last bill | Payments <br> $(-)$ | Additional <br> activity <br> $(+$ or -$)$ | Balance <br> before <br> new charges <br> $(=)$ | New <br> charges <br> $(=)$ | Total <br> amount <br> you (owe <br> $(=)$ | New <br> charges <br> due by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 156.73 | 156.73 CR | 0.00 | 0.00 | 147.36 | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 7 . 3 6}$ | Nov 08 2010 |




## Can Consumers Be Taught to Respond to the Marginal Price?

- Wolak \& Kahn (2013) - field experiment
- On-line personalized instruction on how energy-utilizing activities affect monthly bill under non-linear pricing
- One important upshot:
- Consumers learning they face a higher (lower) marginal price consume less (more)


## "Increasing Block Tariffs" Cannot Be Efficient

- Social marginal cost cannot increase as any consumer moves from e.g. $250^{\text {th }}$ to $251^{\text {st }} \mathrm{kWh}$
- Ubiquitous in regulated tariffs
- Don't necessarily go away in "deregulated" markets
- In Texas (Puller \& West, AER P\&P, 2013)


## What Is Ideal Pricing For Residential?

- Working within constraints of...
- no dynamic pricing for residential
- bills may or may not be read (on-line bill pay...)
- all consumers cannot be "trained" about MP
(i.e. households respond to the average price or marginal price or whatever...)
- Policy levers: tariff function, bill design

How do you set tariffs \& design bills...
...to induce consumption closest to what would happen if households consumed where Marginal Price = Marginal Social Cost?

# Retail Choice: <br> Imperfect Regulation Replaced with Imperfect Competition? 

- Regulatory:
- Fixed distribution costs priced into usage
- Exacerbated under net energy metering policy
- Retail choice
- Imperfect competition


# Topic \#2: The "growing pains" of retail competition 

Power to Choose? An Analysis of Choice Frictions in the Residential Electricity Market

Ali Hortacsu (University of Chicago and NBER) Seyed Ali Madanizadeh (University of Chicago) Steve Puller (Texas A\&M and NBER)

## Residential Market Shares....

Evolution of Market Shares

...Contrasted with Prices


## Possible Causes of Inertial Behavior

1. Inattention/search costs

- Lack of awareness that options exist / inattention from status quo bias

2. Incumbent brand advantage / product differentiation

- Perception that incumbent offers more reliable power
- Differences in customer service


## Preview of Findings

- Consumers only search in only about $2 \%$ of months
- Brand value of incumbent $=\$ 62 /$ month, though it diminishes over time
- $\$ 15$ by 4 years after market started


## Texas Retail Market

- Prior to 2002, residential customers served by "regulated utility"
- Starting Jan 1, 2002, customers could choose provider
- By default, assigned to firm affiliated with the old utility ("incumbent")
- Incumbent required to charge "price-tobeat"
- Ended up being above competitive rates ("headroom")
- Price-to-beat adjustments indexed to natural gas price


## Texas Retail Market (contd)

- Competitive retailers (CREPs)
- Procure wholesale power and market to residential (and other types) of customers
- In 2002: 3-5 CREPs in each service territory
- By 2006: 10+ CREPs
- 1 bill
- No charge to switch from incumbent


## Information for Consumers

- www.powertochoose.com
- (and www.poderdeescoger.org)
- 2005-2006: $\approx 100 \mathrm{~K}$ unique visitors/month
- Can search for rates
- Various media
- Radio, TV, billboards
- PUC public information campaign

[D. Most Visited Latest Headlines Getting Started
 - Games
 Travel • 局 Norton

```
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\section*{Available Offers}


\section*{Our Sample}
- TNMP ("First Choice") service territory
- January 2002-April 2006
- Approx. 192,000 residential customers.

We Study

\author{
Affiliate Retail Electric Provider
}

\section*{First Choice Power
CP\&L Retail Energ \\ CP\&L Retail Energy \\ \(\square\) Reliant Energy Retail Service \\ TXU Energy, Inc. \\ TXU SESCO Energy Services}


\section*{Data}
- For each residential meter from January 2002-April 2006:
- History of retail provider
- Monthly consumption
- For each retailer:
- PUC monthly data on rate plan(s) offered
- We focus on 6 retailers with \(>1 \%\) share

\section*{Switching: Time Trend and Seasonality}

Total Switches By Month


\title{
Descriptive Statistics of Potential Savings
}
- How much would households with incumbent have saved if purchased from lowest-priced retailer?
- This is expenditure savings, not welfare
- What if households with incumbent had switched only once (in Jan '02) to a large retailer?
- Large \#1: Mean = \$7.69/month
- Large \#2: Mean = \$9.97/month
- What if households with incumbent switched to cheapest retailer every month?
- Mean \(=\$ 12.47 /\) month

\section*{Model of Household-Level Choice}
- In each month:
- Stage 1: Decision to Choose
- Household with provider \(k\) chooses whether to consider alternative retailers
- Stage 2: Choice
- Households that decide to choose will observe (all) providers' product characteristics, and choose provider that maximizes utility
- Can choose to stay with current provider \(k\)

\section*{Simplified Illustration}
- 3 retailers
- Consumers identical
- Observe only 2 months of data ("last month" and "this month")
- Each household currently with retailer \(k\) searches with pr \(=\lambda_{k}\)
- Heterogeneity due to \(k\) 's service
- Conditional upon "deciding", household chooses retailer \(j\) with pr \(={ }_{P}{ }_{j}\)
\(\rightarrow 5\) probabilities \(\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \lambda_{3}, P_{1}, P_{2}\right)\)

\section*{Simplified Illustration}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & This & \\
\hline & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{1
2
3} & \# & \# & \# \\
\hline & \# & \# & \# \\
\hline & \# & \# & \# \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{Simplified Illustration}

\(\rightarrow 9\) moments e.g. \(\mathrm{E}[\#(k=1, j=1)]=N^{(1)}\left[\left(1-\lambda_{1}\right)+\lambda_{1} P_{1}\right]\)
( 1 redundant moment in each set - any customer not going to 2 or 3 stays with 1)
\(\rightarrow 5\) probabilities and 6 moments

\section*{Specifying "Decision Function" \(\lambda^{k}\)}

For household previously using provider \(k\) in month \(t\) :
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\lambda}_{t}^{k}(\gamma)=\frac{e^{w_{t}^{k}}}{1+e^{w_{t}^{k}}} \\
& \quad \text { where } W_{t}^{k}=\sum_{r} \gamma_{r} Z_{r t}^{k}
\end{aligned}
\]
\(Z=\) retailer dummy variables, month of year dummies, Customer just received "bill shock"

\section*{Specifying "Choice Function" \(P_{j}\)}

For each household whose provider was \(k\) in \(t-1\) AND decides to search, it chooses the retailer that maximizes utility:
\(U_{i j t}^{(k)}=\sum_{s} \theta_{s} X_{i j t, s}^{(k)}+\varepsilon_{i j t}\)
where \(\varepsilon_{i j t}\) is Type I Extreme Value i.i.d. across consumer, provider, and time.
\(X_{i j t}=\) price \(_{\mathrm{j} t}, I(\text { Incumbent })_{\mathrm{j}}, I(\text { Incumbent })_{\mathrm{j}} \times\) Month \(_{\mathrm{t}}\),

Distributional assumption implies that:
\[
P_{i j t}(\theta)=\frac{\exp \left(\sum_{s} \theta_{s} X_{i j t, s}^{(k)}\right)}{\sum_{k \geq 1} \exp \left(\sum_{s} \theta_{s} X_{i k t, s}^{(k)}\right)}
\]

\section*{GMM Estimation}

Estimate decision parameters \((\gamma)\) and choice parameters \((\theta)\) via GMM:
\(\min _{\gamma, \theta} \eta^{\prime} W \eta\)
where \(\eta \equiv\left\langle\eta_{j t}^{(k)}\right\rangle\) and \(\eta_{j t}^{(k)}=\frac{N_{j t}^{(k)}-\left(\sum_{i \in B_{t}^{(k)}} \lambda_{t t}^{(k)} P_{i j t}\right)}{N_{t}^{(k)}}\)

Estimate for January 2004 - April 2006 when all 6 retailers present ( \(20 \%\) sample to ease computation)

\section*{Highlights of Findings}
- Incumbent customers only consider alternatives in \(2 \%\) of months
- Higher in summer and/or month after receiving a "bill shock"
- Incumbent brand effect large but declines over time
- January 2004: \$62/month
- April 2006: \$15/month
- Interpretation? (Incorrect) perception of power quality? Fear of 'bait \& switch"? Customer service?

\section*{Implications for Retail Choice Policy}
- There will be choice frictions
- Encouraging "search" enhances consumer benefits
- Bill inserts, user-friendly choice websites
- Making households aware of "homogenous power quality"

\section*{Implications for Retail Choice Policy (contd)}
- Growing concern today
- "Choice Overload"
- Tariff proliferation
- In UK, the regulator considering limiting the \# of plans offered

\section*{Pennsylvania}

PAPowerSwitch
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission


\section*{New York}


\section*{123 plans from 69 retailers (for random zip code)}


\section*{Texas}

\section*{H https://join.directenergy.c}
ise.com/en-us/Plan/Results


\section*{195 plans from 41 retailers (for random zip code)}

\section*{\# Tariffs Have Grown Over Time in the EU}


\section*{Conclusions}
- In all jurisdictions (regulated or retail choice), we need to think about whether tariffs and bills send the right price signals
- In jurisdictions transitioning to retail choice, "choice frictions" and "consumer inertia" are important to address.

The End

\section*{Percent of Retail Electricity Sales by a Competitive Retail Provider (2010)}



Household-Retailer Relationship is Purely Financial, Not Technical


\section*{Empirical Complication}
- We do not observe stage 1 outcome
- Non-switchers are:
- "non-deciders"

AND
- "deciders" who choose current provider```

