



Consultation Response

By email to energyefficiency.stats@decc.gsi.gov.uk

Ref: **URN 13D/298**

6 January 2014

NEED Consultation

Statistics Team

Department of Energy and Climate Change

Area 6B, 3 Whitehall Place

London, SW1A 2AW

ELEXON's response to NEED consultation

We welcome the opportunity to respond to this consultation. ELEXON is the not for profit body established to manage the GB electricity Settlement arrangements. We are supportive of the release of NEED data and we have had several discussions with the DECC statistics team with regards to data release and sharing since 2010.

If you would like to discuss any areas of our response, please contact me on 020 7380 4213, or by email at david.jones@elexon.co.uk.

Yours sincerely

David Jones

Senior Regulatory and Market Advisor



A consultation on providing access to NEED data

Question 1: Do you agree DECC should release anonymised NEED data?

Yes, following on from our discussions with DECC (with regards to the potential use of NEED data) it would help support our understanding of the potential for changes in consumption related to energy efficiency and other interventions.

We believe that such data may assist us in assessing potential impacts on consumption profiles. This may help our work to ensure the allocation of energy volumes (and in turn the correct allocation of charges and funds to industry) remain accurate.

The data may be of use in our analysis under the Profiling and Settlement Review to develop our settlement profiles. They will be more beneficial to other parties who can undertake assessments of our analysis.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed approach to publishing two separate dataset for different purposes?

ELEXON has no view on the publication of multiple data sets.

Question 3: In relation to i) the public use dataset and ii) the end user license dataset, what are your priorities for variables in the dataset?

- a) Do you agree with the priority variables set out in Table 4.1? If not, which of the variables listed do you consider to be priorities?
- b) Do you agree with the variables assigned as important in Table 4.1? If not, which of the other variables listed do you consider to be important?
- c) Do you agree that those variables listed as "under consideration" are less important than the variables listed as priority or important?
- d) Are there any variables included in the proposals which you think should not be included?
- e) Do you agree that inclusion of a lower level geography identifier is less important than a wider range of variables?



Consultation Response

f) Which lower level super output area data is most useful? Index of multiple deprivation, output area classification or percentage of households in fuel poverty?

g) Would a weighting variable be useful?

ELEXON would not weight or prioritise the dataset. We would only encourage that where data can be anonymised (and can be produced at reasonable cost), that the data be shared.

Question 4: Proposed bandings for variables in the dataset are set out in Annex B. Do you agree with these proposals in relation to i) the public use dataset and ii) the end user license dataset? Please bear in mind that greater granularity of data will reduce the number of variables that can be included in the final dataset.

a) Annex B sets out options for banding variables please let us know which you would prefer for each variable of interest to you.

b) Are there any variables that can be banded further than proposed without significant loss of utility?

c) Are there any variables which would no long be useable for analysis if the proposed banding – or one of the proposed options - is applied?

d) For variables such as consumption and floor area, is it preferable to have bands of the same size (which may have to be larger) or more detail in the centre of the distribution with larger bands at the extremes?

ELEXON has no view on the proposed bandings.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed approach to anonymisation for

i. The public use dataset; and

ii. The end user licence dataset?

Yes, ELEXON agrees with the anonymisation of the data sets. We would suggest that, if greater granularity or detail is required for specific studies the case for these should be set out separately and data accessed from the appropriate sources.

Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed approach to publication and access?

i. Do you agree with the proposal for a smaller publically available dataset?



Consultation Response

ii. Do you agree with the proposed restrictions on access to a more extensive dataset?

Yes, ELEXON agrees with the approach to making data available for the public and licensed data sets.

We would suggest that DECC provides an indication for when new data sets will be made available (and will this be annually or quarterly etc.) and ensure that a new licence is not required when the latest data becomes available.

Question 7: If you are a potential user, please tell us how you think you would use these data.

ELEXON would only seek to use the data if it would assist in ensuring the accuracy of settlement is maintained. Whilst the current data available is of limited use to our current work, we believe that we will request NEED data in future, if this helps our on-going work to improve the accuracy of settlements (particularly if the data set developed).

Question 8: Do you have any other comments on the proposals?

ELEXON has no other comments.

For more information on our response, please contact:

David Jones, Senior Regulatory and Market Advisor

T: 020 7380 4213 or email david.jones@elexon.co.uk