ofgem E-Serve

Meeting note

Data Use workshop – Meeting Note

Note of discussion and actions from Data Use workshop meeting No. 3	From	Paul Newman
	Date and time of Meeting	3 February 2011 14:00-16:00
	Location	Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London

1. Present

1.1.   Ofgem – Maxine Frerk, David Fletcher, Paul Newman, Joe Hancock, Dan Harris, Jonathan Marcell

1.2.   Data Use members present:

Consumer Focus	Zoe	McLeod
Cambridge University	Shailendra	Fuloria
Which	Georgina	Nelson
EDFE	Shwezin	Win
BG	Stephen	Douglas
ENA	Alan	Creighton
E.On	Alex	Travell
SP	Andrew	Fermie
ESTA	Tony	Taylor
ERA	Jason	Brogden
RWE Npower	Chris	Harris
SSE	Richard	Westoby
Elexon	David	Jones
Microsoft Research	George	Danezis
Onzo	Adam	Westbrooke
ICO	Anne	Russell
COI	Graham	Brown
DECC	Debbie	Stockwell
FFW	Marcus	Turle

1.3.   Apologies:

OII OX		
Privacy International		
No2ID		
First Utility		
Utilita		
CAB		
Privacy Group		
ICoSS		
ICO		

2. Introductions

2.1.   Round table introductions from each member.

3. Introduction to the workshop

3.1.   Ofgem introduced everyone to the meeting and presented what would be discussed during the meeting.

4. Discussion on technical options for data minimisation

4.1.   Microsoft Research presented a set of slides to the group looking at different privacy options.

4.2.   Questions were raised by the group on the slides (within the meeting slide pack)

4.3.   One member of the group asked how the process for "key management" proposed in the Microsoft Research design would ensure that the necessary information would be passed to selected users whilst also being configurable to hold back certain parts where customers see fit. It was suggested that the key method is an all or nothing option. Customers that are not familiar with how to use the technology would have the choice of who to give their key to. Technology literate customers would be able to use their own interface devices (e.g. PCs) to pass cryptographically secured data to third parties. This process would make sure that the readings are authenticated, secure and different data can be sent to different companies (indirectly).

4.4.   A concern was raised about data availability to suppliers and the process for resolving disputes. The computised data would mean that suppliers are only given the results of any algorithm and not the raw meter readings. It was suggested that there could be a round of verification to make sure the data is correct but ultimately there would need to be further processes to account for suppliers getting hold of the raw data.

4.5.   Another concern raised was with the amount of calculations that the meter would be proposed to do. Suppliers spend a lot on the billing process and they questioned whether centralising industry processes and calculations within the meter would be achievable at a reasonable cost.

4.6.   Two members were interested in the amount of data aggregation and what level of granularity would be expected.

4.7.   Whilst there was some debate on the merits of the particular solutions described by Microsoft with a number of practical issues raised, Ofgem asked the group to be open to the idea that there may be Privacy enabling technologies which would help resolve privacy concerns.

5. Further discussion on case for granular data

5.1.   ERA presented to the group a series of slides regarding how their work has progressed.

5.2.   The group were invited to suggest any items that needed to be added to the evidence gathering process, including other benefits. The group were also invited to submit any data they have accumulated that could support the cost benefit analysis for using data at different granularity.

5.3.   It was suggested that suppliers wished to implement their own customer charter over and above the legal obligations associated with collecting and processing customer data that may be set out in their licence conditions and the data protection act.

5.4.   One member suggested that data should not be collected from the customer until it is needed.they commented that data is currently only collected when needed and when there are more smart meters installed in the future it would be possible to revisit the benefits and maybe collect the data more frequently.

5.5.   It was suggested that the drive to make sure smart metering is future proof from the start could result in all information being collected and processed. Another member however suggested that the data items being analysed by ERA are the only bits of information that are needed so no redundant data would be collected.

5.6.   It was suggested that consideration is given to other bodies' needs to make sure that the approach to data access is not just aimed at suppliers. There are other parties that will need access and need to be considered.

5.7.   One member asked whether information regarding the value of data could be gleaned from the public trials undertaken through the Energy Demand Reduction Programme. It was suggested that the customers involved in the trials had given consent they were self selecting so this information would not be useful.

5.8.   It was suggested that projects that don't involve energy could provide useful data / insights. An example of which is the NHS reform which computerised most of its information and put it into the customers hands.

6. Regulated duties

6.1.   Ofgem presented to the group a set of slides on regulated duties.

6.2.   A number of members suggested that settlement and demand forecasting should be added to the list of regulated duties. Ofgem have agreed to consider its inclusion and would welcome any further thoughts from members. These should be provided to david.fletcher@ofgem.gov.uk.

7. Next steps

7.1.   Ofgem presented a slide explaining the next steps for the group.

8. Actions

Circulate Jason Brogden's email address for members to submit any further information that could benefit the evidence gathering process	**Ofgem**
To consider the inclusion of settlement and demand forecasting into the regulated duties list	**Ofgem**
To provide any further information on settlements and demand forecasting and why it should / should not be included in the regulated duties list	**Data Use members**