



respect > commitment > teamwork

DESC TWG Updated Shipper Data Validation

17th November 2015

Background

- NDM sample data numbers have been decreasing over time
- UNC allows transporters to acquire NDM sample data from third parties (i.e. smart metered data)
- Action DTW0502 was established to allow us to explore this further
- The analysis is required to review the suitability of the additional data and determine whether it would be possible to use it as part of the sample data.



Recap

- Initial analysis on the British Gas data was presented at TWG meeting on 16th Sep 2015.
- Validation rules needed to be relaxed due to some gaps in the British Gas data and to allow there to be two comparable data sets.
- Initial analysis suggested the data sets were not the same this could have been due to the gaps in the data and the difference in sample sizes
- Action DTW0901: to normalise the demand using the ALP method and re-analyse the data
- Xoserve to investigate the weather sensitivity between the two data sets.



British Gas - Analysis

- Data sets used Xoserve AMR sample data against British Gas data
- Date range = Apr '14 to Mar '15
- Demand data in gas day

- 01B Domestic (residential) sites used in the analysis
- Aggregated and normalised (using the ALP method) demand by LDZ
- Validation rules had to be relaxed to allow for the British Gas data to pass validation.
 - Existing rule is to reject those MPRNs from the analysis if they have 15 or more days of missing data over the summer. We had to increase this threshold to 40 days as none of the British Gas data would have passed validation
- AMR = 2,835 MPRNs used in the analysis
- British Gas = 2,749 MPRNs used in the analysis



AQ distribution of British Gas & AMR sites - Band 1 Domestic

5





British Gas - Analysis of Weather Sensitivity

	AMR						
LDZ	C1 (intercept)	C2 (Slope)	CWV Intercept	C1 (intercept)	C2 (Slope)	CWV Intercept	Difference
EA	31891.48	-1722.3	18.52	44613.08	-2440.5	18.28	-0.24
EM	25892.73	-1504.4	17.21	29963.71	-1793.8	16.7	-0.51
NE	25683	-1403	18.31	18227.79	-1045.7	17.43	-0.88
NO	21032.1	-1312.5	16.02	13212	-829.5	15.93	-0.09
NT	26370.11	-1463.1	18.02	27471.99	-1507.6	18.22	0.2
NW	22720.62	-1273.7	17.84	26880.6	-1492.6	18.01	0.17
SC	24935.42	-1501.5	16.61	18886.43	-1101.8	17.14	0.53
SE	25436.2	-1436.4	17.71	10605.33	-603.5	17.57	-0.14
SO	31970.16	-1762.7	18.14	15795.82	-897.3	17.6	-0.54
SW	24571.13	-1453.9	16.9	15173.13	-883.5	17.17	0.27
WM	24837.99	-1461.3	17.00	36096.62	-2149.9	16.79	-0.21
WS	25386.45	-1427.9	17.78	14458.18	-811	17.83	0.05





7 British Gas - F test and T test results (normalised demand)

	F Test	T Test	No. of sites	No. of sites
LDZ	Equal Variances	Equal Means	AMR	BG
EA	\checkmark	\checkmark	261	443
EM	\checkmark	\checkmark	241	329
NE	\checkmark	\checkmark	254	196
NO	\checkmark	\checkmark	221	157
NT	\checkmark	\checkmark	233	244
NW	\checkmark	\checkmark	225	270
SC	\checkmark	\checkmark	224	210
SE	\checkmark	\checkmark	227	89
SO	\checkmark	\checkmark	245	146
SW	\checkmark	\checkmark	234	162
WM	\checkmark	\checkmark	244	370
WS			226	133



LDZ SC - largest differences investigated



The shape of the British Gas consumption profile appears to have been affected by various days of missing data across all LDZs, which were infilled prior to the comparison being completed.



Aggregated Demand comparison



XX)serve

Normalised Demand Comparison



(Note – Normalised demand graphs for all other LDZs can be found in the appendix)

🖭 🥌 🎊 🌌

xx>serve

E.ON - Analysis

- Data sets used Xoserve Data Logger sample data against E.ON data
- Date range = Apr '14 to Mar '15
- Demand data aggregated in gas day
- E.ON Band 1 small I&C sites used in the analysis
- Aggregated and normalised (using the ALP method) demand by LDZ
- Compared against Band 2 Data Loggers as no small I&C sites in 01B sample
- NE and SE are the only LDZs with a suitable number of sites (that passed validation) to analyse
- <u>E.ON Band 2</u> only enough sites to analyse that passed validation in LDZ NE
- Aggregated and normalised (using the ALP method)



E.ON – Summary of sites that passed validation

	Small				Large				
LDZ	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09
EA	8	6	11	12	4	2	1	0	0
EM	0	2	11	7	3	3	0	0	0
NE	39	55	13	11	1	1	0	0	0
NO	1	11	4	4	0	1	0	0	0
NT	2	6	19	16	5	0	1	0	0
NW	4	14	18	10	3	1	1	0	0
SC	1	7	12	14	1	1	0	0	0
SE 🤇	34	12	20	4	2	1	0	0	0
SO	6	7	9	10	2	0	0	0	0
SW	3	11	7	8	1	1	1	0	0
WM	4	5	10	12	2	0	0	0	0
WN	0	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	0
WS	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
Total	102	142	141	111	24	12	4	0	0

Note: Circled are the LDZs that had a suitable number of sites that passed validation and allow for a fair analysis against Data Loggers Sites in 01B are small I&C sites. XX)serve

AQ Distribution: E.ON sites vs Data Loggers



E.ON 01B sites (small I&C) were analysed against Data Loggers in 02B – as Band 1 sites in the sample consist of domestic users only. XX)serve

13

E.ON 01B Small I&C vs Data Loggers 02B – LDZ NE





¹⁵ E.ON 01B Small I&C vs Data Loggers 02B – LDZ NE





¹⁶ E.ON 01B Small I&C vs Data Loggers 02B – LDZ SE



XX)Serve

¹⁷ E.ON 01B Small I&C vs Data Loggers 02B – LDZ SE





F-test and T-test:

<u>NE:</u>

18

The results from the F and T tests indicate that when using the normalised demand, E.ON and Data Logger demands have equal variances and their means are not statistically different from one another.

<u>SE:</u>

The results from the F and T tests indicate that when using the normalised demand, E.ON and Data Logger demands have unequal variances but their means are not statistically different from one another.



¹⁹ AQ distribution of E.ON & Data Logger sites - Band 2 LDZ NE





Aggregated Demand LDZ NE Band 2





Normalised Demand LDZ NE Band 2





21

.

F-test and T-test:

The results from the F and T tests indicate that when using the normalised demand, E.ON and Data Logger demands have unequal variances but their means are not statistically different from one another.

Weather Sensitivity comparisons:

	C1 (intercept)	C2 (Slope)	CWV Intercept
EON	2.08	-0.1	21.58
Data Loggers	2.48	-0.1	17.35
Difference	-0.4	0	4.23



22

Conclusions

- Xoserve can utilise 3rd party supplied NDM Sample data provided that:
 - the data is provided in the agreed format
 - data is provided on a frequent basis (preferably monthly)
 - missing consumption data is minimised
- The views of TWG DESC members are sought on the possible inclusion of 3rd party NDM Sample data, for use in future data modelling







respect > commitment > teamwork

Appendix



XX)serve

25



XX)serve





XX>serve

2328





28





29





30



XX)serve



31



respect > commitment > teamwork

X()serve





respect > commitment > teamwork

X()serve





35