



# Technical Work Group

## LDZ Aggregations

**16<sup>th</sup> September 2015**

- April 2015 TWG highlighted instance where sample numbers were lower preferred number of 30
  - EUC band 3 - 4 WAR band 4 for NO had a sample size of 18
  - Available aggregations would have paired LDZs that individually had strong sample sizes
- Request to revisit existing aggregations
- Work plan agreed July 2015 with work area
  - TWG proposed that list of data aggregations for modelling should be reviewed in advance of Spring analysis to see what might be preferred/substituted

**Xserve**



respect > commitment > teamwork

- The current aggregations were last reviewed by TWG November 2013. This added some new aggregations.
- The following slides reviews and show all the current aggregations in the modelling system:
  - Pre existing: This slide reviews the historic aggregations used
  - Spring 2014: This slide reviews the new aggregations

**xserve**



respect > commitment > teamwork

# Historic Aggregations

- Pre-existing aggregations

<b>Used each year</b>			
Individual LDZ	NW / WN	WS / SW	National (all 13 LDZs)
SC / NO / NW / WN	NE / EM / WM	SC / NO / NW / WN / NE / EM / WM	
WS / EA / NT / SE / SO / SW			
<b>Used 2014 and were a tested aggregation in 2015</b>			
EA / NT / SE	WS / SO / SW	NO / NW / WN	
<b>Existing aggregation but not used recently</b>			
SC / NO / NE		NW / EM / WM / WN	

- Aggregations should be geographically sensible groups
- Should work with other groupings to define a rule for all 13 LDZs for an EUC

**xserve**



respect > commitment > teamwork

# New aggregations from Spring 2014

- Spring 2014 new combinations

## Used / tested in 2014 and 2015

EA / NT

SE / SO

EM / WM

NO / NE

## Added in Spring 2014 but never used

SC / NO

NE / NW / WN

EA / NT / SE / SO

- Aggregations should be geographically sensible groups
- Should work with other groupings to define a rule for all 13 LDZs for an EUC




respect > commitment > teamwork

- There is no scope for new aggregations without replacing existing aggregations.
  - General rules are that aggregations should be geographically sensible groups; and
  - Should work with other groupings to define a rule for all 13 LDZs for an EUC
- To solve the small sample numbers that prompted this review
  - NO could be combined with NE or alternatively NO with SC
  - In addition:
    - NW and WN combined
    - WS / SW combined
    - Any remaining LDZs individual

- Note: Applicable aggregations one year may not be appropriate in subsequent years due to fluctuations in sample numbers and / or WAR bandings
- For LDZ Map see last slide

The logo for Xserve, featuring the word "Xserve" in a blue, sans-serif font. The "X" is stylized with two blue arrows pointing outwards from its center.

respect > commitment > teamwork

- Mod 428 – Single Meter Supply Points
  - De-aggregation of supply points may influence the sample numbers (currently as supply point level and may contain multiple meter points)
  - A review could be undertaken after the start of the new gas year to see if numbers have materially changed (this could follow the data collection exercise for algorithm performance)
  - NOTE: These will only be indicative as the 2016 modelling will depend on data collected over the 12 month period April 2015 to March 2016 and any decisions taken on the inclusion of shipper data.

**xserve**



respect > commitment > teamwork

- Recap on discussions
  - changes to existing aggregations
  - New aggregations
- Next steps (if applicable)

**xserve**



respect > commitment > teamwork



# LDZ Map



**xserve**



respect > commitment > teamwork