







## RIIO-ED1 CAWG RIIO Totex benchmarking methodology

Keith Mawson 26 June 2012



## Disaggregated vs Aggregated analysis

- Carried out analysis of Closely associated costs using MEAV as the driver to experiment with the different approaches:
  - First regressed CAI against MEAV
  - Second we split out each element and regressed separately against MEAV

|           | Actuals 2010/11 | Aggregated<br>CAI against MEAV<br>- AVERAGE | Aggregated<br>CAI against MEAV<br>- UPPER QUARTILE | Disaggregated<br>regressions (vs<br>MEAV) summed -<br>AVERAGE | Disaggregated<br>regressions (vs<br>MEAV) summed -<br>UPPER QUARTILE | % Diff AVERAGE<br>CAI - summed | % Diff UPPER<br>QUARTILE CAI-<br>summed |
|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---|
| EMID      | 77.8            | 64.4  | 59.3   | 62.3  | 56.6   | -3%                            | -5%                                     |
| ENW       | 47.4            | 58.8  | 53.7   | 57.2  | 51.5   | -3%                            | -4%                                     |
| EPN       | 86.0            | 78.7  | 73.6   | 75.2  | 69.5   | -4%                            | -6%                                     |
| LPN       | 51.7            | 42.9  | 37.8   | 42.6  | 36.8   | -1%                            | -3%                                     |
| Northeast | 30.3            | 38.8  | 33.7   | 38.7  | 33.0   | 0%                             | -2%                                     |
| SPD       | 49.5            | 51.2  | 46.1   | 50.3  | 44.5   | -2%                            | -3%                                     |
| SPM       | 50.4            | 44.5  | 39.4   | 44.0  | 38.3   | -1%                            | -3%                                     |
| SPN       | 58.0            | 49.3  | 44.2   | 48.5  | 42.8   | -2%                            | -3%                                     |
| SSE Hy    | 30.2            | 26.8  | 21.7   | 27.3  | 21.6   | 2%                             | 0%                                      |
| SSE So    | 58.6            | 74.4  | 69.3   | 71.4  | 65.6   | -4%                            | -5%                                     |
| Swales    | 28.5            | 28.9  | 23.7   | 29.3  | 23.6   | 2%                             | -1%                                     |
| Swest     | 41.7            | 39.0  | 33.9   | 38.9  | 33.2   | 0%                             | -2%                                     |
| WMID      | 75.8            | 55.6  | 50.5   | 54.3  | 48.6   | -2%                            | -4%                                     |
| Yorkshire | 37.8            | 54.3  | 49.2   | 53.1  | 47.3   | -2%                            | -4%                                     |
| Total     | 723.5           | 707.7                                       | 635.9  | 693.1   | 613.0  | -2%                            | -4%                                     |

Also conducted on Business Support and the average is supressed by 1%



## Disaggregated vs Aggregated analysis

## *Principle points*

- Disaggregated analysis supresses industry averages/upper quartiles. Results of different approaches are swings between companies even when using the same defined costs and cost drivers
- All of these issues would be potentially further compounded when we use
  - i) different cost drivers
  - ii) across all the cost building blocks
- Disaggregated approach useful to cross check aggregated results, or a starting point for companies' to explain their relative position, but would caution that disaggregated approach should not be end point for allowances
- Explanations for the differences may lead to debating:
  - Business models
  - Decisions surrounding competing costs / trade offs
  - Boundary issues

