

**To:** Peter Rice[Peter.Rice@ofgem.gov.uk]  
**Cc:** Paul O'Donovan[Paul.O'Donovan@ofgem.gov.uk]; Robert Yates[Robert.Yates@ofgem.gov.uk]; Charles Hargreaves[Charles.Hargreaves@ofgem.gov.uk]; Chris Poulton[Chris.Poulton@ofgem.gov.uk]  
**From:** Adrian Ross  
**Sent:** 2014-10-06T10:25:43Z  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Subject:** RE: Balanced scorecard data  
**Received:** 2014-10-06T10:25:45Z

Peter

Thanks for your comments. Let's discuss. Initial responses below.

A

---

**From:** Peter Rice  
**Sent:** 06 October 2014 08:28  
**To:** Adrian Ross  
**Cc:** Paul O'Donovan; Chris Poulton; Robert Hull  
**Subject:** RE: Balanced scorecard data

Adrian

Thanks for sending this around, just a few points and apologies if some of them have been raised previously:

The 'scheme runrate' seems to suggest that we have actually paid out £1.6bn on Non-Domestic RHIGB. Is that right? I think it is saying that for the schemes we have accredited the estimated payments are £1.6bn but I am not sure. **[Adrian Ross]** Good point. Looks high for payments. Rob is checking. DRHI is definitely payments rather than value committed and RE schemes are definitely value committed.

If my guess is correct would it be possible to add a note at the bottom to explain? **[Adrian Ross]** The "measure" column is intended to make clear the basis of the calculation. Those that have estimated payments for the life of the scheme are shown as "scheme value committed".

Not sure if that is also true for Domestic RHI.

I don't think the Cost per Transaction is 'Funding % divided by transactions'. Can I suggest if you deleted the '%' it would make more sense.**[Adrian Ross]** Agreed

Are the %s on the Cost per Transaction being calculated consistently? Some seem to be the difference to the Annual Forecast (e.g. NDRHI) and others seem to be the actual as a % of the forecast (DRHI).**[Adrian Ross]** Should be variance as % of annual forecast. DRHI figure was entered incorrectly (calc on background spreadsheet is correct).

On that same page, since rounding could account for nearly 14% of the cost shouldn't the calculation be to at least 1 d.p.?**[Adrian Ross]** Agreed. I already suggested the same.

The Queue slide shows positive or negative changes in green/red respectively. Could you consider whether that is appropriate throughout for consistency. It might help people to focus.**[Adrian Ross]** I wondered the same. But have stuck with what has been done in the past this time (not sure what, if any, discussions were had on this in the past).

On 'Performance Targets' are the annual averages really that, or are they the average to date? You might want to think about renaming the column. If they are average for the year to date do they take into account the volumes in each quarter or are they simply the mean of the 2 months results. **[Adrian Ross]** Changing title to YTD average would make it clearer. I think the volumes impact on results may lead to slightly different results. **[Adrian Ross]** Agree that could be the case and the weighted average would be ideal. But we currently only get the % value from each scheme. Would need to get numerator and denominator in each case if we want to do 'properly'. Not clear that will make a big difference, so I suggest we look at that for the next report.

Finally, the struggle to obtain confirmed funding from DETI for RHINI continues from the last Balanced Scorecard. I have asked consistently and persistently for the Non-Domestic team to provide documentation from DETI showing what figure has been agreed but with no success. I have been told categorically that agreement has been reached 3 times and for 3 different figures, but I have not been provided with any documentation to support any of them. I have finally given up asking and Bob has offered to obtain written confirmation for me. I am aware he has asked Teri Clifton for something from DETI to confirm. Can you please therefore confirm with Bob whether he has got any documentation and what you should include in the BS. **[Adrian Ross]** We agreed last time that we would use whatever numbers you have in Finance to ensure reporting consistency. So if you think this number should be different, think it might be better if you agree with bob/etc what the 'correct' figure is or we again risk having 2 competing numbers. Happy to discuss with Bob/Gareth/etc if necessary though.

I will pass on your thanks to my team about the numbers, I am really impressed given how much we had to catch up on after the absences for the whole of August.

Best regards

P

---

**From:** Adrian Ross  
**Sent:** 03 October 2014 11:11  
**To:** Charles Hargreaves; Paul Fisher; Gareth John; David Fletcher; Peter Rice; Stephen Beel; Julie Young  
**Cc:** Paul O'Donovan; Robert Yates; Ashley Malster  
**Subject:** RE: Balanced scorecard data

With thanks to you and your teams, we were able to produce the first version of the Balanced Scorecard in time for EPC submission later today. Please pass on our thanks to the people who provided the data so promptly.

I have attached the current version, which Bob is reviewing at 1.30. I have looked at it and don't see any obvious errors; you might also want to take a look to make sure that your numbers look reasonable.

Bob realises that this version is draft and doesn't contain commentary, and we will be issuing an update version to EPC ahead of the meeting. Therefore, by midday on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup>, please could you:

- Confirm that the stats for your areas are accurate
- Provide commentary on any significant variances or changes.

Thanks and regards, Adrian

---

**From:** Adrian Ross  
**Sent:** 29 September 2014 09:55  
**To:** Charles Hargreaves; Paul Fisher; Gareth John; David Fletcher; Peter Rice; Stephen Beel; Julie Young  
**Cc:** Paul O'Donovan; Robert Yates; Sara Goff  
**Subject:** Balanced scorecard data  
**Importance:** High

Dear all

Bob wants to present the E-Serve Q2 Balanced scorecard at EPC on 9 October. Unfortunately, that requires us to have all of the data for July, August and September by the submission deadline of 2 October. We realise this is extremely tight and Rob has been speaking to your teams re feasibility. Most people have said that they will be able to provide data by 2/10 (commentary will be added later, in time for the 9/10 meeting). Please emphasise the importance of getting good-quality data provided by this deadline to your teams.

If you have any concerns, please contact me and/or Paul.

Thanks, and apologies for the rush.

Adrian

**Adrian Ross**  
Head of Environmental Programmes  
Renewable Electricity  
9 Millbank  
London  
SW1P 3GE  
Tel: 0207 901 7484  
[www.ofgem.gov.uk](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk)

**ofgem e-serve**