

JT Regulatory Consultants

Performance Monitoring and Reporting

Response to Request for Consultations
by RIC

JOHN THOMPSON CA, CMA - ICT Consultant
18A FORT GEORGE ROAD, ST JAMES, Trinidad and Tobago
8/8/2011

I

Introduction

The following represents my comments on the addressing affordability of regulatory prices consultative document.

Defining Performance Monitoring and Reporting

The RIC has defined the following performance and monitoring reporting as a useful tool for the following:

- “Informing customers and other interest groups about the level of service they are receiving;
- Providing information and data for developing regulatory standards where required and for on-going assessment of compliance with such standards;
- Informing the decision-making processes of regulators; and
- Identifying baseline performance of service providers as well as comparing relative performance with other utilities”.

“The performance indicators are grouped in the following categories:

- Baseline explanatory data
- Quality of supply
- Network reliability and efficiency
- Customer responsiveness and service”

My comments are as follows:

Context of Analysis

The important distinction for reporting and monitoring is the value that the information gained can contribute to the optimal operation of the subject of the report and monitoring. In others words, how well does it allow one to identify operational problems and enable meaningful decisions on corrective actions to be made and taken, respectively. The six definitive questions of “analysis” need to be answered for an absolute knowledge of any subject or object selected to be gained/won, they are; what, why, where, how and who. To do achieve the analysis, the performance indicators must provide those answers:

\

Comments and recommendation

1. In the category “Network Reliability” I propose the indicators 3.3 through 4.0 with the exception of 3.8 be stated by area (meaning the part of the power grid as classified by T&TEC with respect to geographic location/area). These indicators must answer the question, where? This way corrective action can be rightly directed to the problem area and feedback on it, monitored in the future. The same “by area” applies for indicators 3.11,3.12 and 4.6 through to 4.9, with 4.10 being by customer class

I recommend adjusting of these indicators to indicate the sources of variation within the actual power grid.

2. The subject of geographic area for the TTEC power grid should be considered for alignment or some method of co- relation to other geographical demarcation systems. This way social and economic analysis can be done for the country or by other sources, at the macro planning level. For example the demarcations of the Elections and Boundaries can be cross-referenced to the power distribution so the socio- political issue of served areas and its political consequence can be analysed for better public service etc. The demarcation of the Central Statistical Office population demographics can be used by TETEC to better plan and project long term demand and other population related issues for power generation and distribution.etc.

I recommend consideration of the benefits that can come from a reconcilable geographic location method shared among statutory institutions

3. Other systems of geographical demarcations exist such as: for WASA, TSTT, Town and Country Planning, Property Tax and Income Tax zoning in the Ministry of Finance (etc.). An, appropriate data taxonomy should be developed to convert and make all these zonings reconcilable with each other to even a 98.9% degree of accuracy. The coming information society demands this type of foundational work for reusable data to begin now.

I recommend some adoption of a common taxonomy for geographic location by relevant statutory institutions.