

Data Sharing Assessment

| | | Insert information in boxes below | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Dataset name: | Super Grid Transformer Flows - South Wales | | | | | | |
| Dataset re | epresentation: | CSV | | | | | | |
| Ope | enness Result: | Shared | | | | | | |
| | completed by: | P Lawson | | | | | | |
| | SA completed: | 05/06/2024 | | | | | | |
| | or sharing by: | | P Lawson | | | | | |
| | te of approval: | | 05/06/2024 | | | | | |
| Form (| Completeness | | Complete | | | | | |
| | | Initial Risk | Mitigation | Residual Risk | | | | |
| | Privacy | Green | | Green | | | | |
| | Security | Amber | Restrict Access - Shared Data | Green | | | | |
| Commercial Negative Consumer Impact | | Green | | Green | | | | |
| | | Green | | Green | | | | |
| | Other | Green | | Green | | | | |
| | Green | | 100% | | | | | |
| Summary | Amber | | 0% | | | | | |
| | Red | | 0% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Openness Recommendation | | | Shared | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation | on Notes | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation | on Notes | | | | | | | |

| # | Question | Guidance | Response | Initial Risk | Decision Tool Response | Guidance | Supporting Information and Notes | Mitigation Category | Residual Risk |
|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|--------------|--|----------|---|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 0 | Does NGED own or have a legal right to publish the data? | Has NGED (or a contracted third party) has generated or collected the data? In some cases where data has been shared with NGED by the data owner, there may be rights (via data licencing) or obligations (e.g. Environmental Information Regulations or DCUSA Embedded Capacity Registers) which provide legal grounds for publication of the dataset or derived dataset. Where a dataset combines owned and shared data this should be recorded as shared data. | Yes: Data Owner | Green | Complete initial and residual risk assessment and proceed to next check | | | | Green |
| Pri | vacy T | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Does the dataset contain personal data? | Consider if sharing this dataset infringes the General Data Protection Regulation (the GDPR) or the Data Protection Act 2018. [1]' Note: Additional guidance is given in LE5 - Data Protection Policy | No | Green | Complete initial and residual risk assessment and proceed to next check | | | | Green |
| 36 | Curity | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | exasperate an existing risk? | Consider if the dataset contains information that is not already public by another source. e.g. existing NGED reports, third party datasets (e.g. satellite imagery), etc. If an alternative source exists then consider if the NGED dataset contains more detailed data (granularity, latency, accuracy, etc.). Where the dataset contains novel information, it should be assessed for new security issues such as: security of supply (Distribution Code - Engineering Recommendation P2), security of assets, security of people, etc. Where the dataset replicates or extends existing public datasets, consideration should be given to the incremental risk publication would create. For example, does the increased granularity of data create more risk? | Yes but mitigation in place | Amber | Capture evidence and reason for mitigation in the 'Supporting Information' column and proceed to next check. | | Dataset includes high-granularity time series data. Access is restricted to registered users only. | Restrict Access - Shared Data | Green |
| Со | mmercial T | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Does the dataset contain information that could damage the commercial interests of the company? | Data Best Practice Guidance described commercial information as "Data that relates to the private administration of a business or data which was not collected as part of an obligation / by a regulated monopoly and would not have been originated or captured without the activity of the organisation". Commercial issues could also arise due to prior data licencing which would preclude sharing the same data under different terms (e.g. exclusivity agreement, confidentiality agreement), data which is (or could be interpreted as) inconsistent with regulatory reporting or could be seen as exploiting NGED's licenced role (e.g. could undermine the Competition Act 1998 [3], Enterprise Act 2002 [4] or Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 [5]) | No | Green | Complete initial and residual risk assessment and proceed to next check | | | | Green |
| Negative Consumer Impact | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Consider if access to this data is likely to drive actions, intentional or otherwise, which will negatively impact the consumer. For example, data about procurement assessment processes could drive up prices for products or services which increase costs for consumers. | No | Green | Complete initial and residual risk assessment and proceed to next check | | | | Green |
| Ot | ner | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | concerns associated with sharing this dataset not | If there are any other issues that require mitigation before publishing your dataset that haven't been addressed by the questions above, please clearly state the reason(s) in the 'Supporting information' cell. For example, specific legislative or regulatory barriers. | No | Green | Complete initial and residual risk assessment and proceed to next check | | | | Green |
| 6 | Is a dataset quality caveat required for end users? | Data quality is subjective. A dataset may be perfectly acceptable for one use case but entirely inadequate for another. Data accuracy can be more objective but there remain many instances where the required precision differs across use cases. Data quality should not be seen as a reason for not sharing as potential users may find the quality acceptable for their use, find ways to handle the quality issues or develop ways to solve issues which can improve the quality of the underlying data. However, known limitations (quality or accuracy) should be clearly documented and where there are uncertainties a robust quality disclaimer should be used. | Yes but mitigation in place | Amber | Capture evidence and reason for mitigation in the 'Supporting Information' column and proceed to next check. | | There is a risk of data quality / accuracy issues, as the data comes from loggers on the network that can be subject to communications problems and innacuracies etc. | Disclaimer | Green |