Appendix 5 - Need for additional stakeholders

Image source: Master isolated images: http://www.freedigitalphotos.net/images/view_photog.php?photogid=1962

Input from additional stakeholders may be required for Smart Meter rollouts to be a true success. An example is given of the present situation in the UK.

To date official meetings undertaken to develop the specifications for the UK's Smart Meters "*have excluded not just potentially critical academics, but also the technical staff of the meter suppliers*" (Anderson & Fuloria 2010). This situation needs to be addressed.

To optimise opportunities for success - *and soundly address its critics* - it appears prudent to robustly expand the UK's Ofgem Smart Metering Implementation Programme Consumer Advisory Group. At present the group consists of representatives of: Age UK, Consumer Focus, the Fuel Poverty Advisory Group (FPAG), Which?, the Public Utilities Access Forum (PUAF), plus DECC and Ofgem representatives (Ofgem 2010).

As noted by Jamieson et al (2010), Robbins (2008) suggests that the optimum number of stakeholder representatives could be between five to twelve, whilst Corder/Thompson & Associates (CTA 2002) suggests this number could be as high as twenty. The present author suggests that due to the complexity of the subject a figure towards twenty may prove more appropriate.

An expanded group could include academics, technical staff and experts on: human rights issues, electromagnetic pulse (EMP) and electromagnetic compatibility (EMC) issues, cyber-security, health (*as related to the biological effects of possible emissions from Smart Meters & related technology*) and environmental matters.

Amongst those who could be considered for inclusion as stakeholders are groups involved with electrohypersensitivity and

chronic RF/microwave exposure issues. In the UK these include: bemri.org, Cavisoc, Electrosensitivity UK, the EM Radiation Research Trust, Mast Action UK, Mast Sanity, Powerwatch, WiFiinschools.org.uk and WiredChild.

It is recognised by the WHO (1986) that it is vital to take into consideration the health impact of technology on the environment.

An efficient restructuring is required to optimise the chances of Smart Meter success. A more collaborative approach could also prove of great benefit in determining what is realistic, practical and achievable.

This restructuring might now be achievable as a result of initiatives such as SmartGrid GB which was launched by Charles Hendry MP, UK Minister of State for Climate Change in June 2011(SG GB 2011).

References

Anderson, R. & Fuloria, S. (2010), On the security economics of electricity metering, 9th Workshop on the Economics of Information Security, Harvard University, George Mason University in Arlington, VA, June 2010, 18 pp.

CTA (2002), Choosing Stakeholders: A Key Step in a Collaborative Process, Corder/Thompson & Associates, http://www.corderthompson.com/documents/Choosing%20Stakeholders%20for%20Public%20Processes.pdf

Jamieson, I. (2010), Intelligent Communication: The Future of EMF Discourse and Risk Governance?, IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Sciences, http://iopscience.iop.org/1755-1315/10/1/012009

Ofgem (2010), Smart Metering Implementation Programme – Consumer Advisory Group, 16 December 2010 at Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?file=SmartmeterCAGMEETINGNOTE1612.pdf&refer=e-serve/sm/Stakeholder/CAG

Robbins, S.P. (2008), The Truth about Managing People (Second Edition). Pearson Prentice Hall Business, London, 232 pp.

SG GB (2011), SmartGrid GB, http://www.energyandutilities.org.uk/representative_organisations/company/smartgrid_gb

WHO (1986), Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion, First International Conference on Health Promotion Ottawa, 21 November 1986 - WHO/HPR/HEP/95.1, http://www.who.int/hpr/NPH/docs/ottawa_charter_hp.pdf