**P375 Meeting 3 Summary**

* The Proposer presented some real life examples of the types of site that the P375 solution could be applied to. The Workgroup agreed this was a useful presentation and thanked the Proposer
* The Workgroup agreed that a ‘metering by difference’ approach (which is distinct from ‘difference metering’ and ‘net metering’) should be incorporated into the P375 solution.  This will work for site configurations where an asset without a meter uses metered data from other meters on the site to deem its volumes.
* A Use Case should be included based on the complex site provided by Alastair to test the P375 solution and calculations.
* The Workgroup agreed that a clear definition of Asset Metering was needed and should include an aggregate of equipment and/or loads for logical grouping and despatch. The critical principle for an Asset Meter is that the equipment can be independently controlled and dispatched.
* The Workgroup agreed that more than one Asset Meter can be installed per site. Other site flows could be determined using a residual methodology which utilises Asset Metering installed.
* The Workgroup agreed that the assurance for this could be a declaration from the end customer along with proof of site load independence with line diagrams (as used by CVA currently)
* The Workgroup stepped through the draft Code of Practice 11 for Asset Metering, and agreed a number of updates and amendments to testing and commissioning, definitions and SLDs
* The Workgroup agreed that SVAA will apply the Boundary Meter DNO LLFs according the voltages used by referencing the Asset and Boundary Meter
* The Workgroup stepped through a draft high-level end to end process diagram and considered some of the questions ELEXON posed
* The Workgroup agreed that further consideration was needed on:
	+ The assurance regime required for the registration of Asset Meters and the on-going monitoring. The Proposer believed that a declaration of site load independence with line diagrams (as used by CVA currently) was sufficient for registration
	+ What data should be sent to which participants and what, if any, data should be made public, for example on BMRS
	+ The extent to which the new Metering Standards for Asset Meters should cater for the type of measuring devices discussed in P379
	+ The role of customer consent for moving an asset between VLPs
	+ Whether P375 can consider adding Asset Meters to a Supplier’s Additional BMUs

**Meeting Actions**

* ELEXON to update Business Requirements based on Workgroup discussions for distribution to the Workgroup before the next meeting
* ELEXON to update CoP 11 Requirements based on Workgroup discussions for distribution to the Workgroup before the next meeting
* Proposer and ELEXON to develop use case for presentation at the next meeting
* NETSO to consider if P375 will allow provision and proof of delivery for ancillary services
* ELEXON to document a viable assurance framework for P375
* ELEXON to clarify appointment of MOPs, DCs, and delivered balancing volumes BMRS reporting and AMSID de-registration process to the Business Requirements, as well as change of VLP process.
* ELEXON to engage with the Association of Decentralised Energy and P379 Design Authority on the use of non-Code of Practice Compliant Asset Metering (to inform consultation, scope and timescale of P375)
* ELEXON to engage with Data Collectors on the interoperability and open protocols to interrogate Asset Meters and an approved list of Asset Meters in BSCP601