

TECHNIQUE REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS – TAPAP

MEETING NAME	Performance Assurance Board
Date of meeting	25 June 2020
Paper number	PAB233/11
Owner/author	Jason Jackson
Purpose of paper	Decision
Classification	Public
Summary	This paper details recommendations for changes to the Technical Assurance of Performance Assurance Parties (TAPAP), Performance Assurance Technique (PAT) identified as part of the PAF Review.

1. Background

- 1.1 The PAF Review set out to make recommendations on how the strengths of TAPAP could be more effectively leveraged in support of the delivery of the PAF.
- 1.2 We have also assessed the feasibility of a process whereby the Performance Assurance Administrator (PAA)/PAB collates best practices or 'lessons learnt' from each audit to be published in an appropriate format for participants to access.
- 1.3 Stakeholders who responded to the PAF Review consultation in respect of TAPAP all believed that it is a useful technique that provides concrete outcomes that help in mitigating Settlement Risk. However, some stakeholders felt that the outcomes of some recent TAPAP checks ([P283](#)) and the subsequent Change Proposals to clarify processes suggest that the approach taken to BSC Change on ELEXON/the PAB's part might not have been as effective or persuasive as it could have been. Many stakeholders noted that the recent AMR TAPAP check, which focussed on practices around auxiliary meter technical details, was particularly effective. It utilised data from the DTN to target the sample for the check onto Metering System IDs (MSIDs) where non-compliance seemed to have occurred. ELEXON uses DTN data in the deployment of TAPAP wherever it is possible to do so.
- 1.4 The lessons learnt and best practices emerging from TAPAP are not communicated openly or clearly enough to industry.

2. Overview

- 2.1 The Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) review project team has worked closely with operational teams and stakeholders in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of Technical Assurance of Performance Assurance Parties (TAPAP) as a Performance Assurance Technique (PAT).

3. PAF Review Recommendations

- 3.1 Our recommendations intend to improve the quality of assurance delivered and increase the volume of assurance activity we are able to deliver through TAPAP. Additionally we intend to:
 - i) Reduce the resource burden placed upon audited Performance Assurance Parties (PAPs) by PAT deployment;
 - ii) Broaden the range of risks against which TAPAP can be deployed; and
 - iii) Maximise the visibility of insights into risk mitigation and controls identified through TAPAP.

TECHNIQUE REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS – TAPAP

Recommendations

3.2 Our recommendations are:

- Amend the timescales and process for agreeing TAPAP Findings Reports (M)
- TAPAP audit of the actions taken by Suppliers regarding appointed Party Agents' BSC Audit Issues (M)
- Clarify communication channels and procedures of non-compliances identified through TAPAP processes (M)
- Providing assurance against Settlement Risks relating to Central Data Collection Agent (CDCA) processes (L)
- Sharing best practice (L)
- Reduce overlapping PAT application (L)
- Introduce formal assurance of BSC process knowledge for TAPAP auditors (L)

4. Implementation

4.1 Recommendations approved by the PAB will be translated into requirements and implemented by the operational teams.

5. Recommendations

5.1 We invite you to:

- a) **APPROVE** the recommendations outlined in the attached report.

Attachments

Attachment A – Technical Assurance of PAPs Recommendation Report

For more information, please contact:

Jason Jackson, PAF Analyst

Jason.Jackson@elexon.co.uk

020 7380 4187