MEETING NAME	Technical Assurance of Metering Expert Group		
Meeting number	38		
Date of meeting	18 July 2019		
Venue	ELEXON Ltd		
Classification	Public		

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

Attendese	Miles Craith	МС	TAMEC Chair
Attendees	Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair
	Vivian Ng	VN	Technical Secretary
	Kathrine Higby	KH	ELEXON
	Sokratis Boursalis	SB	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Beth Procter	BP	ELEXON (Part Meeting)
	Chris Day	CD	ELEXON
	Tom Chevalier	ТС	Association of Meter Operators
	Nicholas Sawyer	NS	Npower (MOA) (Teleconference)
	John Liddell	JL	Smartest Energy (Supplier) (Teleconference)
	Richard Brady	RB	WPD (LDSO)
	Kevin Walker	KW	E.ON (MOA)
	Colin Gentlemen	CG	SSE (MOA) (Teleconference)
	Anthony Hobbs	AH	Industry Expert (Teleconference)
	Michael Messenger	MM	IMServ (HHDC)
	Warren Lacey	WL	Northern Powergrid (LDSO)
	Lisa Young	LY	C&C (TAA)
	Dawn Matthews	DM	UKPN (LDSO)
Apologies	Holly Mills	HM	EDF Energy (MOA)
	Peter Waymont	PW	UKPN (LDSO)
	Peter Gray	PG	SSE Business Energy (Supplier)
	Michael Taylor	MT	ELEXON Technical Secretary

PUBLIC

1. Introduction and Apologies

- 1.1 The TAMEG Chair informed the TAMEG Members of the apologies ELEXON received.
- 2. Actions

Action 31.02

2.1 Action will be progressed following the competition of Action 31.03 (below).

Action 31.03

TAMEG38

2.2 No further update on this action due to insufficient resource to complete the analysis of the National Measurement Transformer Error Statement (NMTES) data.

Action 32.02

- 2.3 ELEXON provided an update that the action is currently sitting with ELEXON's Change Team. ELEXON noted that the issue would be raised to consider the issue raised of Meters being left in situ past the Meter/Outstations manufacturers recommended lifecycle. A TAMEG member queried if this issue is being progressed. ELEXON explained that this will be progressed when resource becomes available, including consideration on whether changes are required for BSCP601.
- 2.4 A TAMEG member noted that Data Collectors (DCs) are having issues with their data retrieval software. Similar issues could be faced by parties entering the market. The TAMEG member also highlighted that DCs could struggle to support older Meters, which may compound the issue. ELEXON recognised the issue, but highlighted that it was not currently considered a priority and would be looked at under a BSC Issue regarding BSCP601 and the lifetime of Meters, when this was raised.
- 2.5 A TAMEG member noted that this action had been outstanding for a considerable time, due to resourcing issues. A TAMEG Member added that action should be progressed.
- 2.6 ELEXON noted that non-BSC Parties, like the Association of Meter Operator (AMO), were now in a position to raise BSC Issues so this could be a route to progress the issue more rapidly. ELEXON added that the Risk team had also been made aware of the issue.
- 2.7 A TAMEG member noted that the longer this issue remains unresolved, the likelihood of Meter failure increases. ELEXON questioned whether the issue should be communicated to the industry via Newscast.
- 2.8 Action ELEXON to publish a newscast related to the length of time Meters/Outstations remained on the wall and the risk of the accuracy of Meters drifting or failing. A TAMEG member added that an information day could be arranged, or the issue could be raised to the BSC Panel.
- 2.9 ELEXON advised that the change would be progressed quicker if it were raised by a BSC Party. Action to remain open.

Action 31.03

2.10 Action to remain open.

Action 34.01

2.11 ELEXON to update Local Working Instructions (LWI) following completion of the re-procurement. Action closed.

Action 35.01:

2.12 ELEXON acknowledged and noted that it had not had opportunity to complete the action. This action remains open.

Action 35.02

2.13 Action 35.02 and 35.03 were amalgamated into Action 37.07. Action closed.

Action 35.05

2.14 A TAMEG member noted that a Request For Information (RFI) had been circulated to Meter Operator Agents (MOAs), to ascertain whether MOAs were experiencing issues in gaining access to High Voltage (HV) substations. A TAMEG member noted that certain Licensed Distributor System Operators (LDSOs) prevented access by not attending site, or requesting payment to attend site. A TAMEG member added that not all LDSOs request payment to attend site.

- 2.15 A TAMEG member clarified that in most cases payment would be requested if the visit would require a full working day. A TAMEG member added that payments were rarely requested for short visits.
- 2.16 ELEXON noted that work has been completed to bring the issue it to the Industry's attention via the Meter Operation Code of Practice Agreement Review Panel. Action closed.

Action 35.06

2.17 ELEXON noted that the Technical Assurance Agent (TAA) audit focuses on Measurement Class (MC) C sites, and added that ELEXON is in the process of getting refresh data to send over to MOAs. Action to remain open.

Action 36.01

2.18 ELEXON noted that this Action was closed in the last meeting. This Action is now closed.

Action 36.02

- 2.19 The TAA noted that if the Current Transformers (CTs) and Voltage Transformers (VTs) had a power factor, this would be taken into consideration. Evidence of the applied power factor would be taken into consideration for the Inspection Visit.
- 2.20 ELEXON noted the member who raised the action was not in attendance. ELEXON recommended the TAA contact TAMEG member to provide an update. Action to remain open.

Action 36.05

- 2.21 ELEXON noted that a response had been circulated for comments, following discussions with National Grid. ELEXON added that one comment advised removing earthing from the test terminal blocks. ELEXON will circulate diagrams once all the feedback had been reviewed.
- 2.22 The TAMEG members later requested the diagrams to be shared prior to the next meeting. ELEXON to submit the diagrams prior to the next TAMEG meeting, dependent on whether it had been completed.
- 2.23 Action to remain open.

Action 37.02

- 2.24 ELEXON noted that Newscast had been published.
- 2.25 ELEXON confirmed that the TAA LWI had been restored to the website, and can be found via the following path from the home page of the <u>ELEXON website</u>: Market Entry and Compliance/Performance Assurance/Techniques, Timetable and Methodology then under the title 'What do the TAA check during the Inspection Visit?', the link for <u>Technical Assurance of Metering Systems</u>.
- 2.26 ELEXON noted that the webpage requires updating, as members are still struggling to locate the LWI.
- 2.27 Action to remain open.

Action 37.03

2.28 Action closed.

Action 37.04

- 2.29 ELEXON noted that long outstanding Category 1 non-compliances are provided to the PAB and ELEXON had been working with the TAA to rectify the non-compliances.
- 2.30 Action closed.

Action 37.05

2.31 No update.

TAMEG38

Action 37.06

2.32 No update on this. ELEXON noted that there is a need to speak to Trading Dispute team on this issue.

Action 37.07

2.33 ELEXON noted this is mentioned in the Change Proposal (CP) and ELEXON will need to send the CP to members before the next TAMEG meeting. Action required.

Action 37.08:

2.34 This Action is closed.

Action 37.09:

- 2.35 ELEXON noted that analysis had been conducted on behalf of the Technical Assurance Agent (TAA).
- 2.36 ELEXON enquired if analysis on instances where check Meters had been registered as main Meters, for SVA and CVA. ELEXON added analysis would be complicated and resource intensive.
- 2.37 A TAMEG member noted a HHDC highlighted where check Meters had been registered as main Meters. A TAMEG member added there was a potential for double counting, if error is not identified, and queried whether there should be additional validation checks.
- 2.38 A TAMEG member noted that it is simple to ask for data from the CDCA as they are already doing such checks and therefore it could be easy to run through these small numbers through them. The Members also noted that this is a potential opportunity for error and putting in checks.
- 2.39 ELEXON queried whether this analysis could be requested from the CDCA. The TAMEG agreed.
- 2.40 ELEXON to provide update following the analysis taken from HHDC's MTDs and to ask CDCA if there is validation on Main and Check Meters. This Action remains open.

Action 37.10:

2.41 Action to remain open.

3. Non-Compliance Stats Report

- 3.1 A TAMEG member noted that no access had increased. TAA confirmed that there was a 16% SVA no access rate for 2018/19, which had increased from 2017/18.
- 3.2 ELEXON noted it had contacted five Suppliers, to query why there had been instances of no access. The performance on no access will be updated to the PAB via the Quarterly Performance Assurance Report (QPAR).
- 3.3 ELEXON noted a change would be implemented in September, which will aim to reduce no access. The change will mandate that required information is submitted to the TAA by Suppliers, MOAs, DCs and LDSOs. ELEXON added that an Education Day will be held following implementation of the change. **Post meeting note:** The Education Day was held at ELEXON on 10 September 2019.
- 3.4 A TAMEG member queried whether the change would have industry consultation. ELEXON responded that no industry consultation had been planned.
- 3.5 A TAMEG member raised concerns around industry awareness. ELEXON noted that the industry will be made aware subsequently. ELEXON added the change is not a CP, therefore does not require industry consultation. A TAMEG Member raised concerns that those impacted by the change were not being consulted. ELEXON responded that that Education Day will be held.
- 3.6 TAMEG members requested more clarification over the reason for Suppliers cancelling Inspection Visits, specifically the Supplier that cancelled 17 Inspection Visits in the last year.

TAMEG38

Action 38.01

- 3.7 A TAMEG member expressed concern about the process of updating the energisation status on ECOES. A TAMEG member noted that an employee from an LDSO had conducted a desktop audit and found a number of different instances where the energisation status was incorrect.
- 3.8 TAMEG Chair enquired whether there are checks in place, which notify the TAA when a site becomes deenergised. ELEXON queried whether D0139 flows are sent to update ECOES following de-energisation. A TAMEG member noted that it is the Supplier's responsibility to update the energisation status.
- 3.9 ELEXON noted that Suppliers should update the TAA, with respect to energisation status, prior to an arranged Inspection Visit.
- 3.10 A TAMEG member recommended that ELEXON undertake additional analysis around disconnection issues. ELEXON agreed to undertake additional analysis.

ACTION 38.02

- 3.11 A TAMEG member queried whether LDSO's were responsible for access issues. The TAA responded that there had been greater engagement from some, but not all LDSOs. ELEXON added that LDSO's had been invited to the Code of Practice (CoP) 4 review in September, with the intention of emphasising the importance of providing the MOA access to the entire Metering System.
- 3.12 The TAA noted that it can be difficult to identify the right person from the LDSO who would be able to grant access. The TAA added that the contact list was provided by the LDSO therefore the TAA relies on the LDSO to provide an update, if the contact changes.
- 3.13 ELEXON noted that Operation Support Managers (OSMs) could contact LDSOs, requesting that they provide an up-to-date contact list.

ACTION 38.03

3.14 A TAMEG Member noted that the quarterly report only covers SVA, and queried whether there was a CVA equivalent. ELEXON agreed to review the report in relation to total visits and no access.

ACTION 38.04

4. Outstanding Category 1 non-compliance report

- 4.1 A TAMEG member queried if engagement had improved following the May 2019 PAB paper on outstanding category one non-compliances. ELEXON noted the paper focused on the length of time that non-compliances had been outstanding. ELEXON added that rectification plan period had been presented in working days in the TAMEG paper.
- 4.2 A TAMEG member raised concerns over the number of activities in rectification plans without timescales. A TAMEG Member added that the length of time some category one non-compliances had been outstanding was not acceptable, considering that the errors impact Settlement.
- 4.3 A TAMEG Member noted that the information recorded on Category one non-compliances is insufficient, and suggested that more detail should be included, detailing the issue.
- 4.4 A TAMEG member raised concerns over the BSC definition of "de-energised". A TAMEG Member added that there are instances where Meters had been removed, but the site is still consuming energy.
- 4.5 A TAMEG member advised that there could be instances where "de-energised" and "Disconnected" had been used incorrectly. A TAMEG Member suggested the TAA re-visit terms to ensure that the correct term had been used.

V1.0

- 4.6 A TAMEG Member added that the terms "un-metered" and "un-registered" might experience the same definition issue. ELEXON noted that the TAA need to be clear on the terms used, and definition should be included in future reports.
- 4.7 ELEXON noted that the Offshore wind farm non-compliance was investigated through the Trading Disputes process, and proposed a lesson learnt activity could be performed following the Trading Dispute.
- 4.8 A TAMEG Member queried this Category 1 non-compliance and mentioned that this (i.e. the resulting voltage failure) is being monitored so is surprised that the fault was not picked up early by the CDCA. The members mentioned that if it's a VT failure, it would have been picked up on energisation therefore the members raised concerns if this was monitored, what is being monitored by DC, is CDCA checking these alarms, etc.

5. Trading Disputes Report

- 5.1 A TAMEG Member noted that Trading Dispute DA971 was related to an incorrect energisation status, which had over £1 million in Materiality.
- 5.2 A TAMEG Member noted that the site was a large office block, where the supply was split into three. ELEXON added that the boundary main supply was re-energised, and the customer had been paying 3 times more. The TAMEG member noted this illustrates lack of controls.
- 5.3 A TAMEG Member queried whether a lessons learned exercise, or additional controls analysis for Complex sites should be undertaken. ELEXON agreed to note the Trading Dispute to the PAB.

6. Modification to allow the TAA to conduct Desktop Audits

- 6.1 ELEXON discussed this with the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) team and recommendations were provided. ELEXON noted the benefit of this is to reduce levels of no access and increase confidence in annual performance.
- 6.2 A TAMEG Member questioned the value of TAA Desktop Audits, as they would only raise category 2 noncompliances for missing documentation. ELEXON responded that Desktop Audits will help to target Metering Systems for Inspection Visits by identifying mismatches in information provided (i.e. Meter Technical Details).
- 6.3 A TAMEG member queried the consequences of Parties not providing the requested information for Desktop Audits. ELEXON advised that failed Desktop Audits will be reported to the PAB. The PAB may decide to repeat the Desktop Audit, or to carry out an Inspection Visit.
- 6.4 A TAMEG member advised that money could be saved by reducing the number of Inspection Visits and undertaking more Desktop Audits.
- 6.5 ELEXON added that a workshop will be held with the TAA in September to discuss the Desktop Audit requirements. **Post meeting note:** ELEXON and the TAA discussed this at the Education Day held at ELEXON on 10 September 2019.

7. Quality of the D0215 data flow

- 7.1 ELEXON noted that volume of Current Transformer (CT) and Voltage Transformers (VT) mismatches had decreased since 2015, but added that the number of mismatches was still significant.
- 7.2 A TAMEG Member expressed its concerns that many MOA still generated D0170 manually, despite systems that automate the process being readily available.
- 7.3 ELEXON noted that a paper regarding the D0215 will be taken to the PAB and an update will be provided to the TAMEG at the next meeting.
- 7.4 A TAMEG Member noted that the BSC Audit focused on compliance, rather than quality of processes. ELEXON added that overall compliance had improved.

TAMEG38

- 7.5 A TAMEG Member questioned how MOAs were using the information in the D0215 data flow.
- 7.6 A TAMEG Member noted that CT and VT ratios could not be confirmed unless a site visit was performed, and questioned the value of D0215 flow.
- 7.7 A TAMEG Member noted that MOAs had to observe conditions on site prior to programming Meters. A TAMEG Member added that Meters had been programmed incorrectly because information received from the LDSO was inaccurate.
- 7.8 A TAMEG Member queried when the D0215 and D0268 analysis was undertaken. ELEXON responded that the initial analysis presented at February 2019 PAB, whilst D0215 and D0170 response rates were presented at the June 2019 PAB meeting.
- 7.9 A TAMEG Member enquired after the difference between D0215 and D0383. ELEXON clarified that a D0215 can be sent at any time, whilst the D0383 was sent after a site was commissioned. A TAMEG Member noted that there were some repeated items within the D0215 and D0383. ELEXON noted that the information in the D0383 was more reliable.
- 7.10 ELEXON asked for suggestions for improvements to the D0215 data flow. A TAMEG Member responded that there were too many flows, and recommended that the D0215 should be removed, as the majority of information was in the D0383.
- 7.11 A TAMEG Member noted it was difficult to comply with processes as they are becoming more complicated.
- 7.12 A TAMEG Member suggested re-purposing the D0215, rather than removing it.
- 7.13 A TAMEG Member enquired whether the MOA and LDSO representatives were aware of how accurate their databases were, and what information they held. The TAMEG Members responded that they needed more information in order to determine the best solution for D0215 issues.
- 7.14 The LDSO TAMEG members agreed to submit data to ELEXON by 9 August 2019 illustrating the following

ACTION 38.05:

- Number of MPANs that have CT/VTs;
- How many of the above were correct;
- What controls were in place to validate the information of their portfolio;
- How many Meters of their portfolio were installed prior November 2008; and
- What methods they use to acquire Commissioning information.

8. TAA Annual Report

- 8.1 ELEXON noted that Bob Dryden would like LDSOs to be made aware of TAA Inspection Visits.
- 8.2 ELEXON queried whether access statistics were available for Offshore windfarms. The TAA noted that all Offshore wind farm Inspection Visits have been successful.
- 8.3 The TAA noted that the volume of CVA Category one non-compliances raised had increased, as Inspection Visits involved multiple circuits.
- 8.4 The TAA advised that that if Commissioning is undertaken, Category 1.04 non-compliances should significantly reduce. The TAA added that D0215 or D0383 flows are unacceptable and Commissioning records are required for TAA Audits.
- 8.5 A TAMEG Member queried if LDSOs received requests from TAA to access Metering Equipment. The TAA clarified that post P283, the TAA sends an information request and not an access request.
- 8.6 The TAA responded that it is the Registrant's responsibility to advise on site access.

TAMEG38

- 8.7 A TAMEG Member suggested that LDSOs are made aware of the site visit, so that responsible person can be scheduled to attend.
- 8.8 A TAMEG member added that in many instances the LDSO were the only Party that had access to the Metering System. Therefore, the LDSO requires the Supplier to contact them with a request for access. ELEXON added that this is currently sitting under a TAA service improvement change for P283.

9. AOB

9.1 A TAMEG Member displayed interest in attending the CoP4 review Working Group. ELEXON agreed to distribute an invitation.

Action 38.06

10. Next meeting

10.1 Wednesday 16 October 2019 at 10 am at ELEXON.

