

# MINUTES

---

<b>MEETING NAME</b>	TECHNICAL ASSURANCE OF METERING EXPERT GROUP
---------------------	--

---

<b>Meeting number</b>	40
<b>Date of meeting</b>	15 January 2020
<b>Venue</b>	ELEXON Ltd
<b>Classification</b>	Public

---

## ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

<b>Attendees</b>	Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair
	Keith Phakoe	KP	Technical Secretary
	Michael Taylor	MT	ELEXON
	Christopher Day	CD	ELEXON
	Sedef Kiris	SK	ELEXON
	Lisa Young	LY	C&C (TAA)
	Kevin Walker	KW	EON (MOA)
	Colin Gentleman	CG	SSE (LDSO)
	Holly Mills	HM	EDF Energy (MOA)
	Warren Lacey	WL	Northern Powergrid (LDSO)
	Nick Carter	NC	UKPN (LDSO)
	Richard Brady	RB	WPD (LDSO)
	Dan Rynne	DR	IMServ (MOA)
	Anthony Hobbs	AH	Industry Expert
<b>Apologies</b>	Nicholas Sawyer	NS	Npower (MOA)
	Tom Chevalier	TC	Association of Meter Operators
	Dawn Matthews	DM	UKPN (LDSO)
	Peter Gray	PG	SSE Business Energy (Supplier)

## 1. Non-compliance stats report

- 1.1 A TAMEG member queried why there had been an increase in incorrect Code of Practice (CoP) non-compliances. ELEXON responded that it could be due to incorrect Commissioning records, but could not provide a definitive answer. The Technical Assurance Agent (TAA) agreed to investigate the root causes of incorrect CoPs for the last two years initially.

### ACTION 40.01

- 1.2 ELEXON advised that no access rates had increased in November and December 2019. ELEXON added that two Meter Operator Agents (MOAs) were responsible and that both had claimed that it was because of illness.

# MINUTES

---

## 2. Outstanding Cat 1 Non Compliance Report

2.1 The TAMEG chair noted that at its previous meeting the TAMEG had requested that the Outstanding Category 1 non-compliance report be amended to include a summary of the non-compliance and required next steps.

2.2 ELEXON advised that a significant number of Category 1 non-compliances could not be closed due to insufficient load for Commissioning following rectification.

2.3 The TAMEG had the following queries regarding specific Category 1 non-compliances.

**2016/1600** - Site may have been erroneously noted as de-energised. A TAMEG Member enquired whether there would be a Trading Dispute raised. ELEXON responded that a Trading Dispute is raised for every Category 1 non-compliance.

**2017/1145** - A TAMEG Member enquired why the Trading Dispute was logged as having no materiality if Commissioning was still outstanding. ELEXON responded that no materiality is a Trading Dispute term and may not necessarily mean that there was £0 materiality, but is below the Trading Dispute threshold (i.e. £3,000 or 60MWh of Settlement Error).

**2018/0886** - The TAMEG Member questioned why there was no estimated reads. The TAA explained that the Meter was for a backup supply.

**2018/2093** - The TAMEG Member questioned why the non-compliance was still outstanding. The TAA explained that Commissioning was required to close the non-compliance and should now be achievable. The TAA added that there had previously been issues with access and customer engagement.

**2019/0880** - A TAMEG Member queried whether any energy had been consumed on-site. The TAA advised that the customer had agreed to disconnect the site which will close the non-compliance. ELEXON added that the Trading Dispute team would investigate possible consumption.

**2019/1441** - The TAMEG member enquired why a Category 1 non-compliance was raised if there was low/no load on-site during a TAA audit. The TAA responded that if there was a discrepancy between the metered and measured volumes during the audit, a Category 1 non-compliance would be raised where the auditor could not validate the accuracy of the Meter. In most cases a Category 1 would be raised if there was a discrepancy between the metered and measured volumes and there were also no Commissioning records available.

2.4 The TAMEG member expressed concerns that the TAA did not appear to be proactive in pursuing the closure of Category 1 non-compliances. ELEXON responded that it did not include every attempt made by ELEXON, or the TAA to contact parties pursuing the closure of Category 1 non-compliances as it was a high volume of information that did not add substance to the paper. ELEXON reminded the TAMEG that its role is to highlight market trends and therefore the inclusion of communication history is not required for its meetings.

2.5 A TAMEG member enquired if it was possible to remove Parties control over the rectification process after a period of time, employing a contractor to carry out rectification. ELEXON responded that it would consider the suggestion but added that there was limited scope for putting pressure on Parties, as currently there is no financial incentive for Parties to rectify issues.

2.6 A TAMEG member questioned whether once Qualified, Party Agent Qualification was permanent, or reviewable after a fixed amount of time. ELEXON responded that re-Qualification is currently by self-assessment. ELEXON added that the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) can request re-Qualification if it suspects self-assessment has been completed incorrectly or has concerns regarding the performance of a particular Party Agent.

2.7 ELEXON advised the TAMEG that the rectification process was currently under review, with the intention of implementing milestones. ELEXON aims to provide the TAMEG with an update at its April 2020 meeting.

# MINUTES

---

- 2.8 ELEXON agreed to include a Trading Dispute summary in the Outstanding Category 1 non-compliance report to supplement the Trading Dispute status.

## 3. Introduction Of Category 1.5 non-compliance

- 3.1 A TAMEG member raised concerns that re-categorising Category 1 non-compliances did not address the issue, but rather side-lined them.
- 3.2 A TAMEG member queried whether there was a definition of insufficient load, as it can be subjective. ELEXON responded that there is not an accepted industry standard for "sufficient load" to complete Commissioning. The load required depends on other factors such as the accuracy of the equipment being used to Commission and the amount of energy being measured by the CT when compared to its rated current.
- 3.3 A TAMEG member queried whether Category 1 non-compliances could be downgraded to Category 2. ELEXON responded that there was not currently scope for downgrading Category 1 non-compliances. This is primarily due to a Commissioning record being required to close the non-compliance, without it there was limited assurance that the error had been rectified.
- 3.4 A TAMEG member advised that Category '1a' would be more suitable than Category 1.5.
- 3.5 A TAMEG member noted that Category 1.5 accounted for 'Settlement accuracy resolved status, but non-compliance not resolved'. ELEXON agreed that is what the proposal covered.
- 3.6 A TAMEG member enquired whether 'rectified pending Commissioning' should just be included in the rectification plan. ELEXON noted TAMEG's feedback and will consider it prior to progressing further.

## 4. Trading Disputes Report

- 4.1 A TAMEG member stated that the number of current transformer (CT) mismatches was a concern, also shorted out CTs. Both are affecting Settlements. ELEXON reported that sites commissioned post [P283](#) should have the correct CT ratios programmed.
- 4.2 A TAMEG member asked if this was a SVA report or were there no CVA ones. ELEXON replied that CVA Trading Disputes are identified as 'General' and there were no CVA Metering System Trading Disputes.

## 5. Action 35.01 - Incorrect energisation statuses – Root causes

- 5.1 ELEXON stated that this was still an ongoing action. They had contacted all the relevant parties to investigate, and have tried to capture incorrect data by auditing validation controls.
- 5.2 Root causes include data transfer failures between agents and suppliers, data flows not updated in a timely fashion, and downtime of gateway. Currently there is no control in place to monitor the sites to see if there is a discrepancy or if it is material to the Settlement
- 5.3 The next steps will be in reconciling data from different ELEXON databases in order to show up mismatches for updated data flows and providing this information to all LDSO and IDNOs so they can provide root causes specifically in MPAN granularity. Currently ELEXON have to tell them where there is a difference.
- 5.4 ELEXON attended LDSO sites with the BSC Auditor in order to identify the root causes from a Risk point of view and will be providing an update on the outcomes of this process to TAMEG members via email in the next couple of weeks.
- 5.5 Once root causes have been identified the next step will be to present the results to the Performance Assurance Board (PAB).
- 5.6 A TAMEG member asked if there was a way for the system to tell if an MPAN was disconnected or de-energised. ELEXON reported that it is possible to see if a MPAN is disconnected, energised or de-energised.

# MINUTES

---

- 5.7 ELEXON reported that D0004 is the dataflow that contains information on which of the three statuses the MPAN has. The update above will contain all relevant flows and what they tell us in the Site Visit Codes.

## 6. Action 38.05 – Quality of data within the D0215

- 6.1 ELEXON noted that a previous update had been provided to the TAMEG at its July 2019 (TAMEG38) meeting. ELEXON added that a summary of D0215<sup>1</sup> analysis had been presented to the PAB. The PAB had considered a Technical Assurance of Performance Assurance Parties (TAPAP) audit however, there was not scope in the current Risk Operating Plan (ROP). ELEXON advised that the PAB would have to consider whether there was still appetite for a D0215 TAPAP in the 2020/2021 ROP.
- 6.2 ELEXON noted that a Party had previously attempted to change the data items in the D0215, yet the recommendations were rejected by the Master Registration Agreement (MRA).
- 6.3 ELEXON advised that it intended to undertake analysis on the effectiveness of the D0382<sup>2</sup>, as it is suspected that it was being used incorrectly.
- 6.4 A TAMEG member advised that D0215s had been deemed low impact at a previous TAMEG.
- 6.5 ELEXON responded that should Parties consider the D0215 surplus, then a Party should raise a change to remove it.
- 6.6 The TAMEG agreed to close the current action, but open a new action for ELEXON to provide an update following the decision of the PAB whether to endorse a D0215 TAPAP.

**Action 40.02**

## 7. LDSO TAAMT non-compliance – Verbal

- 7.1 ELEXON advised that it had been highlighted that LDSOs can't see Category 1 non-compliances on the Technical Assurance Agent Management Tool (TAAMT), resulting in issues when attempting to assist in the rectification of non-compliances.
- 7.2 ELEXON proposes allowing LDSOs to view all non-compliances that are related to sites in their portfolio. ELEXON asked TAMEG, notably MOA representatives, whether there were any specific objections to LDSOs viewing this information.
- 7.3 A TAMEG member queried whether this would require any modification to the BSC, or changes to Code Subsidiary Documents. ELEXON responded that no change would be required.
- 7.4 The TAMEG did not have any objections to the recommendations, but ELEXON provided a window until the end of February for members to raise concerns before progressing the TAAMT system change.

## 8. Action 36.05 – Diagrams showing CT polarity

- 8.1 The ELEXON Chair drafted a CoP1 diagram and invited comments from TAMEG. Alterations had been made due to previous TAMEG feedback, e.g. moving the earthing points and putting in VT links. The local means of isolation had been changed to links, and some text was changed (indicated in red on the diagram).
- 8.2 A TAMEG member asked if a 'Common Neutral' was the right terminology for CTs, and suggested instead a 'Common Return'.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Site Technical Details'

<sup>2</sup> 'Rejection Response for Request to LDSO for Site Technical Details'

# MINUTES

---

- 8.3 A TAMEG member noted that a common return could make it hard to identify incorrect wiring on site. Also it gives you multiple points of failure.
- 8.4 The TAMEG chair stated he would begin to draft equivalents for CoPs 2, 3, 5 and 10 in the absence of any other comments.

**Post meeting note:** The TAMEG chair updated the CoP1 diagram with the feedback provided at TAMEG40 and circulated it to TAMEG members.

## 9. Actions

- 9.1 The TAMEG reviewed open actions, updates provided in the Action Log.
- 9.2 31.02 - This action is dependent on Action 31.03.
- 9.3 31.03 - ELEXON is awaiting additional resource in order to progress this action.
- 9.4 32.02 - No update, this is still with the change team.
- 9.5 35.01 - No update, this is an agenda item in the January TAMEG.
- 9.6 35.06 - ELEXON ran the script, found the anomalies and exceptions, and sent them to the industry asking for manual corrections to be done. The script needed to be re-run with the updated SMRS data. It was stated that this error was due to P272 so it should eventually disappear. Update in next TAMEG.
- 9.7 36.05 - CLOSED.
- 9.8 37.05 - ELEXON stated that this was still open but there would be a change of actor internal to ELEXON.
- 9.9 37.06 - ELEXON had investigated and there had been no increase in Cat 1s but an increase in Trading Disputes.
- 9.10 37.07 - ELEXON stated that the changes had been made and distributed. Anyone who was supportive of that change was invited to sponsor the change, otherwise it would join the ELEXON queue of changes. CLOSED.
- 9.11 37.09 - No analysis had been done. CLOSED.
- 9.12 38.03 - The TAA stated that the update had been done, and would be now done regularly, probably every six months. CLOSED.
- 9.13 ELEXON to contact the [Competitive Networks Association](#) (CNA) to obtain a list of IDNO contacts.
- ACTION 40.03**
- 9.14 38.04 - ELEXON stated that the slides had been produced and a new strawman produced for indication. It will be sent out for comments and progressed from there.
- 9.15 38.05 - CLOSED.
- 9.16 38.06 - ELEXON stated that this will hopefully restart in late Q1.
- 9.17 39.01 - The TAA stated that this was still ongoing as further investigation was required.
- 9.18 39.02 - CLOSED as a duplication of 38.04.
- 9.19 39.03 - CLOSED.
- 9.20 39.04 - CLOSED.
- 9.21 39.05 - CLOSED.
- 9.22 39.06 - CLOSED.
- 9.23 39.07 - ELEXON stated that this was still in progress and internal to ELEXON. It would remain open until feedback was available on the change request including an impact assessment with an ETA for delivery.

# MINUTES

---

9.24 39.08 - CLOSED.

## 10. AOB

- 10.1 A TAMEG member asked if there was any update on the change for the CEWE Prometer 100 protocol approval. ELEXON responded that there was no update, but the Central Data Collection Agent (CDCA) was in discussions with the manufacturer to possibly use the manufacturer's software to collect data.
- 10.2 A TAMEG member advised that the CEWE Prometer R was running out of stock and that stock was expected to last until March 2020.
- 10.3 A TAMEG member asked if this was going to be an ongoing problem, and if commercial decisions were causing a problem to the industry. ELEXON responded that they had raised the matter with the CDCA Service Manager and the CDCA. A TAMEG member stated that this was possibly anti-competitive.
- 10.4 A TAMEG member asked if any other manufacturers had requested any information about compliance testing against CoPs 1 or 2. The TAMEG chair stated that he believed there had been two CoP10 applications. Further, there had been discussions with a German manufacturer who wanted to understand the approvals process. The manufacturer had also contacted SGS UK Ltd about testing the Meter for possible Schedule 4 (of SI 1998 No. 1566) listing under the Electricity Act 1989.
- 10.5 A TAMEG member stated that he had had issues with the Schneider wall box hinges, which kept falling off and enquired whether any other Members had encountered this issue. TAMEG agreed that it was an ongoing issue. The hinges were not robust enough to cope, and it had happened numerous times. A TAMEG Member noted that the Health and Safety Executive were involved in finding a solution.
- 10.6 A TAMEG member enquired about the TAM education day agenda. ELEXON replied that the agenda had not been finalised, but the day would cover Desktop Audits and wider pieces around for LDSOs. ELEXON added that more information would be available soon.
- 10.7 A TAMEG member enquired whether the TAA contract had been finalised and whether ELEXON could disclose who had won the contract. ELEXON confirmed that the contract had been awarded, yet required rubber stamping and would not be available to the industry until March 2020.

**ACTION 40.04**

## 11. Next Meeting

- 11.1 The TAMEG Chair noted that the next TAMEG meeting (TAMEG41) was scheduled for Wednesday 15 April 2020, at ELEXON. Due to availability issues for some members the TAMEG members agreed to move the meeting to **Wednesday 22 April 2020**.