

Minutes

MEETING NAME: TECHNICAL ASSURANCE OF METERING EXPERT GROUP (TAMEG)

Meeting number **43**

Venue **ELEXON Ltd**

Date of meeting **21 October 2020**

Classification **Public**

Attendees and apologies

Attendees

Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair
Keith Phakoe	KP	Technical Secretary
Michael Taylor	MT	ELEXON
Christopher Day	CD	ELEXON
Lisa Young	LY	C&C (TAA)
Colin Gentleman	CG	SSE (LDSO)
Warren Lacey	WL	Northern Powergrid (LDSO)
Anthony Hobbs	AH	Industry Expert
Tom Chevalier	TC	Association of Meter Operators
Dawn Matthews	DM	UKPN (LDSO)
Meg Wong	MW	Stark (HHDC)
Richard Brady	RB	WPD (LDSO)
Michael Messenger	DR	IMServ (MOA)

1. **New TAMEG Stats Report (Desktop Audits Results)**

- 1.1 Elexon commented that this was the first prototype of the new stats report and welcomed feedback. Elexon added that the stats report currently only included Desktop Audits, as no Inspection Visits had been completed due to Covid-19.

- 1.2 Elxon noted that Desktop Audits had focused on the Measurement Class E¹ Specific Sample, where the TAA technique was optional due to COVID restrictions. Elxon commented that there had been a positive uptake in the optional Desktop Audits from Half Hourly (HH) Participants. A TAMEG Member noted that there have been no Inspection Visits performed and asked if Elxon would publish the Inspection Visit data separately, or in the same report. Elxon responded that Inspection Visits and Desktop Audits would be published in the same report, but split into different sections. Elxon added that a similar format would be used, which would also be subject to TAMEG feedback.
- 1.3 Elxon noted that the high number of [A1.X](#)² non-compliances observed in June/July 2020, were primarily contributed by two Suppliers. Elxon added that both Supplier performances against A1.X had improved significantly and that initial failings may have been due to unfamiliarity with the process, or resourcing issues due to Covid-19. A TAMEG Member, enquired whether all Suppliers had opted in to the optional Desktop Audits. Elxon responded that approximately 50% of Suppliers had opted in, yet this included a number of the larger Suppliers, as such there was reasonable coverage in terms of MSID count.
- 1.4 A TAMEG Member questioned whether there were any obligations for Participants to hold and make available Single Line Diagrams (SLDs). Elxon responded that SLDs are produced during installation and the requirement to provide them was covered in evidence submission obligations in [BSCP27](#)³.
- 1.5 A TAMEG Member noted that Licensed Distribution System Operators (LDSOs) typically hold SLDs, rather than the Supplier. A TAMEG Member added that it was difficult to source the SLD following a request from the Supplier within the required Service Level Agreements (SLA). A TAMEG Member advised that it would be more appropriate for SLD obligations to sit with the LDSO. The TAMEG agreed.
- 1.6 A TAMEG Member noted that if the SLD requirement was not present in the Codes of Practice (CoPs), they should not be required for Desktop Audits. Elxon responded that SLDs assist the Technical Assurance Agent (TAA) auditor in providing the most robust remote assessment possible, as such there is value in the SLD being provided. Elxon added that the requirements for SLD submission were outlined in the Desktop Audit Local Working Instruction (LWI), yet these will be amended to allow for generic SLDs to be submitted for Low Voltage (LV) sites. Site specific SLDs were still required for High Voltage (HV) sites.
- 1.7 A TAMEG Member noted that, as an LDSO, site specific SLDs that meet the requirements outlined in the Desktop Audit LWI, may not be produced during installation. Elxon noted that the value of Desktop Audit evidence requirements were open to discussion, following the availability of more data from the completion of Desktop Audits. A TAMEG Member (Warren Lacey) agreed to take an action to investigate what SLDs were produced at installation phase.

ACTION 43.01

- 1.8 A TAMEG Member enquired why Suppliers were required to submit the [D0268](#)⁴, as only the Meter Operator Agent (MOA) and Half Hourly Data Collector (HHDC) D0268s were used for Settlement purposes. Elxon responded that Settlement processes required the D0268 to be sent to the Supplier. Elxon added that Desktop Audits validated whether Participants held the same data, whilst Suppliers' D0268s may not be directly involved in Settlement, if incorrect information was held it indicates process failures.
- 1.9 A TAMEG Member noted that the Desktop Audit LWI was clear, but Participants were still sending HH data to the TAA in an incorrect format. Elxon acknowledge that this appeared to be the case and noted that it would be producing a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document to supplement the Desktop Audit LWI. Furthermore, Elxon would be looking to update the Technical Assurance Agent Management Tool (TAAMT) so that once one Participant had submitted Settlement data, the dates for the HH data submitted would be visible by other Participants.
- 1.10 A TAMEG Member enquired what constituted a D0268 mismatch. Elxon replied that any mismatch on Data Items across the Supplier, DC, or MOA D0268s would result in a D0268 mismatch. Elxon added that a mismatch non-compliance would be raised for all three Parties, as the auditor would be unable to validate which Data Item in the D0268s was correct.

¹ Measurement Class E - Half Hourly Metering Equipment at below 100kW Premises with current transformer

² A1.X - Registrant failed to confirm or complete Desktop Audit notification non-compliance

³ 'Technical Assurance of Half Hourly Metering Systems for Settlement Purposes'

⁴ 'Half Hourly Meter Technical Details'.

- 1.11 A TAMEG Member enquired whether future reports would include a view of non-compliances over time. Exelon responded that it would be investigating this, yet, as the Desktop Audit data was currently only available since June, it had not been included in this stats report.
- 1.12 Exelon noted that poor performance around Commissioning record retention was likely exacerbated by [P272](#)⁵. A TAMEG Member added that low retention of Commissioning records was likely impacted by failure for MOAs to transfer records following a Change of Agent event. A TAMEG member asked how many LDSOs had opted into the Desktop Audits. The TAA responded that all but one of the LDSOs had opted into the audits, and all Independent Distribution Network Operators (IDNOs) had opted in to the audits.
- 1.13 Exelon noted that a new non-compliance would be added to account to [D0215](#)⁶ mismatches. A TAMEG Member noted that some data items in the D0215, such as measurement transformer ratios, were optional, as such were not included as standard. Exelon responded that measurement transformer ratio data items were optional to account for Whole Current Meters and that measurement transformer ratios should be included where available⁷. A TAMEG Member noted that a Customer may request a different measurement transformer ratio following the distribution of the D0215. Exelon responded that the expectation is that following a change of ratio, an updated D0215 would be re-distributed⁸.
- 1.14 A TAMEG Member queried whether Desktop Audits validated that the MPAN was in the correct Measurement Class. Exelon responded that it did not currently provide this check, but would take an action to investigate adding it into the process.

ACTION 43.02

2. TAM Headline Report

- 2.1 Exelon enquired whether the TAMEG saw value in the Desktop Audit process and endorsed the widening of the scope to Measurement Class C⁹. A TAMEG Member responded that whilst there were areas of the process that needed improving, there was value in the process. The TAMEG agreed.
- 2.2 A TAMEG Member noted that parties that opted in would have different audit results than those who had abstained. Exelon responded that it would be seeking the Performance Assurance Board's (PAB's) approval to make Desktop Audits mandatory, to mitigate this.

3. Removal of Pre-[P283](#) Calibration Certificate Non-compliances – Discussion

- 3.1 A TAMEG Member enquired whether the proposal included Commissioning record non-compliances. Exelon responded that the proposal only included Metering Equipment Calibration Certificates.
- 3.2 A TAMEG Member enquired whether only Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA) was included in proposal, or was Central Volume Allocation (CVA) considered. Exelon responded that it would include both, as the proposal was to reflect the reality that pre-[P283](#)¹⁰ certificates were no longer available. Subsequent changes to timescales and the implementation of data flows were [BSCP514](#)¹¹ changes so were SVA only changes.
- 3.3 A TAMEG Member noted that changes may be required to the CoPs. Exelon responded that non-compliances were assigned based on the obligations at the time of the audit, no changes would be required to remove the non-compliances. A change of requirement to hold Metering Equipment Calibration Certificates was already implemented. The Commissioning party is now responsible for holding Calibration Certificates as opposed to the MOA.
- 3.4 After a discussion, Exelon resolved to draw up a list of risks associated with removing the SVA CoPs 3 and 5 non-compliances to see how that impacted the numbers, and distribute it ex-committee to the TAMEG for comment. A TAMEG member pointed out that work had been done to add to the National Measurement Transformer Error Statement (NMTES), which would help LDSOs and MOAs to clear some of the non-

⁵ 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'

⁶ 'Provision of Site Technical Details'

⁷ This is outlined in Section 28.2 of the Master Registration Agreement (MRA)

⁸ See [CP1225](#) 'Review of D0215 'Provision of Site Technical Details' and surrounding processes'

⁹ Half Hourly metered in 100kW Premises

¹⁰ 'Reinforcing the Commissioning of Metering Equipment Processes'

¹¹ 'SVA Meter Operations for Metering Systems Registered in SMRS'

compliances, but the latest data for inclusion hasn't progressed for some time (Action 31.02). Exelon pointed out that resource was finite, and it was part of a large amount of work that needed to be done.

ACTION 43.03

4. Impact of Target Operating Model (TOM) on the TAM, TAAMT and TAMEG

- 4.1 Exelon presented several slides on this topic, including moving to 'Agile' ways of working. They stated that this new way of working was currently in the design stage, with the first large task (TAAMT2 delivery) being aimed for April 2021 delivery. It was not looking at a completely new area of reporting. High level TAAMT2 is the first step in the creation of an Agile Product Backlog that will be used to implement a more proactive continuous improvement process. TAMEG made advisory comments about PAB expertise, and the renaming of the action to bring this in line with other 'Agile' processes. Next steps will include a live product backlog for review.
- 4.2 A TAMEG Member noted that the PAB preferred to defer technical decisions to the TAMEG. Exelon responded that it would still be using the TAMEG as an advisory group, but would be looking to widen its scope to help drive improvements.

5. Actions

- 5.1 **Action 31.02.** A TAMEG Member enquired how this action can be escalated, as it has been outstanding for a while. Exelon responded that as part of the TOM work discussed previously, more emphasis is put on prioritisation. Exelon added that such a prioritisation could be employed for TAMEG actions. Action remains open.
- 5.2 **Action 32.02.** There was no change. A TAMEG member felt there was some overlap on obsolete metering, while another felt there was an overlap with [CP1527¹²](#). This action was closed.
- 5.3 **Action 35.01.** An update was produced, looking into LDSO procedures and the root causes for any problems that may have arisen. TAMEG members had issues around what this data represented. They weren't sure what the data was telling them, and whether or not there were examples to look at. TAMEG members interpreted what was being asked for in different ways when first canvassed for the number of HV MPANs registered as de-energised versus the number that were actually (physically) still energised. Exelon then resolved to look at root causes as to why there could be mismatches between them.
- 5.4 **Action 35.06.** Exelon noted that it would be running the SQL script that generates the [CoP10¹³](#) and Measurement Class C outliers within the next quarter and present the findings at the next TAMEG meeting. Action to remain open.
- 5.5 **Action 37.05.** Action Closed, as work captured in the TAM backlog and given a high priority status.
- 5.6 **Action 38.04.** Work completed as part of the new TAMEG stats report. Action Closed.
- 5.7 **Action 38.06.** This action was closed. The invitation to a TAMEG member has been sent.
- 5.8 **Action 39.01.** This is being reinstated. Exelon could find no reason not to carry this out, and asked TAMEG if they had any reason not to reintroduce the Outstation clock check. They did not. Action Closed.
- 5.9 **Action 39.07.** This action was closed as the change went in to TAAMT in May 2020, and LDSOs are now to be informed of any TAA Site Inspections.
- 5.10 **Action 40.01** The TAA provided an update on the root causes of non-compliances associated with incorrect CoPs. The decision was made to close this action. A TAMEG Member requested that analysis is sent to TAMEG members following the meeting.
- 5.11 **Action 40.02.** PAB did not currently plan to include a TAPAP on the D0215 in the Risk Operating Plan (ROP). Action Closed. A TAMEG Member noted that they were currently drafting a report on the value of D0215s.
- 5.12 A TAMEG Member enquired how long a D0215 should be retained. Exelon responded for the lifetime of the Metering System.

¹² 'Increase the minimum data storage capacity for Settlement Outstations and mandate specific selectable integration periods for Metering Codes of Practice'

¹³ 'Code of Practice for the metering of energy via low voltage circuits for Settlement purposes'

6. AOB

- 6.1 A TAMEG Member requested an update on the Prometer 100 Meter type. Elexon responded that the Central Data Collection Agent (CDCA) had not applied for protocol approval yet, despite the manufacturer agreeing to cover the costs.
- 6.2 A TAMEG Member requested an update from the issue group, which is discussing electronic registration process for CVA. A TAMEG Member replied that an arrangement about CVA metering was being looked at by Elexon in parallel to create something to facilitate the process so the side group had stopped discussing it.
- 6.3 A TAMEG Member noted it was drafting a report around a high number of [D0384](#)¹⁴ flows being received and will be submitting a paper with Western Power Distribution (WPD) by the end of October.
- 6.4 A TAMEG Member raised concerns around National Grid's scheme around Reactive Energy Balancing Service provision and the implications around the accurate metering at poor power factors. A TAMEG Member enquired whether changes would impact the CoPs.
- 6.5 A TAMEG Member informed the group about the Issue Group starting in January 2021 to discuss perceived ambiguities within the CoPs and find solutions to them, which can be implemented.
- 6.6 Elexon reminded TAMEG Members that there is an [Issue 88](#)¹⁵ Request for Information (RFI) out, related to complex sites and netting.
- 6.7 A TAMEG Member mentioned the Change Proposal (CP) ([CP1530](#)¹⁶) on measurement transformers which had been reissued. It involves creating a valid set of Voltage Transformers (VT) and Current Transformers (CT) ratios to be held on the Elexon Portal. It is back out for review based on changes Elexon have made.
- 6.8 Elexon advised the next TAMEG meeting date would be 20 January 2021.

¹⁴ 'Notification of Commissioning Status'

¹⁵ 'Clarification of BSC Arrangements relating to Complex Sites'

¹⁶ 'Introduction of a formalised process for the validation of measurement transformer ratios by Elexon'