

Minutes

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

Meeting number **47**

Venue **Remote**

Date of meeting **20 October 2021**

Classification **Public**

Attendees and apologies

Attendees

Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair
Mica Thomas	MT	Technical Secretary
Christopher Day	CD	Elexon
Simon Waltho	SW	Elexon
Lisa Young	LY	C&C (TAA)
Dawn Matthews	DM	UKPN (LDSO)
Colin Gentleman	CG	SSE (LDSO)
Warren Lacey	WL	Northern Powergrid (LDSO)
Antony Hobbs	AH	Industry Expert
Meg Wong	MW	Stark (HHDC)
Richard Brady	RB	WPD (LDSO)
Dan Rynne	DR	EDF (MOA)
Kevin Walker.	KW	E.ON (MOA)

Apologies

Tom Chevalier	TC	Association of Meter Operators
Holly Mills	HM	EDF (MOA)
Lorraine Smith	LS	IMServ (MOA)

Attendees and apologies

Jono Liddell	JL	Smartest Energy (Supplier)
Michael Slater	MSL	Total Gas & Power (Supplier)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The TAMEG Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and noted those that had sent apologies. The Chair invited members to introduce themselves.

2. TAMEG Stat Report (TAMEG47/01)

2.1 Desktop Audits Specific Sample - Supplier Category B Non-Compliance Summary

- 2.1.1 Following a question sent by a Group Member via e-mail, Elexon asked members if they had a view on recording Suppliers' non-provision of a D0268¹ as a B.1X² non-compliance.
- 2.1.2 Elexon advised that the point of the Desktop Audit is to ensure that all Parties that are involved have access to the same information. If the Supplier holds different information to what the Data Collector (DC) or Meter Operator Agent (MOA) has access to, there is a breakdown within the process that has not been identified.
- 2.1.3 Elexon added that a Party had raised a change request under the Retail Energy Code (REC) for 'Supplier to Supplier' instances of Meter Technical Details (MTDs), and that it was still in the early stages of the change request process. If the change request is progressed that would provide credence to checking that the Supplier has the correct details.

2.2 Desktop Audits - Meter Operator Agent (MOA) Non-Compliances

- 2.2.1 A TAMEG Member asked for clarification on whether the report was for Central Volume Allocation (CVA) or Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA). The terminology used indicates this is for SVA market but this is not highlighted clearly. Elexon confirmed that the report was in relation to SVA: Desktop Audits did not take place for the CVA market.

2.3 Desktop Audits – Half Hourly Meter Operator Agent (HHMOA) Category A Non-Compliance Summary

- 2.3.1 One MOA, MOA12, had 30 non-compliances in category A.6M³. A Group Member clarified that this was due to the Meter manufacturer's software retrieving the data to a different granularity than required for the Desktop Audit process (kWh).
- 2.3.2 The point was raised that the high number of mismatches were due to incorrect submissions related to granularity of data and not a mismatch between the two sets of data themselves. Elexon stated that it could look at whether a mismatch in granularity should be downgraded from a category A to a category B. Elexon also noted the existing guidance on the data submission process. As this is a Desktop Audit, Elexon advised that, unlike a category 1, a category A does not necessarily affect Settlement but there is a likelihood of impacting Settlement.

2.4 Desktop Audits – Half Hourly Data Collector (HHDC) Category A Non-Compliance Summary

- 2.4.1 There was a larger number of non-compliances in Category A.6C⁴ recorded for one HHDC in comparison to others. Elexon asked if this was due to the same root cause as the MOA12 data mismatch or if it related to a different issue. The DC confirmed that this was the same root cause as the previous issue.
- 2.4.2 Elexon advised that as Desktop Audits were not mandatory for the period this data set is from, and Site Visits were suspended, the Desktop Audit participant numbers has been inconsistent with some participants completing more Desktop Audits than others. As Desktop Audits are now mandatory, these will even out.
- 2.4.3 Elexon suggested adding an indication or caveat on the report and slides to show the proportion of errors found against the number of Desktop Audits completed per participant. This would be a fairer way to have the stats

¹ 'Half Hourly Meter Technical Details'

² 'D0268 not provided'

³ 'Settlement data mismatch'

⁴ 'Settlement data mismatch'

presented, and prevent an impression of bad performance where a large number of Desktop Audits had been completed by one participant.

ACTION 47.01 (SW)

- 2.4.4 A Member observed that if this was done by percentages and a party only completed one audit, the statistics would show a 100% failure rate if there was something wrong. Elexon agreed to take this into account and look into the fairest way to represent this, adding in some caveats where there are samples are small enough to affect the representation of the data.
- 2.4.5 A Member asked how they could know which party reference belonged to their organisation: when looking at the chart they were not able to easily detect which party member was which. Elexon advised that this was something that can be notified to individual parties upon request, and agreed to send the Member their information.

ACTION 47.02 (SW)

2.5 Desktop Audit - HHDC Category B Non-Compliance Summary

- 2.5.1 The Chair raised concerns that D0268's were not being provided.
- A Member advised that as all D0268s should be held electronically they were concerned that some parties were having issues submitting D0268s. Elexon took an Action to further investigate the common issues with sending a D0268, as the root cause for this could not be determined without further investigation.

ACTION 47.03 (SW)

- 2.5.2 A Member noted that they always provided D0268s but they are still categorised as non-compliant, this can potentially be due to the MOA failing to send it.
- 2.5.3 Elexon advised that the omission of a D0268 from one party should not result in a non-compliance for omission where another party hasn't provided the D0268. With a mismatch there was a holding non-compliance status as without the MOA sending the D0268 it could not be compared to the DC one.

2.6 Desktop Audit – Licensed Distribution system operator (LDSO) Category A Non-Compliance Summary

- 2.6.1 The Chair asked whether, with measurement transformer ratio mismatches, particular sites would be targeted to confirm whether the Meter's programmed ratio or the Current Transformer's (CT's) ratio was correct.
- 2.6.2 Elexon advised that there was a process for specific Category A non-compliances, including measurement transformer ratio mismatches, where the Technical Assurance Agent (TAA) would recommend a site audit. There was currently a backlog of these, but now site visits had recommenced following COVID-19, they will be targeted through this process.
- 2.6.3 A Member asked what could potentially make a commissioning sheet suspect and asked who determined this.
- 2.6.4 Elexon advised it could be that there is a mismatch of the ratio, the TAA will look into all submitted evidence from each role and if there is inconsistencies or the calculations don't make sense they will mark this as suspect data. This is the responsibility of the TAA in their role as auditor.
- 2.6.5 A Member advised it could also be the accuracy class or the Meter fuse rating, not only the CT ratio mismatches. This step of the process was to question if it was correct.
- 2.6.6 Another Member argued that some of the issues recorded as non-compliances were not likely to change the measurements the Meter records: for example, the submission of the wrong fuse size was not really going to affect the Meter accuracy. The Member noted that this can be seen as misleading, suggesting something is wrong with the actual measurement of the Meter when the issue can be something as small as a typing error that does not affect the data set.
- 2.6.7 The Chair suggested that the TAA provide a list of what they are picking out so that it can be analysed further.

ACTION 47.04 (LY)

- 2.6.8 A Member requested for clarity on an A.5R⁵ and what this entailed. Elexon advised that this was suspect data from the commissioning data provided by the LDSO (this was what the 'R' indicated in the category name).

⁵ 'Suspect data on Commissioning evidence provided'

Elxon agreed to discuss this with the auditors to obtain a further understanding of what was recorded against this category. Elxon added there was a similar precedent in the site audit non-compliances in which headline non-compliances were then placed into sub-categories. During a Desktop Audit, this was usually avoided but a list of what is recorded can be requested to confirm if it was appropriate to be under Category A. The Chair advised this would then be discussed with TAMEG to ensure it was appropriate, after which an update to the guidance would be completed.

3. BSCP40 form for D0215 Issue Group (TAMEG 47/02)

- 3.1 Several TAMEG Members noted that they were glad that the Issue has been proposed.
- 3.2 A Member noted that the form mentioned D0142s⁶, which they did not think were the root cause of the issue. They argued that some MOAs would issue a D0170⁷ to an LDSO for every new Metering System Identifier (MSID) added to their portfolio, sometimes sending multiple requests, even though this was not a BSC requirement. Another Member replied that it was mandatory for MOAs to issue a D0170 for new connections. The first Member clarified that they knew of this occurring in other situations, for example on a Change of Supplier.
- 3.3 A Member observed that one MOA's operating system had an option that allowed for an MOA to automatically send a D0170 to the LDSO on receipt of a D0155⁸ data flow where they had not been previously appointed to an MSID. Another Member replied that a D0170 was mandatory only for new connections, and that, in their experience, the vast majority of requests were not made in line with the requirements set out in the BSC or a BSCP.
- 3.4 A Member noted that the requirements that were previously governed under BSCP514⁹ are now under the REC Metering Operations Schedule and advised that a MOA could request a D0215 from the LDSO at any point during their appointment. Some MOAs preferred to do so when appointed to a new MSID as they judged the LDSO, as equipment owner, more likely to hold accurate data with regards to CTs and Voltage Transformers (VT). The member added that they would not operate this as a mandatory process within their own organisation.
- 3.5 **Post meeting note:** [CP1225](#)¹⁰ was implemented on 6 November 2008 and introduced the option, in [BSCP515](#)¹¹, to request a D0215 from the LDSO:
- "If required, and at any time after a new connection (and only for MSIDs first registered after 6 November 2008), the SVA MOA may make further requests for Site Technical Details from the LDSO, in which case the LDSO shall respond by sending a D0215 'Provision of Site Technical Details' or D0382 'Rejection Response for Request to LDSO for Site Technical Details' within 5WD."
- A similar footnote was added to BSCP514:
- "If required, and at any time after the effective date of the MOA's appointment (and only for MSIDs first registered after 6 November 2008), the MOA may request Site Technical Details by sending a D0170 'Request for Metering System Related Details' to the LDSO. The LDSO shall respond within 5 WD of such requests by sending a D0215 'Provision of Site Technical Details' or D0382 'Rejection Response for Request to LDSO for Site Technical Details' either by electronic means or by another method, as agreed with the MOA. The MOA shall determine any appropriate course of action within 2 WD of receiving this information."
- The D0382 rejection response was added under [CP1495](#)¹² for cases where the LDSO did not hold a D0215 for a site or was not obliged (i.e. pre 6 November 2008) to provide the information dependant on when the Metering System was first registered.
- 3.6 A Member asked if MOAs order Meters based on D0215s¹³ or await for a D0142. A Member responded that in their experience they did not usually order Meters until they have received a D0142. Another Member added that if LDSOs received a high amount of requests under optional provisions in the footnote of BSCP514, then they would still receive a high number of requests if the optional provision was moved elsewhere. If appointed

⁶ 'Request for Installation or Change to a Metering System Functionality or the Removal of All Meters'

⁷ 'Request for Metering System Related Details'

⁸ 'Notification of Meter Operator or Data Collector Appointment and Terms'

⁹ 'SVA Meter Operations for Metering Systems Registered in SMRS' (obsolete)

¹⁰ 'Review of D0215 'Provision of Site Technical Details' and surrounding processes'

¹¹ 'Licensed Distribution'

¹² 'Introduction of a rejection response dataflow for a D0170 'Request for Meter System Related Details' request from the Meter Operator Agent to the Licensed Distribution System Operator where a D0215 'Provision of Site Technical Details' response is required'

¹³ 'Provision of Site Technical Details'

to a new MSID the D0215 will have no new information unless the Supplier requests for the MOA to reconfigure the Meter.

- 3.7 Elexon advised that the D0383¹⁴ is available for this information if utilised correctly, as it shares similar information and is more accurate, a Member agreed and added that if CTs/VTs are replaced by the LDSO they will need to be Commissioned and an updated D0383 will be required.
- 3.8 A Member advised they would like to retain the D0215 for two purposes. Firstly, for changes to the Metering Equipment by the LDSO where they attended site without the MOA. Secondly, for the purpose of investigation, for example, if there is an adopted Meter with unknown measurement transformer ratios, in which case it would be useful to have the LDSO provide a second opinion before there is a site visit. This would not be for a large number of MSIDs (tens or hundreds rather than thousands) and the quality of data should improve with a smaller number of requests.
- 3.9 A Member asked if a D0383 could not be used in this case, as this is for Commissioning data whereas the D0215 is for Site Technical Details. A Member added that the D0215 is not always accurate as the flow is more dated. The Member, that asked the initial question, advised that the LDSO is not responsible for Commissioning measurement transformers prior to 6 November 2014. For post-P283¹⁵ measurement transformers this information would be available as it is covered as part of the TAA audit. From an industry perspective the Member had more trust in the D0383 than the D0215. Another Member agreed with this.
- 3.10 A Member queried if a D0215 was mandatory where the CTs/VTs were changed. Elexon confirmed that it was (Post meeting note: see CP1225).
- 3.11 A Member asked if the D0215 can be decommissioned. Another Member responded that it was an option. MOAs process the D0215s but do not always use the data due to the large volume received. This was one of the reasons for seeking a wider input. If the D0215 had no value for MOAs then either value would need to be added or the flow should be removed. Another Member agreed that the D0215 should be decommissioned if there was no value.
- 3.12 Elexon advised that there was a discussion around this a few years ago at the Issue Resolution Expert Group (IREG). Some Non-Half Hourly (NHH) market participants did use the D0215 for some fields. Many of those fields had been moved over to the D0383, but Supply Voltage ([J0443](#)) was not available in any other flow.
- 3.13 Another Member noted that another option was to keep the D0215 for the mandatory information (MSID or MPAN Core ([J0003](#)), Supply Voltage, Supply Capacity ([J0456](#)) and Number of Phases ([J0427](#)) only. They suggested discussing this further outside of TAMEG.

4. A.O.B (Any Other Business)

- 4.1 A member advised that the Technical Assurance Agent Management Tool (TAAMT) had improved from a dashboard point of view. However, when attempting to reconcile all of the non-compliances against the dashboard there was challenges as you have various configurable views.
- 4.2 Another member added that with the physical site audits the tool did not show the non-compliances. Although they were aware that there were non-compliances outstanding, they could not locate them. Elexon advised that this was an issue with that user's specific login of TAAMT and not a wider system issue.
- 4.3 A different Member advised they have had issues where numerous non-compliances are being sent but there is no way to clear these up as they were not seen as valid. The Member advised that it would be beneficial to have a filter option added so that the dashboard can be filtered by participant such as LDSO or Supplier.
- 4.4 The Chair proposed raising an action to speak to the TAA and any parties that are experiencing issues with the TAAMT portal.
- 4.5 Elexon advised that the issues had been noted and a majority had already been dealt with. A similar issue to this, reported historically, was resolved by using a different browser. TAAMT is not supported in all browsers, and this information would be added to the guidance for the TAAMT tool. The question around filters was an improvement request rather than a defect.
- 4.6 Elexon asked if it was difficult to view specific non-compliances. The Member responded that they were able to reconcile all the Desktop Audits, but had issues with audits that were before the Desktop Audit start date in

¹⁴ 'Notification of Commissioning Information'

¹⁵ 'Reinforcing the Commissioning of Metering Equipment Processes'

2020. There was no way to see a record of the non-compliances. The TAA were able to manually provide this information. However, the Member would prefer for this to be available on the TAAMT portal.

- 4.7 Elexon confirmed that their plan was to bring suggested improvements to the TAAMT to TAMEG for discussion through the product backlog presented at a previous meeting. They reminded members that it was important to distinguish between improvements and defects, which would be managed through the existing TAA Service Desk process.
- 4.8 A Member asked if there was any update on Meter approvals. The Chair replied that the Central Data Collection Agent (CDCA) was currently testing the protocol for a new Meter (Prometer 100), but this has also been delayed by the need to obtain legal advice around the password length the Meter uses.

5. Actions

- 5.1 **35.06** Action to remain open as Elexon were still awaiting for SMRS data. Elexon agreed to send figures out ex-committee.
- 5.2 **44.02** Action closed following paper 47/02.
- 5.3 **45.01** Action to remain open. Elexon agreed to look into adding a caveat for the data proportions to prevent misrepresentation of a large number of non-compliances that result from a large number of audits.
- 5.4 **45.03** Action to remain open. Elexon agreed to speak to parties concerned individually in regards to issues with providing this data.
- 5.5 **45.04** Action to remain open, to be discussed under Issue 93.
- 5.6 **45.06** Action to remain open.
- 5.7 **45.07** Action to remain open. Elexon agreed the affected category in the Trading Dispute report would be updated.
- 5.8 **46.01** Action to remain open. The TAA agreed to investigate further.
- 5.9 **46.02** Action to be closed.
- 5.10 **46.03** Action to remain open. The TAA indicated they would undertake further investigation alongside Elexon.
- 5.11 **46.04** Action to be closed.
- 5.12 **46.05** Action to remain open.
- 5.13 **46.06** Action to be closed.
- 5.14 **46.07** Action to remain open.
- 5.15 **46.08** Action to remain open.

6. Next meeting

- 6.1 The TAMEG agreed that the next meeting should be held remotely on 19 January 2022 at 10.00 and that future meetings could be held in person (subject to any COVID-19 restrictions) on alternate meeting dates (e.g. April 2022 in person, July 2022 remotely, etc.).