

Minutes

Technical Assurance of Metering Expert Group (TAMEG)

Meeting number **TAMEG49**

Venue **Microsoft Teams (Remote)**

Date of meeting **Wednesday 20 April 2022**

Classification Public

Attendees and apologies

Attendees

Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair
Mica Thomas	MT	Technical Secretary
Simon Waltho	SW	Elexon
Christopher Day	CD	Elexon
Lee Walker	LW	Elexon
David Brown	DB	Association of Meter Operators (AMO)
Anthony Hobbs	AH	Siemens (Industry Expert)
Richard Brady	RB	Western Power Distribution (LDSO)
Meg Wong	MW	Stark Software International (HHDC)
Lisa Young	LY	C & C Group (TAA)
Stephen Cuddihey	SC	UK Power Networks (UKPN) (LDSO)
Michael Messenger	MM	IMServ (HHDC)

Apologies

Lorraine Smith	LS	IMServ (MOA)
Andy Hume	AH	IMServ (MOA)
Paul Gregory	PG	C & C Group (TAA)
Warren Lacy	WL	Northern Powergrid (LDSO)
Simon Hagan	SH	IMServ (MOA)
Tom Chevalier	TC	AMO
Holly Mills	HM	EDF Energy (MOA)
Dawn Matthews	DM	UKPN (LDSO)
Jono Liddell	JL	Smartest Energy (Supplier)
Kevin Walker	KW	E.ON Energy (MOA)

1. TAMEG Stats Report (TAMEG49/01)

1.1 Elexon presented details and analysis of:

- the cancellation and no access figures for Technical Assurance Agent (TAA) audits;
- the number of Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA) Main Sample audits resulting in a Category 1¹ or Category 2² Non-compliance for the last five years in which site visits had taken place;
- the number of SVA Desktop Audits resulting in a Category A³ or Category B⁴ Non-compliance for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 audit years;
- the number of CVA (Central Volume Allocation) audits resulting in a Category 1 and Category 2 Non-compliance, year-on-year for the last five years in which site visits took place; and
- options for presenting peer comparisons of the data in the Stats Report, given the likelihood that all performance data would be publicly available in future.

Engagement

1.2 Key Discussions:

- a) A TAMEG Member asked why data for site visits in the 2020-21 Audit Year were not being included in the report. Elexon replied that site visits had been suspended due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The Member suggested that including the figures would give a clear visualisation on the effect that Covid-19 had on failed visits. The Chair advised that this information could be added prior to the stats being published.
- b) Another Member advised that caution should be taken when considering current cancellation rates: the pandemic was still ongoing, and technician resource could be difficult to source for visits at short notice.
- c) Another Member added that there was now a backlog of infrastructure projects for both Transmission and Distribution systems that could result in a shortfall of available technicians for Assurance work.
- d) A Member observed that the current presentation of the stats did not clearly demonstrate variations in the number of audits scheduled each month.
- e) Elexon demonstrated some alternative views of the stats. After further discussion, Elexon took an Action to reformat the visualisations as stacked columns with data labels showing the percentage cancelled and/or no access rates.

SVA Main Sample Non-compliances

1.3 Key Discussions:

- a) A TAMEG Member asked if analysis or stats were available that included the time taken for Non-compliances to be resolved.
- b) Elexon advised that a section within the Annual Report would show the length of long-open Category 1 Non-compliances. This information could be added to future TAMEG Stats Reports. For other Non-compliances, Elexon would need to consider how best to account for Non-compliances also being closed during the initial visit.

SVA Desktop Audit Non-compliances

1.4 Key Discussions:

- a) A TAMEG Member asked if there was any way to highlight the material impact to Settlement of Category 1 and Category A Non-compliances that had been identified. It was understood that this can be challenging as, for long outstanding Non-compliances, this may not be possible until after the final visits for resolution/rectification has taken place. They noted that this would be useful in determining whether the resolution of these Non-compliances was improving Settlement.
- b) Elexon advised that the material impact of each Category 1 Non-compliance would be included in an appendix of the TAA Annual Report, although for long outstanding Non-compliances it may not be possible to calculate materiality until after the final rectification had taken place. They added that gathering this information for Category A Non-compliances presented further challenges as the impact on Settlement could not be confirmed without a further site visit. Elexon confirmed that every Non-compliance found to have an

¹Category 1 - Deemed to be currently affecting the quality of data for Settlement purposes

²Category 2 - Deemed to potentially affect the quality of data for Settlement purposes

³Category A - Deemed to be currently affecting, or to have a high likelihood of affecting, the quality of data for Settlement purposes

⁴Category B - Deemed to have a lower likelihood of affecting the quality of data for Settlement purposes, or for the non-provision of evidence

impact on Settlement would automatically go through the Trading Dispute process, and that the materiality of closed Trading Disputes was given each Quarter in the TAMEG Trading Disputes paper (TAMEG49/02).

- c) A Member noted that some Category As were easily identifiable as having no material impact, for example where documents were named or formatted incorrectly, but the data submitted was correct. The TAA responded that following a review of the categories, these issues had been reclassified as Category B Non-compliances: over 900 audits had been reviewed to confirm they were placed in the correct category.
- d) The Chair asked Elexon to take an action to add the material impact of a Non-compliance to the TAMEG Stats Report.

CVA Non-compliances

1.5 Key Discussions

- a) The Chair asked Elexon to elaborate on why the targeted CVA visits had taken place. Elexon advised that there were anomalies in the Annual Demand Ratios (ADR) for several Grid Supply Point (GSP) Areas. Elexon had asked the TAA to complete a number of targeted inspections of GSP metering and found issues at two sites, both relating to reversed polarity Current Transformers (CTs). One had been incorrect from first registration, whilst the other had been re-wired incorrectly after repairs were made to switchgear. Both were now resolved.
- b) A Member asked if Elexon would consider holding workshops for the Registrants of CVA Metering Systems to help address any gaps in their knowledge. Elexon confirmed they would evaluate the current Registrants and metering issues to see if there was a further requirement for workshops.

Peer Comparison Example Formats

1.6 Key Discussions

- a) A Member queried about the weighting of the stats, given that not all participants completed the same number of audits and that some roles, such as MOA, had a larger number of potential non-compliances than others.
- b) Elexon agreed with this analysis and that there would need to be some form of caveat put into place to ensure that data was represented fairly. They added that this could include noting that the sample size was too small for any comparisons to be drawn between participants' performance.
- c) A member noted that having the raw data available would allow for people to make their own interpretations of the data and put it into different visualisations to meet their needs.

1.7 Actions:

Number	Description	Owner	Relevant Discussions
49.01	Add data for site visits in Audit Year 2020/21 to the TAMEG Stats Report prior to publication.	SIW	1.2(a)
49.02	Present engagement data in the TAMEG Stats Report as stacked columns with data labels showing the percentage cancelled and/or no access rates	SIW	1.2(e)
49.03	Add information on resolution times for Non-compliances to TAMEG Stats Report and Non-compliance tracker	MTH	1.3(b)

49.04	Include the material impact of Non-compliances to the Stats Report where possible	MTH	1.4(d)
-------	---	-----	--------

2. BSC Audit - Periodic and Sample Calibration Report Checks (Verbal Update)

- 2.1 The Chair reported that an agenda item had been added under Issue 93 to discuss Periodic and Sample Calibration Reports. As Elexon had not been receiving these, a work paper would be added to the BSC Audit to ensure that Registrants were complying with this requirement.
- 2.2 A TAMEG Member noted that that they had been forwarding Elexon's requests for this information to their MOA, and would follow up on these to press for a response.

3. AOB

- 3.1 Elexon noted that there had not been many agenda items for recent TAMEG meetings and queried whether members would benefit from meetings being on a need-to-have basis, with smaller workshops and/or workgroup on metering events.
- 3.2 There was general agreement from Members many of the issues discussed would benefit more from a workgroup on Agent performance than a full TAMEG meeting.
- 3.3 A TAMEG Member suggested scheduling placeholder meetings every quarter, and deciding a month beforehand whether to go ahead. If there was nothing to discuss, standing items could then be sent to Members via email.
- 3.4 The Chair proposed TAMEG meeting in person twice yearly, with quarterly meetings pencilled in should any items need to be discussed: rather than the next meeting taking place remotely in July, it would be scheduled for October at the Elexon offices.
- 3.5 Elexon noted that the TAA Annual Report would be presented to PAB at the end of May, so there would likely be a need for a July TAMEG to discuss this.
- 3.6 Elexon took an Action to explore these proposals further.
- 3.7 A TAMEG Member expressed an interest in being involved in any Lessons Learned exercise resulting from the recent high-volume metering errors in the CVA market.
- 3.8 The Chair was happy to explore expanding these discussions into a workgroup setting but would need to check the logistics, particularly with regard to participant confidentiality.
- 3.9 A Member mentioned the recent approval of the Prometer 100, and asked if there were updates on any other approvals, especially given the current issue with meter shortages.
- 3.10 The Chair replied that one provider had recently ceased compliance testing but that Elexon had approved another provider to carry out this work. Several manufacturers were entering meters into this process.

Actions:

Number	Description	Owner	Relevant Discussions
49.05	Explore options for reducing the frequency of TAMEG meetings. Investigate changing the Terms of Reference of the TAMEG to make the meeting more of an operational metering issues forum/workgroup and not just Technical Assurance of Metering (TAM) related issues.	CHD	3.6

49.06	Explore including TAMEG Members in any Lessons Learned exercise resulting from the recent high-volume metering errors in the CVA market	MIS	3.8
-------	---	-----	-----

4. **Actions**

- 4.1 Elexon presented the current open and recently closed actions.
- 4.2 In response to a query from a TAMEG Member on Action 47.04, the TAA provided a list on what is captured within non-compliance category A.5 and agreed this can be made available to TAMEG Members on request.
- 4.3 Members agreed to the closure of actions marked TBC (to be closed).

5. **Next Meeting**

- 5.1 The next meeting would be held remotely on **20 July 2022**