



TAMEG 09 Minutes

Meeting Name	TAMEG
Date of Meeting	16 March 2011
Meeting Number	9
Venue	ELEXON Ltd, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

Attendees	Keith Champion	KC	Chairman
	Alastair Barnsley	AB	
	Jane Buxton	JB	
	Tom Chevalier	TC	
	Ron Cook	RC	
	Matt Day	MD	
	Colin Gentleman	CG	
	Jade Thomas	JT	
	Tony Rabone	TR	
	Paul Gregory	PG	Technical Assurance Agent
	Megan Bennie	MB	ELEXON
Mike Smith	MS	ELEXON	

Apologies

Aaron Seamer

1. Review of Actions Log (Verbal)

- 1.1 **Action 3:** It was agreed that this action would be removed from the list as its purpose was unclear.
- 1.2 **Action 6:** KC noted that this was underway and should therefore be closed.
- 1.3 **Action 31:** KC advised that information from TAPAP checks would be fed in and a contact list for LDSOs and MOPs prepared.
- 1.4 **Action 5.4:** It was agreed that this action could be closed and any comments fed into the TAM review.
- 1.5 **Action 6.1:** PG noted that he had provided some information on pre-Audit visits to ELEXON and summarised it for the group. It was agreed that KC would circulate this information to the TAMEG then close the action. KC advised that the PAB would be updated with number of pre-Audit visits.
- 1.6 TC noted that numbers of pre-Audit visits were higher than he expected. MS noted that even though numbers of visits were high, it was not certain that work was being carried out on each one and that there was no harm in a visit taking place to make sure a site was in order and could be safely accessed. CG



queried what the TAA did to pick up on visits that had been genuinely planned in advance. PG advised that when notifying checks, the TAA asks if any work is planned.

- 1.7 **Action 6.2:** It was noted that the TAA contract had been extended but the TAM review was still on track (though it may not include BSCP27). It was agreed to leave this action on hold.
- 1.8 **Action 6.6:** KC noted that this was covered in the changes the TAA had been asked to cost up and an update would be provided at a subsequent meeting.
- 1.9 **Action 7.5:** It was agreed that this action should be closed.
- 1.10 **Action 8.01:** It was agreed that this action should be closed.
- 1.11 **Action 8.03:** It was agreed that this action should be closed.
- 1.12 **Action 8.04:** KC noted that ELEXON had circulated this information. High voltage sites were part of the normal sample and not showing any particular trends therefore the action was to be closed.
- 1.13 **Action 8.05:** This had been completed so it was agreed that it should be closed.
- 1.14 **Action 8.06:** It was agreed to leave this action open pending an update.
- 1.15 **Action 8.07:** It was noted that this action was an agenda item for the meeting.
- 1.16 **Action 8.08:** KC advised that ELEXON would await RC providing some guidance and combine it with that provided by the TAA in time for the next TAMEG meeting in June.
- 1.17 **Action 8.09:** KC advised that the BSC Auditor had been asked to check which specifications LDSOs were referring to for CT and VTs. This was also being carried out on TAPAP checks.

2. Minutes of Meeting 08 (Verbal)

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.

3. NMTES (Verbal)

- 3.1 KC noted that RC had sent in data that had lead to a change. He queried how much data could be expected in the future. RC advised that he would be providing lots of data in the future, including a large chunk in the near future. KC queried if PG could identify which Non Compliance each piece of RC's data related to. PG advised that he could not.
- 3.2 KC queried whether there were any quick wins regarding outstanding non compliances. RC advised that this was the case and that there was already information around certificates. TC suggested that AMO members

are unlikely to review outstanding certificate non compliances due to value and cost. KC noted that this would be very disappointing given the amount of work that has gone into the issue over the past two years.

- 3.3 PG took an action to get the data RC referred to then compare to a TAAMT list. KC noted that significant work had gone into the process of updating the NMTES, especially by RC, and further noted his disappointment in the potential lack of engagement for MOAs.
- 3.4 KC agreed to look at the data recently provided by RC and compare that with data from TAAMT and TAMs (to be provided by PC). Where there is a match KC agreed to arrange for the associated non compliances removed.

Action: PG/KC/9.1

4. Update on TAPAP Audits (Verbal)

- 4.1 KC noted that the programme had been delayed but that all audits were now completed. ELEXON would be feeding results back to the PAB in April. The main issue was still communication, as well as issues around completion of commissioning records.
- 4.2 The TAMEG discussed communication across areas of work. BD noted that BSCP27 had been written at a time when the Industry was more unified and less out of area work was required compared to now. AB said that he felt the BSC did not accurately reflect the current environment and needed a root and branch review.
- 4.3 BD suggested that the Meter Operator Code of Practice Agreement could be involved – it could be the right vehicle for a solution.
- 4.4 KC suggested that as an approach to this issue it may be helpful to provide TAMEGs views for its April meeting.
- 4.5 TR agreed to work on some wording for a solution proposal and circulate it to the rest of the TAMEG.

Action: TR/9.2

5. Update on ENA Concerns (Verbal)

- 5.1 The COG Chair Tony McEntee has responded to ELEXON with his view that the TAMEG hadn't addressed the ENA's issues in its workshop at the previous meeting. As a result ELEXON and the TAA were invited to attend the COG meeting of 8 February 2011 and had learned that there were concerns around the quality of Metering Systems: the COG did not feel that issues were being picked up by the TAA but were being picked up by people's investigations into their own HV sites. A number of Disputes had been raised and were upheld by the TDC. ELEXON advised the COG that it felt the issues would have been picked up had the sites



in question been selected for TAA visits. ELEXON had been invited to work with the ENA to develop a possible future change. There had been discussions around cost recovery mechanisms for those responsible for errors and introducing a DCUSA auditing process.

- 5.2 TC noted that there were already BSC and MOCOPA auditing process and nothing had been raised through them. He suggested that the ENA should raise a change via those processes rather than starting a new audit process and a potential duplication of work.
- 5.3 BD queried why people had started investigating their own HV sites. KC advised that he understood the driver to be loss of DUoS income.
- 5.4 JB felt that TA issues were being confused with commissioning issues and the TAA being used as an excuse.

6. AOB

- 6.1 TC raised some points around the TAMEG stats that had been distributed to the TAMEG. He queried the certificate-related Non Compliances, particularly category 2.15: approximately half of the site visits were unable to provide commissioning records. BD noted that just because the records were not provided did not mean that they didn't exist and that most of this type of Non Compliance was cleared within a few weeks when MOAs saw the Non Compliance and supplied the certificate. TC felt that there should not be a Non Compliance where information is provided to the TAA at any time before the visit takes place, even if that information is not provided before the TAA goes out to the check. The TAA has a five working day period in TAAMT by which time the certificates must be provided – however, this is not a BSC requirement and failure to comply should not be a Non Compliance.
- 6.2 TC noted that a Meter Operator Code of Practice Agreement desktop audit would be carried out over the summer and also that the idea of labelling meter panels that was discussed at TAMEG 7 had been implemented.