

MINUTES

MEETING NAME	TECHNICAL ASSURANCE OF METERING EXPERT GROUP
Meeting number	31
Date of meeting	19 July 2017
Venue	ELEXON Ltd
Classification	Public

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

Attendees			
Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair	
Tashaurn Beckles	TB	Technical Secretary	
Chris Day	CD	ELEXON	
Katharine Higby	KH	ELEXON	
Alistair Barnsley	AB	E.ON	Supplier/MOA
Antony Hobbs	AH	Siemens	Industry Expert
Calvin MacFarlane	CM	npower	DC/MOA
Kevin Walker	KW	E.ON energy	MOA
Nicholas Sawyer	NS	npower	DC/MOA
Paul Gregory	PG	C&C Group	TAA
Ron Cook	RC	Western Power	LDSO
Stephen Cuddihay	SC	UKPN	LDSO
Tom Chevalier	TC	Association of Meter Operators (AMO)	MOA
Warren Lacey	WL	Northern Powergrid	LDSO
Apologies			
Bob Dryden	BD	npower	Supplier
Colin Gentleman	CG	SSE	MOA
Rebecca Gaskill	RG	SSE	Supplier
Simon Voyse	SV	Northern Powergrid	LDSO

INTRODUCTIONS

1. Apologies

- 1.1 The Chair noted that Bob Dryden, Colin Gentleman, Rebecca Gaskill and Simon Voyse had given their apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

ADMINISTRATION

2. Minutes and Actions

MINUTES

- 2.1 The minutes for the Technical Assurance of Metering Expert Group (TAMEG) 30 meeting were approved without amendment within a month of the meeting.

ACTION 26.06

- 2.2 In regards to specific sample recommendations, ELEXON to look into High Voltage (HV) sites and the longevity of their de-energisation status, as suggested by a TAMEG member (TAMEG 26, 5.7-5.10).
- 2.3 Mike Smith (MS) gave a verbal update to TAMEG on analysis of HV sites with de-energised feeders. MS stated that there are 1,888 feeders with an inactive feeder status for 1,142 Metering Point Administration Numbers (MPANs) in regards to looking at the length in which they have been inactive. MS added that the analysis is based on the latest D0268s¹.
- 2.4 Tom Chevalier (TC) inquired whether the de-energised MPANs are different to the de-energised feeders in regards to the audit issues raised on de-energised sites. MS informed TC that they are different.
- 2.5 MS informed TAMEG that it is difficult to gain access to de-energised MPANs and added that the sample of sites the Technical Assurance Agent (TAA) uses for its audit is derived from the Electricity Central Online Enquiry Service (ECOES) and does not include de-energised MPANs.
- 2.6 TC informed TAMEG that there are a large numbers of sites which are de-energised and would not be picked up in the main sample audit. Ron Cook (RC) agreed with TC and informed TAMEG that if we don't look at de-energised sites we don't know their current status and if there is a problem; he then suggested auditing a small number of de-energised sites.
- 2.7 TC inquired whether a Data Collector (DC) would be trying to collect data from a site that is de-energised as if they are not trying to collect any data we will not be able to see if the site has been energised and using energy. Chris Day (CD) informed TAMEG that DCs will be trying to collect data on de-energised MPANs once a month for sites with active communications and annually for sites without communications. MS inquired whether ELEXON should consider auditing de-energised MPANs using a specific sample if PAB agrees to it.
- 2.8 Katharine Higby (KH) informed TAMEG that we need evidence of Metering Systems that are energised but are registered as de-energised.
- 2.9 TC informed TAMEG that examples of this are found in Trading Disputes papers and the results of the TAA Audit, and inquired whether TAMEG members could also do some investigations in their distribution areas, as it will be helpful to help discover any issues before a more formal investigation.
- 2.10 Antony Hobbs (AH) inquired whether the audit would be aimed at Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA) as well as Central Volume Allocation (CVA) as he knew of power sites that have a Meter Operator Agent (MOA) registered to them; however they have not been selected for audit. AH added that the MOA should check that the Metering Equipment is compliant.
- 2.11 Paul Gregory (PG) informed TAMEG that he has limited access to CVA sites which are either part closed or closed down. The TAA noted that it is only able to do a limited exercise or in some cases and cannot audit a site if there is no power in the building.

¹ D0268 – Half Hourly Meter Technical Details

MINUTES

- 2.12 MS inquired whether TAMEG wants ELEXON to ask Licensed Distribution System Operators (LDSOs) to compare their records with the status of ECOES. Kevin Walker (KW) informed MS that regardless of who is responsible for the issues, only the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) can check.
- 2.13 Stephen Cuddihay (SC) informed TAMEG that he believes we should take a sample of sites which are believed to be de-energised and audit those sites to check their arrangements.
- 2.14 Action closed.
- 2.15 SC agreed to look into examples of sites registered as de-energised and report to TAMEG in October whether any were actually energised, if examples are found earlier, he will report to ELEXON and ELEXON will circulate them to TAMEG members.

Action 31.01

ACTION 27.02

- 2.16 In reference to RCs Current Transformer (CT)/Voltage Transformer (VT) data Beth Procter (BP) suggested she will contact a member of WPD (Ryan Robinson) for more CT/VT data.
- 2.17 RC provided ELEXON with more data and ELEXON agreed to progress the data RC provided.
- 2.18 MS inquired what RC has done with the data he provided to ELEXON and whether there are a sufficient number of samples. RC informed MS that the data collected was trimmed down and that there are a sufficient number of samples, however, if ELEXON needs more samples they should contact him.
- 2.19 MS informed RC that an increased number of samples are not necessary at the moment for the National Measurement Transformer Error Statement (NMTES) to be updated, ELEXON need to progress the data it has received from RC first.
- 2.20 RC inquired whether there are any specific manufacturers TAMEG would like information on.
- 2.21 MS informed TAMEG that if anyone else needs information to inform RC, or ELEXON can circulate list of the sample we have. He added that for NMTES, we need to go to Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) to see if they will approve it.
- 2.22 TC inquired whether the data being approved for the NMTES will lead to some NCs being closed. MS informed TC that they could be closed and asked PG if he holds information on the manufacturers of the CT/VTs. PG informed MS that the TAA does not always see the rating plate with the manufacturer's name on it.
- 2.23 KH agreed to investigate outstanding Non-Compliances (NCs) for CT/VTs in the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) areas to compare with WPDs CT/VT data and the NMTES to see what's missing.

Action 31.02

- 2.24 ELEXON will take a paper to SVG to get WPDs data onto NMTES so the related CT/VT NCs can be cleared.

Action 31.03

- 2.25 Action Open.

ACTION 30.01

- 2.26 KH to present the annual report to TAMEG and also present her views on the TAA annual report to TAMEG.
- 2.27 Action Closed (See agenda Item 6 & 7).

ACTION 30.02

MINUTES

- 2.28 BP agreed to going to PAB and informing them of the concerns of TAMEG regarding Independent Connection Providers (ICP) and Independent Distribution Network Operators (IDNO) obligations and the issues with the adoption process.
- 2.29 BP spoke to a member of the Competition in Connections Code of Practise (CiCCoP) Panel and it did not provide her with any knew information that she did not already know from reading the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) and from feedback given by the dataflow workgroup.
- 2.30 ELEXON are looking at the ICP, Building Network Operator (BNO) and Independent Distribution Network Operator (IDNO) issue internally. There is yet to be an update on when Performance Assurance Board (PAB) will be approached with the issue.
- 2.31 Action Open.

ACTION 30.03

- 2.32 KH agreed to finding out if there is more backstory to the Outstanding Category 1 NCs and provide an email to TAMEG with an update on these NCs.
- 2.33 Action Closed (See agenda item 4).

ACTION 30.04

- 2.34 MS agreed to arrange a work group after a TAMEG meeting to discuss alternative ways to provide assurance when metering certificates are not obtainable.
- 2.35 Action Closed (See agenda item 9).

ACTION 30.05

- 2.36 KH agreed to investigate a possible resolution going forward in regards to resolving outstanding NC regarding calibration certificates and contacting the TAA to obtain a copy of their Local Working Instruction (LWI) to find out what they are looking for in the measurement transformer certificates to provide assurance.
- 2.37 Action Closed (Duplicate of action 30.04).

ACTION 30.06

- 2.38 KH agreed to taking a paper to PAB suggesting a change to category 2 NC and category 1 NC with regards to Timing Errors.
- 2.39 KH is going to present the change to PAB in August and provide an update on the decision to TAMEG at the October meeting.

- 2.40 Action Open.

ACTION 30.07

- 2.41 MS agreed to ask the PAB Chair about having a PAB member on TAMEG.
- 2.42 TC joined PAB in June.

- 2.43 Action Closed.

ACTION 30.08

- 2.44 MS agreed to contact Chris Allanson and David Messant in regard to joining TAMEG.
- 2.45 MS informed TAMEG that SC will attend as an LDSO member and suggest not having Chris Allanson as a member as Simon Voyse represents the same company (Warren Lacey's is the Alternate for Simon Voyse) and did not want TAMEG to have too many members from one company representing a role on TAMEG.

MINUTES

2.46 Action Closed.

ACTION 30.09

2.47 MS agreed to update the members list and circulate them with minutes.

2.48 The members list was updated and circulated to TAMEG members.

2.49 Action Closed.

2.50 MS to ask BSC Admin to put a list of TAMEG members on the ELEXON website.

Action 31.04

ACTION 30.10

2.51 MS agreed to further investigate the impact of the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) review on the Technical Assurance of Metering (TAM) technique and request Max O'Conner (ELEXON) to come in and talk to TAMEG to explain the consequences.

2.52 MS informed TAMEG that ELEXON are currently re-planning the review. The first part is about the PAF processes and risks, and the second part will be about the PAF Techniques, which is where TAM will be reviewed. He added that the ELEXON Compliance Team said they can come to the October meeting to talk through the new project plan and this has been added to the draft agenda item for TAMEG32 in October.

2.53 Action Closed.

ACTION 30.11

2.54 MS agreed to inquire whether ELEXON can voice concerns on EE Circuit Switch Data (CSD) numbers not working anymore.

2.55 MS informed TAMEG that ELEXON will wait until AMO have their meeting in September.

2.56 TC informed TAMEG that AMO are discussing CSD Data and have explored the impact and the future of the issue, he added that there seems to also be some issues in CVA, and AMO are seeking to understand the issue there may be a potential update on the issue in September.

2.57 Action Open.

ACTION 30.12

2.58 ELEXON agreed to report concerns of BNOs as Energisation may not be appropriate for Settlement due to the lack of knowledge.

2.59 MS informed TAMEG that ELEXON are discussing the challenges presented by BNOs and ICPs and will be talking to PAB once this has been done.

2.60 MS inquired whether this action is similar to the ICP action. TAMEG informed MS that it is not and they should be dealt with separately as there are more risks associated with BNOs.

2.61 Action Open.

ACTION 30.13

2.62 MS agreed to talk to the BSC Admin in order to extend the external paper day to eight days instead of seven days.

2.63 Completed on 22 May 2017.

2.64 Action Closed.

ACTION 30.14

MINUTES

- 2.65 MS agreed to talk to the BSC Admin to make sure all papers are uploaded to the ELEXON portal.
- 2.66 Completed on 13 June 2017.
- 2.67 Action Closed.

3. Non-compliance stats report

- 3.1 KH presented the Non-Compliance stats report to TAMEG.
- 3.2 TAMEG noted an increase in the number of Inspection Visits which resulted in no access in the past couple of years. KH informed TAMEG that it is steadily increasing but it is still under 10%.
- 3.3 AB informed TAMEG that there are issues with no access across the board and Parties have to try hard to get access on all sites, by doing pre planning and booking visits in advance.
- 3.4 AH inquired whether the report was on the SVA or CVA market or the total. TC informed AH that it is mostly SVA. AH added that the report is not clear as it does not say whether it is SVA or CVA and it should show TAMEG members that.
- 3.5 TC informed TAMEG that we have spoken about making changes to this report many times. KH responded to TC by informing him that ELEXON had a meeting with Stuart Jackson from C&C about potential changes.
- 3.6 AB inquired whether Supplier 292, who has an 18% no access rate, has had a discussion with ELEXON regarding the no access rate and whether ELEXON got feedback from the Supplier which was helpful in changing anything. KH informed AB that a chat will be held with PG about the level of no access and the feedback received.
- 3.7 TC inquired what Category 1.06 is, as it has come from nowhere and asked what the NCs are and why in the last 2 years it is suddenly five.
- 3.8 MS asked PG if he can clarify what 1.06s are. PG informed TAMEG that Category 1.06 (Other NC not covered elsewhere) was created to give more detail in a report rather than just putting NC.
- 3.9 MS inquired whether it is difficult for Suppliers to contact various LDSOs for CT/VT certificates.
- 3.10 PG informed TAMEG that in BSCP27 the Supplier needs an LDSO to access CT/VT transformer rating plates in HV (and some LV) instances. RC added that sometimes in substations where you can see the switchgear behind a fence, you cannot get access and LDSOs are trying to charge MOA/Suppliers to attend to allow access.
- 3.11 AB informed RC that there is no reference to payment for any BSC obligation. However, he understands why LDSOs would want to charge as it is a transactional opportunity.

4. Outstanding cat 1 non-compliance report

- 4.1 KH presented the outstanding cat 1 non-compliance report.
- 4.2 TC informed TAMEG that we should note that a Category 1 NC rectified pending confirmation cause no error in Settlement, but is still affecting the number of Category 1 NCs and it can stay there for years, as it has already.
- 4.3 MS asked PG if rectified pending confirmation Category 1 NCs that are de-classified to Category 2 NC would go off the records. PG informed MS that the TAA does not actively pursue Category 2 NCs.
- 4.4 TC informed TAMEG that he believes the TAA, ELEXON & Registrant are wasting time dealing with Category 1 NCs that are rectified pending a confirmation which can never be given to the satisfaction of the TAA.

MINUTES

- 4.5 PG informed TAMEG that the Category 1 rectified pending confirmation NCs could still remain a problem. As if the TAA stopped reporting on the issue, it can be reconnected without anyone knowing, which is always a risk to Settlement. TC agreed and added there are many other sites with the same issue that we are not looking at as closely as there is no impact on Settlement so asked if this issue was really a risk.
- 4.6 MS informed TAMEG that the reason this instance has not been downgraded to Category 2 is because the TAA has not received a Commissioning record.
- 4.7 MS inquired whether it is in ELEXON's remit to downgrade the Category 1 NC to a Category 2 or if ELEXON has to ask the PAB. KH informed TAMEG that it is within ELEXON's remit.
- 4.8 PG informed TAMEG that if there no risk associated with the NC, the TAA would close the NC. MS and KH informed PG that there is still a risk as we are yet to receive a Commissioning record so we cannot close the Category 1 NC.
- 4.9 TC inquired whether there was a need for exceptional cases, as the example NC could be unresolved for years.
- 4.10 AB inquired whether the TAA can change the heading in the report from 'average age of NCs' to 'average age of resolved NCs' as the heading is unclear.
- 4.11 AH inquired why a revisit of the site cannot be arranged in order to see if any changes have been made on site since the NC was raised. MS informed AH that a revisit is normally to confirm compliance following rectification of a NC. AH informed MS that you cannot re-categorise without a revisit of the site.
- 4.12 MS informed TAMEG that we need to keep de-energised sites as NC and we should not close them until a Commissioning record has been provided, and we also need figure out a way to re-categorise the Category 1 NCs as Category 2 NC, which may be possible through a re-visit.
- 4.13 KH to consider points raised and figure out how to best address and deal with the issue, re-consider the process and report back with any changes made.

Action 31.05

- 4.14 TC was concerned that a Category 1 NC in which a registration error has occurred, where the current transformers are shorted out and voltage fuses removed, is taking longer than 418 days to resolve when the TAA is unable to verify if the site is taking load.
- 4.15 AH informed TAMEG that if it is a Category 1 NC, it has an impact on Settlement, we need to either address them or close them as there is a lack of knowledge and if they are open for years it undermines the audit technique. AH was concerned that if we do not address the issue now the market will not get any better. He added that it should take less than 400 days. TC added that a Category 1 NC shouldn't be left open for more than ten's of days or should be escalated to PAB.
- 4.16 KH informed TAMEG that we need to look into the escalation process.
- 4.17 KH to look into the escalation process and take it to PAB if anything needs to change.

Action 31.06

- 4.18 TAMEG agreed that Parties are leaving Category 1 NCs open for so long as ELEXON do not have a level of threat that motivates Parties to close these Category 1 NCs and without the level of threat ELEXON are not taken seriously. TC informed TAMEG that Ofgem were at the PAB 197 meeting, as Parties that failed to comply with the BSC is a Party in failure of their licence and that can cause them to suffer enforcement action which could ultimately result in loss of their licence.

5. Trading Disputes Report

MINUTES

- 5.1 KH presented the Trading Disputes report.
- 5.2 Several TAMEG members inquired whether the term 'general' meant SVA or CVA and asked if the report could be made clearer for clarity sake. KH confirmed that general means it is a CVA Trading Dispute.
- 5.3 PG inquired whether the TAA audit should become more risk based. MS responded to PG by informing him that ELEXON use other techniques such as Technical Assurance of Performance Assurance Parties (TAPAP) to assess risk.
- 5.4 TAMEG inquired what causes a Trading Dispute to be raised. KH informed TAMEG that when ELEXON is notified of Category 1 NC it raises a Trading Dispute. BSC Parties also raise Trading Disputes themselves.
- 5.5 TAMEG noted the large number of Trading Disputes and agreed that the faulty Meter Dispute is concerning as underlying processes have not worked and there should be checks in place to pick up Meter faults earlier so they do not continue. MS added that first we need more detail to understand what the actual issue is. AH noted the number of mismatches and informed TAMEG that more information is needed as a CT/VT mismatch can happen for many reasons and a certificate alone cannot always prove that.
- 5.6 AH informed KH that it would be useful if we knew the Meter type and age for the Trading Disputes. KH informed AH that ELEXON do not have that information straight away, and that ELEXON have to do some investigation to attain that information.

6. **TAA Annual Report**

- 6.1 PG presented the TAA Annual Report.
- 6.2 TC inquired whether site visits resulting in no access are being rescheduled. PG informed TC that they would go back in the general population to be selected in a future audit year and are not be rescheduled in the same audit year.
- 6.3 TC suggested if the TAA hasn't been able to see the rating plates or the serial numbers then the Commissioning records are irrelevant. TC inquired why the TAA does not use the MOCOPA label where it is unable to access the rating plates. PG responded to TC by informing him that ELEXON have advised not to rely on the MOCOPA label as there have been a few instances where the MOCOPA label has been incorrect.
- 6.4 KW raised concerns regarding Commissioning, informing TAMEG that it is unfair to expect Parties to Commission if the LDSO cannot commission the Measurement Transformer. KH inquired whether the TAA is able to filter out instances where there is no Commissioning record, but there is no Settlement Error.
- 6.5 KH to submit an impact assessment request to the TAA to see if the TAA is able to filter out instances where there is no Commissioning record, but there is no Settlement Error.

Action 31.07

- 6.6 TC inquired whether there were any trends of DCs being associated with the SVA Category 1.04 NCs identified. PG informed TC that there is no trend and that multiple DCs were associated with the NCs.
- 6.7 TC noted the increase in Metering Equipment failures recorded this year.
- 6.8 MS inquired whether the alarms in Meters are working if there is a fuse failure as errors should be flagged by the alarm to the DC.
- 6.9 AH inquired whether the 665 Category 2.16 NCs identified are CVA or SVA. As there was a robust process for measurement transformer certificates in the CVA market that seems to have been disregarded. AH also inquired what the TAA and ELEXON plan to do with the issues and the length of time they have been outstanding.

MINUTES

- 6.10 MS suggested looking into the Commissioning records when Category 2.16 NCs are identified in order to check if the correct energy was being recorded.
- 6.11 TC inquired whether this would mean that Category 2.16 NCs would not be checked anymore. KW noted that that this is not possible because everyone will stop providing measurement transformer certificates.

7. TAA Annual Report recommendations

- 7.1 KH presented TAA Annual Report recommendations.
- 7.2 A TAMEG member informed KH that it is not only beneficial to ask for Supplier views on P283 but also for MOAs and Distributors. KH informed TAMEG that ELEXON will start with Suppliers and will go from there. TC suggested to KH that ELEXON could ask for the LDSO Local Work Instructions (LWI) regarding Commissioning and P283 at the same time.
- 7.3 Several TAMEG members informed ELEXON that they believe confidentiality should stop in the TAMEG meetings. In particular the TAA report should be published in a non-confidential form which identifies the good and poor performing parties.
- 7.4 KW informed TAMEG that he needs to see where he is looking in order to help and at the moment it is hard to resolve issues due to the anonymity of the Parties. KW added that one of two Parties may be skewing the results of the industry and we will not know due to confidentiality.
- 7.5 TC agreed informing TAMEG that bad participants can hide behind confidentiality, and we cannot take the information within the business and improve as it is confidential. MS reminded TAMEG that we're looking for trends in TAMEG meetings in order to make recommendations for changes to PAB, via ELEXON.
- 7.6 MS inquired whether all business at PAB is confidential. KH informed MS that some sections of PAB are confidential due to Party performance and we would have to go to the Trading Dispute Committee about any request to see confidential information around Trading Disputes.
- 7.7 TC informed TAMEG that if that helps our discussions and progresses issues, then there is value in revealing participants. TC added that he would encourage visibility of information, as within an expert group we should be allowed visibility of the underlying causes of Disputes or Category 1 NC to ensure that the root causes of the problem are understood and consideration to improvements to the PAF techniques can be proposed. This may not require the identification of the participants, just further detail of the root cause.
- 7.8 MS to investigate whether TAMEG can see more confidential information from PAB and TDC.

Action 31.08

8. TAA: Logistics and service delivery consideration – Cancelled

- 8.1 MS read a statement from the Procurement strategy team to TAMEG.

Post meeting note: ELEXON confirmed that it is currently reviewing its TAA sourcing strategy based on some recent developments and due to their commercially sensitive nature is not in a position to provide an update to the TAMEG. ELEXON will however of course provide information once it has an agreed position.

9. Certificate Non-compliance Working Group (meeting 1) – verbal update

- 9.1 KH gave an update on the working group where the output was to remove the requirement to provide calibration certificates, where overall accuracy could be calculated by other means. ELEXON will now review

MINUTES

the BSC requirements to ensure all relevant documentation changes are understood and also discuss a potential TAA LWI review with the TAA.

10. Commissioning update and a verbal update from the 'commissioning dataflow'

- 10.1 CD gave an update on the working group responsible for turning the P283 process into a dataflow, and what ELEXON aim to do with ICPs and BNOs in terms of data flows. He added that ELEXON are currently looking at the timescales in the BSCPs that will sit behind the data flows to address the issue of D0170s² being sent for a D0215³.
- 10.2 CD informed TAMEG that there will be another workgroup in August which will aim to progress a solution for amalgamating Part 1 and 2 of the dataflow. He added that there is an issue when a D0215 is sent by a LDSO, MOAs flood them with D0170s.
- 10.3 SC voiced concerns about the IDNOs obligations and questioned if they have the same obligations as LDSOs. He added that unlike IDNOs at least with ICPs, whoever adopts the ICPs assets takes on the obligations. The TAMEG advises that DNO & IDNO have the same obligations under the BSC.
- 10.4 CD informed TAMEG that ELEXON are also reviewing the commissioning timescale process and trying to decide whether the 16 WDs to commission after energisation is still relevant.
- 10.5 TC inquired why three Change Proposals (CPs) have been made.
- 10.6 CD informed TC that the three CPs raised are for the new connection process, change of agent process and a D0170 rejection flow when a D0215 is sent. If one CP is more controversial at least it may not stop the others.

11. Any Other Business

- 11.1 TC provided TAMEG with a draft Issue document regarding the discussion about Meter memory storage and that the CoPs have required a minimal number of day's storage since 1990 and it has not changed.
- 11.2 TC added that the CoP has a short period of 10 or 20 days as it fits with the weekly Meter reads and that there is a risk that the data can get overwritten if the Meter goes past the memory limit and this is a Settlement Risk due to increased estimated data.
- 11.3 AH informed TAMEG that CoPs 1 and 2 states that Meters should be capable of storing information for up to 10 days so Meters should already have that capacity. CoPs 3 and 5 require 20 days minimum storage per channel.
- 11.4 TC informed TAMEG that he is willing to take suggestions from the meeting; however he ultimately needs someone to raise the issue. MS informed TC that ELEXON can raise it through the change team and inquired whether manufacturers can comply with the BSC without going through compliance testing again if they increase memory.
- 11.5 TC informed TAMEG that he is also willing to raise this in PAB. MS asked TC if he has evidence of the over writing issue. TC informed MS that there have been estimated data graphs which he saw in PAB, however this is in the confidential section.

² D0170 – Request for Metering System Related Details

³ D0215 – Provision of Site Technical Details

MINUTES

Next Meeting: 18 October 2017