

MINUTES

MEETING NAME TECHNICAL ASSURANCE OF METERING EXPERT GROUP

Meeting number	32
Date of meeting	18 October 2017
Venue	ELEXON Ltd
Classification	Public

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

Attendees

Mike Smith	MS	TAMEG Chair
Tashaurn Beckles	TB	Technical Secretary
Beth Brown	BB	ELEXON (part meeting)
Chris Day	CD	ELEXON
Katharine Higby	KH	ELEXON
Nick Groves	NG	ELEXON (part meeting)
Antony Hobbs	AH	Siemens plc
Colin Gentleman	CG	SSE
John Noble	JN	EDF
Nicholas Sawyer	NS	Npower (telephone)
Richard Thompson	RT	EDF
Ron Cook	RC	Western Power
Stuart Jackson	SJ	C&C Group (TAA)
Tom Chevalier	TC	Association of Meter Operators (AMO)
Warren Lacey	WL	Norther Powergrid (telephone)

Apologies

Alistair Barnsley	AB	E.on
Bob Dryden	BD	Npower
Calvin MacFarlane	CM	Npower
Dan Rynne	DR	IMServ
Holly Mills	HM	EDF Energy
Kevin Walker	KW	E.on
Paul Gregory	PG	C&C Group (TAA)
Rebecca Gaskill	RG	SSE
Simon Hagan	SH	IMServ

INTRODUCTIONS

1. Apologies

- 1.1 The TAMEG Chair (MS) noted that Alistair Barnsley, Bob Dryden, Calvin MacFarlane, Dan Rynne, Holly Mills, Kevin Walker, Paul Gregory, Rebecca Gaskill and Simon Hagan had given their apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

MINUTES

ADMINISTRATION

2. Minutes and Actions

- 2.1 The minutes for the Technical Assurance of Metering Expert Group (TAMEG) 31 meeting were approved without amendment within a month of the meeting.

ACTION 27.02

- 2.2 In reference to Ron Cook (RC)'s Current Transformer (CT)/Voltage Transformer (VT) data, Beth Procter (BP) noted that she will contact a member of RCs team for more CT/VT data.
- 2.3 ELEXON noted that it no longer has access to the CT/VT data sent by RC and has asked RC to resubmit the data. See section 2.32 under Action 31.02.
- 2.4 Action closed.

ACTION 30.02

- 2.5 BP agreed to informing the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) of TAMEG's concerns regarding Independent Connection Providers (ICPs) and Independent Distribution Network Operators (IDNOs) obligations and the issues with the adoption process.
- 2.6 The TAMEG Chair noted that BP spoke to a Competition in Connections Code of Practice (CICCOP) Panel member and noted that no new information was acquired from the discussion with the CICCOP member. The TAMEG Chair added that the subject of ICPs and Building Network Operators (BNOs) is now being looked at internally by ELEXON, and noted that there is yet to be an update on when ELEXON will approach the PAB regarding this issue.
- 2.7 Action open.

ACTION 30.06

- 2.8 KH agreed to take a paper to the PAB that suggests changing category 1 and category 2 timing error non-compliance thresholds in Codes of Practice (CoPs) 2¹, 3² and 5³ to 15 minutes.
- 2.9 KH noted that a paper was presented at [PAB200 in September](#). KH added that the non-compliance threshold was amended to 15 minutes for CoPs 2, 3 and 5, and the change will be implemented in the 2018/19 BSC year.
- 2.10 TC questioned why the change will be implemented in the 2018/19 BSC Year. KH noted that changing the audit scope mid-cycle could skew the annual audit results.
- 2.11 Action closed.

ACTION 30.11

- 2.12 MS agreed to enquire whether ELEXON can voice concerns to PAB on EE Circuit Switch Data (CSD) as the numbers not working anymore.

¹ CoP 2 – The Metering of Circuits with a Rated Capacity not exceeding 100 MVA for Settlement Purposes

² CoP 3 – The Metering of Circuits with a Rated Capacity not exceeding 10 MVA for Settlement Purposes

³ CoP 5 – The Metering of Energy Transfers with Max Demand of up to (and including) 1MV for Settlement Purposes

MINUTES

- 2.13 MS proposed that the Association of Meter Operators (AMO) have their meeting before ELEXON make any enquires.
- 2.14 TC noted that the AMO meeting was moved to November. MS added that if the AMO see the CSD issue as a real concern TC should raise the issue with ELEXON before the next TAMEG meeting in January as it may have to go to the PAB and notify the relevant committees as CSD will not work for various network providers.
- 2.15 Action open.

ACTION 30.12

- 2.16 ELEXON agreed to report concerns of BNOs to PAB as energisation not being appropriate for Settlement due to the lack of general knowledge.
- 2.17 ELEXON are discussing the challenges presented by BNOs and ICPs and will be talking to PAB once this has been done.
- 2.18 Action open.

ACTION 31.01

- 2.19 SC agreed to look into examples of sites registered as de-energised and report to TAMEG in October 2017 whether any were actually energised and if examples are found earlier SC agreed to report the findings to ELEXON to circulate them to TAMEG members.
- 2.20 SC provided ELEXON with examples of sites registered as de-energised and presented his findings to TAMEG.
- 2.21 SC noted that there are nine sites registered as de-energised that are energised even though there was no load at the time of the snapshot of the site. TC added that as the site should be registered as energised and Meter readings should have been collected for them.
- 2.22 SC added that the de-energised sites should at least be isolated, earthed or removed all together and raises the question of what we want to see when we say a site is de-energised. SC asked how many other sites have a similar status of being de-energised whilst they should be registered as energised.
- 2.23 TC noted that the TAA excludes de-energised sites from its main sample audit, however if nine out of 50 sites are actually energised, they should be audited. MS asked if ELEXON should ask the TAA to audit de-energised sites or check with DNOs to see if they have any energised sites registered as de-energised and audit them.
- 2.24 RC noted that ELEXON should audit a sample of de-energised sites. TC noted that ELEXON should perform a desktop check for each DNO to review their de-energised High Voltage (HV) sites to see if system records support that they are de-energised.
- 2.25 KH asked SC how much resource he used to perform the check on de-energised sites. SC noted that the sample of 58 sites took 1 Working Day.
 - 2.25.1 MS agreed that ELEXON will speak to DNOs to ask them to check their de-energised HV sites. Should DNOs identify sites which have the wrong energisation status, they should amend them so that they will be included in the TAA main sample for audit purposes.

ACTION 32.01

- 2.26 TC noted that ELEXON may find that each DNO has different view on what they class as de-energised. RC added that there is a discrepancy between what the DNO and Meter Operator Agent (MOA) classify as de-energised.
- 2.27 CG asked if SC knew how many of the Meter Point Administration Numbers (MPANs) in question were multi-feeders as if there is more than one feeder and only one feeder is switched off the site could be incorrectly

MINUTES

stated as de-energised. SC noted that partially de-energised sites are flagged as sites which require further investigation.

2.28 MS asked for a summary of what the TAMEG suggest that ELEXON should ask DNOs. SC noted that ELEXON should ask DNOs to check the de-energised status of HV customers and confirm the information they hold matches the metered data. In order for an MPAN to be classed as de-energised, the TAMEG would expect the circuit breaker to be open and if there is one MPAN with two feeders both feeders should have their circuit breakers open. The TAMEG suggested that ELEXON should request feedback from the DNOs regarding their results which will feed into the steps that ELEXON takes going forward. MS reconfirmed that ELEXON would ask DNOs to investigate the de-energisation status of HV sites.

2.29 Action closed.

ACTION 31.02

2.30 KH agreed to investigate outstanding non-compliances for CT/VTs in the DNO areas to compare it with RCs CT/VT data and the NMTES to see what is missing.

2.31 KH noted that ELEXON have obtained the report run by the TAA containing CT/VT information for outstanding non-compliances; however they are still waiting on RCs CT/VT.

2.32 RC noted that he will provide ELEXON with the original data gathered as well as additional data.

2.33 Action open.

ACTION 31.03

2.34 ELEXON agreed to take a paper to the SVG to add RC's data to the NMTES so the related CT/VT non-compliances can be cleared.

2.35 MS noted that ELEXON is awaiting RCs CT/VT data.

2.36 Action open.

ACTION 31.04

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

2.38 MS noted that BSC Admin has placed a list of TAMEG members on the ELEXON website.

2.39 Action closed.

ACTION 31.05

2.40 KH agreed to look into how ELEXON should best address and deal with the issue of re-categorising category 1 non-compliances that are 'rectified pending confirmation' to category 2 non-compliances and report back with any changes made.

2.41 See Agenda Item 7 – "Re-classifying Category 1 Non-Compliances".

2.42 Action closed.

ACTION 31.06

2.43 KH agreed to look into the escalation process regarding the amount of time category 1 non-compliances should be left unresolved and take a recommendation to the PAB if any changes need to be made.

2.44 See Agenda item 10 – "Category 1 Escalation Process".

2.45 Action closed.

ACTION 31.07

MINUTES

- 2.46 KH agreed to submit an Impact Assessment request to the TAA to enquiring whether the TAA is able to filter out instances where there is no Commissioning record, but there is no Settlement Error.
- 2.47 KH noted that the there is insufficient data in the Technical Assurance Agent Management Tool (TAAMT) to filter out these instances due to the TAA not being able to access rating plates.

2.48 Action closed.

ACTION 31.08

- 2.49 MS agreed to investigate whether the TAMEG can see more confidential information from PAB and Trading Disputes Committee (TDC).
- 2.50 MS read a statement from the PAB and the TDC Chairs regarding whether TAMEG could see more confidential information from the PAB and the TDC.

'Each Panel Committee is specific in its role and the information it is privy too, which is detailed within each Panel Committee's Terms of Reference (ToR).

All members of a Panel Committee have to sign a confidentially agreement, due to the sensitivity of the data presented and the potential reputational or commercial impacts to any Party concerned.

TAMEG is an expert group and its members have not signed confidentially agreement, with the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this group clearly stating its purpose.

Therefore ELEXON cannot share any confidential information, from any of the Panel Committees with this group'.

- 2.51 RC noted that the PAB and the TDC Chairs statement is incontestable, however whilst the TAMEG are unable to access confidential information it makes more difficult to make recommendations against highlighted issues.
- 2.52 TC added that the PAB and the TDC Chair misunderstood the request and noted that TAMEG were asking for generic root cause information on the details of Trading Disputes and other issues, so that the TAMEG can act to make recommendations to resolve Settlement issues so that Trading Disputes are not needed.
- 2.53 TC asked if there was any pattern with the Trading Disputes raised and if there is a specific problem that needs to be addressed. MS noted that if the PAB or the TDC see any repetitive issues they can ask the TAMEG for its expert opinion and added that the TAMEG now has the TDC report which provides an overview of the current outstanding Trading Disputes.
- 2.54 TC noted that in terms of accuracy there have been Meters tested that are not accurate and will start to fail eventually by design as they have mechanical parts. AH added that there is an issue of obsolescence and TAMEG need to be proactive and discuss how to best address the issue as if it is left unresolved it will lead to an increased number of Trading Disputes overtime.
- 2.55 MS asked if TAMEG should have an agenda item addressing the impact of old Metering Equipment and take a recommendation to the PAB regarding particular Meter types or Outstations.
- 2.56 MS noted that ELEXON currently rely on MOAs to look after Metering Equipment rather than ELEXON telling them to remove or replace Metering Equipment. AH noted that Registrants do not see metering as a priority and would rather take action once there is an issue with a Meter rather than proactively monitoring the Meter.
- 2.57 TC noted that NHH Metering Equipment owners are having Meters recalibrated to prolong their life as they know in next few years the Meters will be changed to Smart Meters. MS noted that ELEXON will only have assurance of the Meter accuracy though CoP4 periodic testing.

MINUTES

- 2.58 CG asked whether ELEXON need to put a product life on these Meters as according to CoP4 if you do regular period testing, you can use the Meter until it is no longer operable. CG noted that if product life for a Meter is 10 years there should be a requirement in BSCP601 that says Parties should not use the equipment longer than the Meter manufacturer's stated product life.
- 2.59 MS asked if ELEXON should put something in BSCP601 that limits the life of the compliance certificate for a Meter type when it first undergoes compliance testing and if ELEXON should adjust the Meter life if Parties make amendments such as changes to the firmware of a Meter, as ELEXON specifically asked if the firmware change affects the compliance of the Meter for Settlement purposes, rather than force compliance testing again. AH noted that the Meter should go through compliance testing again as there needs to be monitoring of the firmware and an understanding of what the firmware does, as it would need to be checked for bugs that can affect Settlement data.
- 2.59.1 MS noted all the issues and agreed to set up a working group to discuss the issues in more detail in order to add new requirements to BSCP601.

ACTION 32.02

3. Non-compliance stats report

- 3.1 KH presented the non-compliance stats report to the TAMEG.
- 3.2 TC commented in relation to a non-compliance that the Registrant signs off on the Aggregation Rules which are used for Settlement purposes. TC suggested that the MOA should also be obligated to sign off on the Aggregation Rules, like they do on SVA complex sites. AH added that the non-compliance could have been caused by the Registrant having a limited knowledge base and noted that if the MOA also had the opportunity to check and sign off on the Aggregation Rules there would have been less chance of them being incorrect.
- 3.3 SJ noted that the non-compliance has since been corrected and was due to the Registrant not providing the latest Aggregation Rule to the TAA. The TAA closed the non-compliance through the query process as the Registrant provided the latest Aggregation Rule used for Settlement purposes. A TAMEG member highlighted that the NC should not have been 'closed' but resolved as a NC had been identified and resolved following the visit.
- 3.4 MS asked if the TAA could change their Local Working Instruction (LWI) in order to request the Aggregation Rule from the Registrant and Central Data Collection Agent (CDCA) and compare them with each other and the circuits on site.
- 3.4.1 SJ agreed to investigate the request and noted that it may involve raising a change to the TAA LWI.
- ACTION 32.03**
- 3.5 TC noted that MOAs signing off on the Aggregation Rules would require a change to BSCP75 'Aggregation Rules'. TC noted that MOAs signing off on Aggregation Rules will help improve its accuracy. MS noted that ELEXON had prepared guidance to assist Registrants with constructing Aggregation Rules ([Constructing Aggregation Rules – Central Volume Allocation](#)) and that ELEXON now validates all Aggregation Rules on behalf of the Central Data Collection Agent and sometimes produces them on behalf of Registrants. MS also noted that the TAMEG need to make sure Registrants agree that MOAs should be involved with signing off on Aggregation Rules before someone raises a Change Proposal (CP).
- 3.6 AH asked if there is any commonalities in NC 2.13 'Other non-compliance not covered' and if it possible to group any common NCs together and create a new NC.
- 3.6.1 SJ agreed to look into the miscellaneous category 2.13 non-compliances individually, to see if there's any commonality and group them accordingly.

4. Outstanding category 1 non-compliance report

- 4.1 KH presented the outstanding category 1 non-compliance report.
- 4.2 TC noted that the category 1 non-compliances should not be going on for so long and need to be addressed. KH noted that the potential resolution will be discussed in Agenda item 10 'Category 1 Escalation process'.
- 4.3 TC noted that ELEXON should be cautious about non-compliances where the error type is unknown as we do not know their impact on Settlement. SJ noted that ELEXON used to apply the Error and Failure Resolution (EFR) technique to Parties who have had a non-compliance which has remained outstanding for an extended period.
- 4.4 AH noted that some of the non-compliances require correction by a Licensed Distribution System Operator (LDSO), and the LDSO should therefore be the responsible party. KH noted that ELEXON is working with the TAA on addressing the issue of who is responsible for a non-compliance.
- 4.5 A TAMEG member noted that MOAs are chasing LDSOs to correct errors and they are not being resolved. TC noted that in instances where Registrants are chased and do not resolve an issue they should be escalated to the PAB. SJ noted that for every category 1 non-compliance raised, Registrants are provided with additional information so they have some high level knowledge of the error and the recommended course of action to correct it. SJ added that the TAA also send an email to the ELEXON Trading Disputes team so that a Trading Dispute can be raised, and once the non-compliance is closed ELEXON receive a closing notification.
- 4.6 A TAMEG member asked if a non-compliance is sent to all Parties associated with the non-compliance including the LDSO. SJ noted that the TAA only sends non-compliance details to Parties associated with the non-compliance. In the current process the LDSO has no association with non-compliances so they are not sent an automatic email. TC noted that the BSC requires the LDSO to be told when a non-compliance is identified. SJ noted that is how the TAAMT works and there is a gap in the process that the TAA and ELEXON want to address. SJ added that Parties can register for the TAAMT on the ELEXON website by visiting www.elexon-assurance.co.uk. KH noted that when ELEXON start the change process there will be a Newscast to encourage LDSOs to register for access to the TAAMT.
- 4.7 MS proposed that all LDSOs register for access to the TAAMT. MS added that ELEXON will eventually enforce all LDSOs to sign up to the TAAMT. ELEXON will set up a workshop and produce guidance for LDSOs ahead of time. AH asked if ELEXON have a contact register of LDSOs. MS noted that in regards to contacts ELEXON have contacts from the P283 contacts list on the ELEXON Portal and Metering Dispensations as a starting point.
- 4.8 AH noted that the "Outstanding Category 1 Non-Compliance" report needs to be more up to date as the TAMEG are wasting time discussing issues that have been rectified. SJ noted that a more up to date report can be produced but it will be less detailed due to the research involved in its production.
 - 4.8.1 KH agreed to update the LWI to keep process of creating the "Outstanding Category 1 Non-Compliance" report as it is and omit the rectified non-compliances from discussion in the TAMEG meeting. KH added that the report will also reflect the new escalation process once it has been agreed and implemented.

5. Trading Disputes Report

- 5.1 KH presented the Trading Disputes report.

MINUTES

- 5.2 TC asked why Trading Disputes are not being resolved quickly. KH noted that the Trading Disputes team are concerned with the error and the earlier you raise a Trading Dispute, the more Settlement Error you can correct. MS added that the error which leads to the Trading Dispute must be rectified prior to correcting Settlement data.
- 5.3 AH asked whether non-compliances and errors leading to Trading Disputes are subject to the same resolution timescales. KH noted that they are not subject to the same timescales as the process in [BSCP11 'Trading Disputes'](#) and [BSCP27 'Technical Assurance of Half Hourly Metering Systems for Settlement Purposes'](#) are different. CG noted that this may mean there is a failure in the BSC processes. TC noted that this is why the TAMEG needs feedback from the Trading Disputes team as its clear there are issues causing errors in Settlement, but the TAMEG need more information to propose a resolution.
- 5.4 AH asked if ELEXON can use targeted TAA checks to investigate re-occurring Trading Disputes. MS noted that ELEXON have Technical Assurance of Performance Assurance Parties (TAPAP) checks that target specific processes to address issues that are identified. AH noted that there is an issue that some errors are covered by more than one Performance Assurance Technique (PAT). KH noted that the issues are still being rectified but have just been identified differently.
- 5.5 MS noted that ELEXON could have something internal discussions with all PAT technique owners or at the Risk Evaluation Work Group (REWG) and discuss how to address issues identified through more than one PAT and take the recommendations to PAB. KH added that ELEXON should give also give the feedback to Beth Brown (BB) for the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF).
- 5.6 RC noted that Parties are finding Settlement Errors which ELEXON are not raising as Trading Disputes as they do not meet the Trading Dispute criteria and this needs to be addressed as they are still errors in Settlement.
- 5.7 MS noted that ELEXON should pass the discussion onto the REWG to discuss whether there needs to be an alignment in the timescales between Trading Disputes and non-compliances identified by TAA.
- 5.7.1 KH agreed to notify BB about issues we have discussed.

ACTION 32.06

6. PAF Review Update

- 6.1 BB gave a PAF Review Update.
- 6.2 JS asked who will be invited to the Issue 69 work group and whether it will be internal. BB noted that the workgroup will be external and members would involve industry participants. BB added that as the PAF Review goes through work steams the membership would change so the relevant participants can give their expert opinion.
- 6.3 TC asked if the TAM technique will be reviewed. BB noted that there would be a review of the PATs in the 4th work stream however, ELEXON would need to see who would be involved and when, based on workload. TC noted that Agenda item 11 (see section 10 of these minutes) discusses the difference between the risk based audit approach and compliance based approach to raising non-compliances, and suggested ELEXON make improvements to its approach by placing values on risk. KH noted that ELEXON will discuss the different approaches in Agenda item 11 and provide BB with the minutes.

7. Re-classifying Category 1 Non-Compliances

- 7.1 KH presented the "Re-classifying Category 1 Non-Compliances" paper.
- 7.2 SJ noted that if the TAA reviews a rectification plan and if the evidence is not sufficient, the TAA will wait for more evidence, and the non-compliance status remains as 'rectified pending confirmation'. The TAA would

MINUTES

need to add new steps to link the plan status to the non-compliance status (Attachment B to the TAMEG paper).

- 7.3 CD noted that there needs to be a step in the process map for the TAA to reject the rectification plan if it is not sufficient to rectify the non-compliance. KH added that the TAA needs to allocate the status to the relevant party as the diagram in Attachment B is showing status rather than which party is responsible for a non-compliance.
- 7.4 SJ noted that the TAA needs to add another level in the diagram asking if the plan valid, a step to give the TAA the ability to send the plan back, and a level below that asking whether all the steps in the plan have been completed.
- 7.5 RC noted that if plan has too many items it may never get resolved.
- 7.5.1 SJ agreed to take the points from the discussion away, add the extra steps to the diagram and circulate the updated diagram to TAMEG members.

ACTION 32.07

- 7.6 SJ noted that when a rectification plan is created it asks you what role is going to rectify that plan and it groups who is going to be responsible for each issue when you make the plan. CD asked who will decide who is responsible for an issue. SJ noted that the TAA and ELEXON will discuss who will be responsible in regards to Commissioning non-compliances.

8. CT metering units with no visible rating plate for CTs

- 8.1 MS gave an update on CT metering units with no visible rating plate for the CTs.
- 8.2 MS asked if the TAA should accept the MOCOPA labels when a rating plate is not visible and if this LDSO fills in the label. RC noted that the LDSO completes the label. MS asked if only the MOCOPA label is available, there are no CT/VT certificates and the rating plate is not visible, would TAMEG say it is reliable enough to program the Meter with those ratios. RC noted that providing commissioning records are provided correctly, it is good enough to program the Meter.
- 8.3 MS noted that the TAA had identified at least one instance where the MOCOPA label did not reflect the installed/selected ratio. MS asked if the TAMEG members believe that the TAA should accept the MOCOPA labels whether signed or not. The TAMEG unanimously agreed the TAA could rely on the MOCOPA label.
- 8.3.1 MS noted that if it is the expert opinion of TAMEG that the TAA should use the labels, ELEXON will instruct the TAA to accept MOCOPA labels.

ACTION 32.08

- 8.4 MS noted that some LSDOs were installing common ratio CTs (e.g. 500/5) at sites with different circuit ratings or agreed capacities and questioned what should be done to ensure that Settlement was not impacted by CTs operating in ranges of currents where the CT accuracy may not be as good (e.g. 20% of rated current and below for a class 0.5 CT). The TAMEG agreed that a solution would be to specify in CoPs 3 and 5 that CTs be 'extending range' CTs of class 0.5s instead of class 0.5 to ensure CT accuracy is better at lower currents.
- 8.4.1 ELEXON agreed to add this proposed solution to the proposal to change the Meter class accuracy requirement for CoP5 to class 1.0 and discuss the solution in the certificates working group (which has been proposed to assist with not having to present certificates to the TAA when it calculates and ensures overall accuracy is maintained).

ACTION 32.09

MINUTES

- 8.5 MS asked if ELEXON should include guidance in the appendices of the CoPs to address concerns about the VA rating of CTs and VTs being too high for the Metering System as they need to be operating in the correct range for accuracy and it may avoid the need for MOAs to add additional burden to ensure this.
- 8.6 MS asked what the industry standard is and where is it specified. TC noted that DNOs may have different standards due to contractual agreements with manufacturers. AH noted that the National Grid may be a starting point in regards to an industry standard as a version of NGTS 3.2.6 states 15 VA across the board that will be transmission voltages for 400 kV to 33 kV for VTs performance requirements and for CTs performance requirements 400 kV to 33 kV it is 7.5 VA.
- 8.6.1 The TAMEG Chair agreed to investigate what LDSOs and transmission companies currently specify for the rated burdens for CT/VTs for metering, so ELEXON can provide guidance to Parties going forward.

ACTION 32.10

9. Category 1 Escalation Process

- 9.1 KH presented the "Category 1 Escalation Process" paper.
- 9.2 TC noted that ELEXON should chase BSC Parties until the non-compliance has been unresolved for 15WDs and the PAB should then be given a list of BSC Parties that have not responded. AH noted that 10WDs is too long to agree with the NC and it should be 5WDs for a category 1 NC.
- 9.3 KH asked if ELEXON should report the escalations to PAB via the quarterly Technique Progress Report (TPR). AH noted that waiting for the next quarterly meeting is too far away and it should be reported to PAB at the following meeting.
- 9.4 TC noted that ELEXON should go to PAB with a paper to seek approval for the category 1 non-compliance escalation process.
- 9.5 KH asked if the TAA should escalate the BSC Party to ELEXON after 5WDs without a response, followed by ELEXON writing a letter to the Party in 5WDs, and give the BSC Party 5WDs to respond to this letter. If the Party does not respond, ELEXON should escalate the Party to the next PAB meeting and then recommend the PAB considers using the EFR technique. The TAMEG agreed with these timescales.
- 9.5.1 KH agreed to take note of the discussion and modify process with the suggestions made and speak to the EFR analyst to investigate whether the Parties with outstanding category 1 NCs need to be put in EFR.

ACTION 32.11

10. MTD Related Non-Compliances and SR3019

- 10.1 TC gave an update on "MTD Related Non-Compliances and Settlement Risk (SR) 3019".
- 10.2 KH noted internal discussions about MTD related non-compliances and SR3019 which is an amalgamation of SR0022 and SR0028 and noted TCs comments about risk based audit approach.
- 10.3 TC noted that ELEXON should have a risk based approach to raising non-compliances rather than a compliance approach, and should be looking at whether not having documents such as certificates has an impact on Settlement.
- 10.4 MS noted that ELEXON will need to perform a documentation review on BSCP27, CoP4 and BSC Section L, highlighting everything that mentions measurement transformer certificates. CD suggested reviewing NMTES

MINUTES

as ELEXON potentially want to look at using different test points and different burdens for measurement transformer error data.

- 10.5 RC noted that ELEXON has to investigate using generic errors. A TAMEG member asked what would happen if load is higher or lower than the test point and what point would the test value be set at. MS noted that the BSCP515 Appendix specifies the test points.
- 10.6 KH noted that monitoring SR3019 is difficult as the data held in the TAAMT is not conclusive. KH added that there were instances where category 1 non-compliances were raised because MTDs were incorrect, and upon investigation ELEXON found that the MTDs used for Settlement were correct, but incorrect MTDs were supplied to the TAA for audit.

11. Any Other Business

Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA) forum slides

- 11.1.1 MS agreed to circulate the slides related to TAM from the SVA forum, once they have been approved.

ACTION 32.12

P283 CPs

- 11.2 CD noted that the Meter Registration Agreement (MRA) CP has been raised for the Commissioning flows (Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC) CP 3522) and for the D0170 response flow (DTC CP 3523) and the BSC CPs have been raised for the Commissioning flows ([CP1496](#)), the MOA to MOA process with the flows ([CP1497](#)) and the D0170 response flow ([CP1495](#)).

Next Meeting: 17 January 2018