Issue 93 Workgroup 3 Summary

## Summary

1. **Meeting Objectives**

The Chair welcomed attendees and presented the following meeting objectives to WG Members:

* Provide an update on upcoming Change Proposals (CPs)
* Provide an update on redlined documents
* Confirm sub-group members to address outstanding aspects
* Identify the next set of aspects to review

1. **Review Updated redlining**
   1. Elexon presented redlining changes to the WG and welcomed comments.
2. **A\_09 Tightening the minimum accuracy classes for Meters (CoP5) and CTs (CoPs 3,5 and 10)**
   1. Elexon confirmed that there was no impact to BSCP27 and CoP4, therefore, no redlining needed.
   2. Elexon confirmed that the required Meter class will be updated to class 1 for CoP5, CT accuracy class updated 0.5s for CoPs 3, 5 and 10.
   3. Elexon asked the WG for more information on ‘standard’ CT ratios installed so that we can be in a position to recommend that appropriate ratios are installed. The WG agreed to create a sub-group to address the “Standard CT ratio” item as a separate aspect.
   4. Elexon confirmed that a CP is going to be raised to resolve the underlying issues flagged in Aspect 9.
   5. Elexon proposed to include a question in the CP to enable us to confirm if the industry requires time to offload their 0.5 CT stock (and possibly Class 2.0 Meter stock). The WG agreed with this proposal.
   6. Elexon confirmed that section 5.1 of CoPs 3, 5, and 10 had been updated, and CoPs 1 and 2 will be updated to include the minimum burden of quarter burden required on the measurement transformer. However, the WG believed that there were more aspects of the “minimum burden” requirement and as such, should be addressed on a separate CP (e.g., the proposed change should also apply to CoPs 1 and 2). Elexon agreed with this view and took it as an action.
3. **A\_10 Accuracy of Active Energy for sites providing Reactive Energy services**
   1. Elexon presented the redline changes made in CoPs 2 and 4, particularly on the definition of “Reactive Power Service”.
   2. TC noted that the definition of “Reactive Power Services” should be made generic. Elexon took an action to review the definition provided in the WG session.
   3. Elexon raised a question to confirm what the measurement transformer manufacturers thought about testing additional points at the Reactive Power Service sites. DM took an action away to speak to the manufacturers and confirm their views.
   4. Elexon proposed to update CoP3 so that it refers to the additional test points that is currently written in CoP4, the WG agreed with this proposal.
   5. Elexon posed a question to the group regarding the calculation of compensation for VT errors. We wanted to confirm if it was a better option to perform the calculation based on the IEC standard requirements for tests at 0.8PF lag. AH from Siemens took an action to confirm this information as his organisation is familiar with the compensation calculation process.
4. **A\_12 Future proofing changes to IEC Standards**
   1. Elexon confirmed a CP will be raised to implement the agreed solution.
   2. Elexon confirmed the removal of the word “Purchased” from the CoPs.
   3. TC questioned the inclusion of the standard’s year, noting that the CoPs should only include the reference and name for simplicity. **Post meeting note**: CP1508 (<https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1508/>) removed the year for standards quoted in the Reference section of the CoPs and added a footnote to clarify (i.e., 'Metering Equipment should be tested and stamped to the latest iteration of the applicable standard named in this document at the time of initial registration')
   4. Elexon acknowledged the feedback, and will look to review the wording.
5. **A\_15 Monitoring of Voltage failure alarms**
   1. Elexon confirmed that a CP will be raised to implement the agreed solution.
   2. Elexon confirmed the wording in section 5.1.3 of CoPs 1 and 2 had been updated to reflect the comments from the second Workgroup session.
   3. TC noted that the statement about ‘Time delay feature’ could be misinterpreted by installers as it doesn’t specify what the ‘Time delay’ should be to avoid spurious activities at the site. However, after a group discussion, a decision was made to keep the text in based on the notion that the ‘Time delay’ requirements should serve as a guideline to installers and the onus is on the installer to set an appropriate ‘Time delay’ that is justifiable.
6. **A\_07 Considerations of DMP vs AMP**
   1. Elexon presented their view on Appendix A – Defined Metering Points. Where Metering Dispensation applications are submitted to Elexon on cases where the AMP (Actual Metering Point) doesn’t correspond with Defined Metering Point (DMP) and loss compensation is not required to maintain overall accuracy at the DMP. Elexon’s view was that processing Metering Dispensations in these circumstances creates an unnecessary burden on the applicant, Elexon and the Panel Committees.
   2. Elexon proposed to expand Appendix A “to allow the AMP and DMP to be a certain distance apart, to be compliant for other scenarios”. TC expressed a view that distance (in metres) might not be the best way of defining situations where loss compensation was not required due to the AMP not being at the DMP. The WG agreed to meet overall accuracy limits at the DMP and no compensation needed to be applied for power transformer/cable/line losses.
   3. Elexon flagged ‘Insignificant Import in Comparison to Export’ as an item within this aspect for clarification. We wanted to clarify what the specific DMP for LV supplies in Offshore and Onshore substations should4 be. MS cited a scenario where flows occurred between two BM Units (e.g., two offshore Power Park Module (OPPM)) and noted that we might need a DMP to make it clear that these flows were metered. The WG moved to have this item addressed as a separate aspect.
7. **A\_08 Number of Measuring elements**
   1. Elexon wanted to clarify if the switchgear configuration requirement (i.e., the number of CTs and VT configuration required to accurately measure flows in primary conductors) should be placed in the CT/VT section of the CoPs.
   2. Elexon flagged this item to clarify what CoP should the requirements for switchgear configuration be placed in? Should we specify in CoPs if three CTs and three phases/neutral voltages should always be used by Meter Operator Agents (MOAs)? TC asked if the group could investigate and find out the trigger for these questions, which the group agreed to.
   3. WL noted that his organisation had recently changed their specification to accommodate the installation of two CTs at CoPs 1 and 2 sites. WL mentioned this in response to this point for clarification “Should we specify in CoPs if three CTs and three phases/neutral voltages should always be used by MOPs”. In response, TC asked if WL could provide a rationale for that decision, this was taken as an action.
   4. The issue group agreed to “Moving the switchgear configuration requirements to the CT/VT section of the CoPs”. However, they noted that it should be confirmed that the installed CTs are used to avoid waste of resources/equipment.
8. **A\_11 Relevant CoP for embedded circuits**
   1. Elexon raised this item for a group discussion. The aim was to understand which CoP should be used where a Metering Dispensation is applied to meter an embedded circuit for Settlement purposes. TC’s view was that the circuit capacity of the metered circuit should determine the relevant CoP applicable to that circuit– meaning that if the circuit is above a certain threshold, then the next higher CoP should apply.
   2. Elexon proposed to clarify the wording in the Foreword and Appendix A section of the CoPs, to explain how embedded circuit should be handled where the rated capacity at DMP and embedded circuit are at different CoPs. The Issue group agreed with this proposal.
   3. Elexon took an action to redline the relevant section of the CoPs to reflect the discussion point.
9. **Decisions**
   1. The WG agreed that the first batch of CPs should target June 2022 BSC standard release schedule.
   2. The WG voted to have sub-groups created for the purpose of addressing specific aspects of Issue 93.
   3. The WG agreed to raise a separate CP to address the minimum burden requirement in Aspect 9 (Tighten Accuracy Classes).
   4. The WG agreed that the “Clarify the appropriate DMP for LV suppliers” item should be addressed a new aspect.
   5. The WG agreed to raise a new aspect that will look at adding a requirement for the creation and maintenance of Single Line Diagrams (SLDs) for HV or a subset of HV MSIDs.
10. **Prioritisation Process**
    1. Elexon to prioritise the following aspects and provide updated redlining for the next WG:
       1. **A\_07** Considerations of DMP vs AMP
       2. **A\_08** Number of measuring elements
       3. **A\_11** Relevant CoP for embedded circuits
11. **Next Steps**

* The next WG meeting will be held on the 20th of September 2021
* Elexon to raise CP to address the following aspects:
  + Tightening Accuracy Classes
  + Future proofing IEC standards
  + Monitoring of voltage failure alarms
* Elexon to complete redlining on all impacted documents
* Elexon to set-up a monthly WG meeting schedule
* Elexon to prioritise the next set of aspects to work on

1. **Actions**

* Elexon to share the first batch of CP and redlining with the WG for their review and comments
* Elexon to share the anonymised data on bulk buying CT activities
* Elexon to confirm WG attendance for the next session in September
* Elexon to set-up subgroups to address specific aspects of Issue 93
* Elexon to amend the redlining in the Reactive Energy aspect (10) to avoid the use of “Reactive Energy Service”.
* The WG to review and provide comments to Elexon on previously shared redlining
* DM to speak to measurement transformer manufacturers and confirm if they are capable of testing the additional test points (for Aspect 10).
* AH to confirm if it would be better for compensations to be calculated for VT errors based on IEC standard requirements of 0.8PF lag (for Aspect 10).
* Are Meter Operator Agents coming across instances where the incorrect number of CTs were provided and what the impact of that was?
* WL to provide his organisation’s rationale for changing their spec to allow two CTs in CoP1 and 2 sites.
* Do more digging on the number of CoPs 6, 7, 8 and 9 sites.
* Do the redlining on the aspects discussed in the call as per the feedback provided.