Meeting Summary

TNUoS Task Force Meeting 5

Date:	05/10/2022	Location:	virtual
Start:	10:00	End:	12:00

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Aled Moses (AMo)	Regrets	Angeles Sandoval (AS)	Attend
Andy Manning (AMa)	Choose an item.	Andy Pace (AP)	Choose an item.
Anthony Dicicco (AD)	Choose an item.	Arjan Geveke (AG)	Regrets
Binoy Dharsi (BD)	Attend	Adam Morrison	Regrets
George Moran (GMo)	Attend	Grace March (GMa)	Attend
Graham Pannell (GP)	Regrets	Jo Zhou (JZ)	Attend
Harriet Harmon (HH)	Regrets	James Greenhalgh (JG)	Choose an item.
James Stone (JS)	Attend	John Tindal (JT)	Attend
Jon Wisdom (JW)	Attend	Joseph Dunn (JD)	Attend
Joshua Logan (JL)	Attend	Kyle Smith (KS)	Attend
Lauren Jauss (LJ)	Attend	Matthew Patrick (MP)	Attend
Milly Lewis (ML)	Choose an item.	Niall Coyle (NC)	Attend
Naomi De Silva (ND)	Choose an item.	Paul Jones (PJ)	Attend
Sam Davies (SD)	Regrets	Sam Hughes (SH)	Attend
Simon Lord (SL)	Regrets	Teri Puddefoot (TP)	Attend

Discussion and details

Please note: These notes are produced as an accompaniment to the <u>agenda</u> and <u>slide pack</u> presented which can be found on the Charging Future website

1. **Introduction and Welcome**

    JW welcomed Task Force members to the meeting and noted that this was a shorter meeting which would focus on agreeing prioritisation of the TNUoS Defects collated at Task Force meeting 3.

2. TNUoS Defect and Prioritisation

In TNUoS Task Force meeting 3, members began to compile a list of TNUoS Defects/areas for review. Since this meeting JS and NW have collated the individual defects/areas for review and attempted to group these into four main packages:

1) Data inputs and methodology enhancement / simplification (structural changes);

2) TNUoS & SQSS Review interactions;

3) Signals/Locational signals; and

4) Other

Members agreed that this grouping worked.

JS talked through possible approaches and considerations in terms of how the Task Force agree prioritisation of the defects (see slides 5-7). Members then debated:

- Urgency - if the defect was considered a high, medium or low priority;
- Importance - how big the issue was considered to be;
- Wider impact - if defects overlapped other areas and if this meant it may take time to review;
- Complexity - how easy the issue might be to fix and if there are any quick wins

Members agreed to focus on if the defect should be fixed now or at a later date and gave each defect a rating of high/medium/low. Using these criteria, members then went on to identify work that could be carried out in the background should the TNUoS Task Force be required to take a period of intermission. It was recognised though that this would be dependent on the possibility of Ofgem needing to re-prioritise work as discussed in the last meeting.

Members worked though the defects spreadsheet and each item was given an importance rating. Members discussed the reasoning behind this. The updated spreadsheet will be made available once finalised

3. Next Steps and Close

As time was limited during this session, only the first package defects were covered during this meeting. JS and NW agreed that the spreadsheet would be updated to reflect the meeting discussion but also that an initial ESO view in terms of priorities for the other packages would also be provided. This would then be sent to the Task Force members to allow for further comment prior to the next meeting (see Actions 1 and 2 below)

MP noted that HH will provide JW with an update regarding Ofgem Prioritisation of work mentioned at Task Force meeting 3, as soon as possible.

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

ID/ date	Agenda Item	Description	Owner	Notes	Target Date	Status
1 05/10	2	Update TNUoS Defects spreadsheet with ESO view of prioritisation etc	JS/NW	Once completed, send to TP for circulation to TF Members	TF Meeting 6	
2 05/10	2	Add comments to TNUoS Defects spreadsheet	All			