

17th MAMCoP Board Meeting

From	Daniel Smith	30 th March 2009
Date and time of	27 th March 2009	
Meeting	10:30	
Location	Room 9, Ofgem	

1. Present

Steve Rowe	Ofgem
Daniel Smith	Ofgem
Dave Thorley	National Grid
Andrew Goodfellow	United Utilities
Jim Sibley	Advantica
Phil Daniels	CORGI
Terry Mundy	Lloyds Register
Ian Smith	IGEM
Iain Heffey	National Grid Metering
Chic Dalrymple	UK Meter Exchange
Andrew Watson	UK Meter Exchange
John Heyburn	Scotia Gas Networks
Mike Buss	SBGI/Actaris
Alan Smith	AIGT/ES Pipelines
Tom Chevalier	AMO
Trevor Smallpeice	CORGI
Kelly Sherwood	Siemens Metering Services
Steve Brand	United Utilities
Nicola Wade	HSE
Chris Turner	SBGI

2. Apologies

- 2.1. Bob Murray, EnvoyOnline.co.uk; Scott Agar, EDF Energy; David Perriam, WW Utilities; Ian Aldridge, National Grid; Russell Gibson, Energy Assets

3. Review of Minutes of the 16th MAMCoP Board Meeting

- 3.1. Page 3 – Action 8 – PEMs Workshop probably action on NGM/AMO? (T)
- 3.2. Page 8 – PEMs on Action Log
- 3.3. MB: 10.2.1 – “is out” should be changed to “will be out”
- 3.4. Minutes approved

4. Review of Actions

Action	Person- By
Action (1) - Review of MAMCoP and CoP 1a/b	
SR: We have existing COPs 1a, 1b, 1c there's no issues in them operating, will hold until the new scheme is operating and in place. Likely to be an announcement/Open letter on Ofgem website proposing the arrangements to be put in	

<p>place – quite soon. Shortly after COPs will be out for general comment.</p>	
Action (2) - Appeals Process for MAMCoP/AIGT	
<p>SR: With latest round of legal reviews, gas act is concern – we require licence condition? It is maybe that SoS or HSE (or Ofgem with LC changes) could do it. Given existing MAMCoP scheme as it stands it's has an element of challenge and review at the audit stage. Not something perceived to be a huge risk – more about providing clarity. Something AIGT raised 18+ months ago.</p> <p>TC: Action has been around for 2 years – any timescale/thoughts</p> <p>TC: Concern that this just drifts on, no milestones or timeline.</p> <p>SR: As it stands the risk is on Ofgem, so something we need to resolve for our protection and purposes. Where findings have been made its been resolved at a working level - not been escalated.</p> <p>TM: It needs a “final arbiter”.</p> <p>SR: Mechanism as it works is working, but it's been flagged by AIGT that it needs to be bolstered by formal process.</p> <p>TC: Problem that when something does bubble up to that level it'll be serious.</p> <p>SR: Agree.</p> <p>TM: System at the moment is the same as gas, water and electricity schemes. Never had an appeal situation which went beyond the local level with the assessor. The organisation that's being assessed has to sign off the deficiency findings before the assessor leaves. Some discussion and recognition as to the ultimate finding and only if that level of agreement cannot be found it would be passed onto Ofgem to decide the result. When major deficiency is identified the organisation has a month to address that. Very clear what they're signing up to. Only if they don't address within a month it will escalate.</p> <p>TC: Problem is when a company doesn't believe it's a deficiency.</p> <p>TM: Yes, but it hasn't happened to date in any scheme we operate.</p>	
Action (3) - Commissioning and Auditing	
<p>TM: went out to the MAMs and identified the preferred dates for taking the audit. Only one MAM came back with requirement to retain audit timeframes. Majority opted for May. Completed 5 audits to date. Program was submitted to SR of the preferred dates of the MAMs.</p>	

Action (4) - Moving Domestic Meters and OAMI CoPs	
This item is on the agenda to be discussed later.	
Action (5) - I&C Meter Code Obligation - signatories	
<p>SR: Has chased Mick a number of times but not received anything. He hasn't attended meetings for some time. Not sure if we still require that comfort – a talking point.</p> <p>JS: No underpinning. It was the idea of the action that Ofgem signed onto as part of the risk assessment – something would be put in place</p> <p>SR: they've got the ICOP – the issue was around confirmation of who the signatories are.</p> <p>JS: Is that underpinned in any LC? Any supporting document? It was raised as a high level issue. The sunset clause was put in and other actions were going to be put in place but weren't.</p> <p>SR: No other actions going to be put in place. Most I&Cs were signatories to ICOP. Board would take comfort in seeing that list.</p> <p>JS: going back a bit further than that. When sunset clause came to fruition something else should have been put in, but wasn't. Some talk with NG about putting something in.</p> <p>SR: some concern that it had lapsed but no commitment to underpin through licence or otherwise.</p> <p>NW: Been through this a number of times. Accepted I&C was voluntary approach, and they just needed to sign up and for us to see a copy – why is it so hard to see one?</p> <p>SR: Perhaps because it's not just one party.</p> <p>IS: If they all signed up it should be somewhere and they should have the message</p> <p>SR: Need to talk about with NW if it's not being fruitful. Not sure it's a single document with signatures.</p> <p>IS: Mick said at the meeting that all would sign up voluntarily, but not sure they were signed up to one single document – just agreements.</p> <p>SR, NW: not our understanding – think it's just one document.</p>	<p>SR- chase Mick Curtis for MAM compliance letter</p> <p>SR: Chase this with formal letter to MD level (Andrew Wright)</p>

Action (6) - Update on Missing ECVH	
This item is on the agenda to be discussed later.	
Action (7) - PEMs Workshop	
<p>TC: Had a meeting in January. Discovered that the wrong supplier were getting billed where there was a change of supplier after April 08 – which led to the ‘old’ supplier being notified of PEMs job and the ‘old’ supplier was paying the bill. Discussion about obtaining removed components after PEMS job. WWU only company known to keep them.</p> <p>TC will chase up the other GTs – would be grateful for contacts. MAMs wish to have parts available for collection so that they can investigate issues.</p> <p>KS: Only thing we get back is the meter, everything else is scrapped. NG have written a letter.</p> <p>TC: Understand that the Supplier/GT contract requires to keep the removed items for collection by MAM. Follow up meetings: keeping going, next couple of months to see how it’s going. Did stats last year in terms of PEMs & transporters – interesting to pick that up for 2008 to see whether the number of jobs increased/declined.</p> <p>SR: In terms of data/transfer data is this a problem?</p> <p>TC: After April new supplier not picked up errors and old supplier getting told about it, parties trying to investigate but still sending to old supplier. One transporter at the meeting said they were suffering this problem but though it was their own, when others said they had the same problem there was a realisation that this was a more central problem. After the meeting the suppliers decided they should be checking the PEMs charges they receive are their own.</p>	
Action (8) - CAPITA and HSE	
<p>TS: Propose to touch on this after 7.3 on agenda.</p> <p>IS: Propose a question: at present, Lloyds register operates the MAM registration, CORGI operates the OAMI registration (or have done) – what happens next week to the latter.</p> <p>SR: Sending out a letter in terms of what our intention is with OAMI, imminently.</p>	<p>SR to send out letter regarding Ofgem’s intentions with OAMI</p>

Action (9) – Meter Mimic	
SR: Action on BC to inform trading standards of device fault.	
IH: No idea if it's been completed – ongoing.	
Action (10) – MPI Installation Faults	
SR: completed, closed out	
IS: But the issue itself is still alive.	
SR: Is that a new action then?	
NW: Suggest wait until report back.	
IS: In interim corgi have a draft technical bulletin on the issue – leave until NW report back	

5. Smart Metering Specification Update (Mike Buss)

- 5.1. Mike Buss gave a presentation on this (included).
- 5.2. Slide 3: CEN 273 – approval in May time.
- 5.3. MB: Smart meters – France and Spain are using 1 way communication.
- 5.4. MB: Germany going probably for a bit more functionality (valve) but not much info on screen. Germany problem with lots of distribution companies.
- 5.5. MB: Specification not quite finished. One change is that they want to put in import/export specification for elec.
- 5.6. MB: Difficult for EU standard to say "smart meters have this:" in it.
- 5.7. MB: Report had difficulties in Calculating the bill: UK PPM calorific value info is passed down to it. When calculating consumption values its using CV. In SM things are different and consumer has to see this info. Possible that CV average is different from notional one. If estimated info for consumer is less than the bill there'll be call into supplier (and if more). If you're going to provide info in £ on a display, how do you make it the same as a bill? Can be done, but very complex.
- 5.8. JS: tight program, drivers driving it forward.
- 5.9. JS: always from suppliers side not transporters. TER needs changing. Not going to happen this week/year.
- 5.10. MB: only BERR/DECC have considered this in any detail. In theory, if you can provide the data in more or less real time to the meter, you can do it. Proposal is that fixed factor is a variable, theoretically you could post code it for altitude etc. not expensive, just write to OS and they'll tell you altitude by postcode. Not perfect, but better than current. IF DECC come round and say we're going to have monthly billing, it would make sense to factor these things in.
- 5.11. SR: depends on definition of timing and accurate.
- 5.12. MB: because of complexity we're waiting on DECC to announce the next level.

5.13. JS: most people aware smart metering rise in last few years. Just before ESCO directive in 2006, MID was put into force. One of the prime fundamentals for EU is free movement of goods. MID designed to allow manufacturer to go to one body, get it approved, and then use it throughout Europe. Then some member states were putting forward directives for SM – defining what a SM was and should have on it. Some of the changes were going to commission, and commission rejecting them. Can't do anything in law at that point, but if that legislation comes into force then they see them in Strasburg. Situation here member states trying to move things forward and free movement of goods issue. Commission sees harmonised standard process of helping SM unblock barriers, so you can have functionality on an EU level, could be optional. Started to draft a mandate – to cover gas, elec, water and heat meters. The EU SM industry group chaired by Howard Porter, has been putting a lot of pressure on the commission to try to move forward. GTAs and MMAs have also pressured. Now mandate issued by commission which gives work program and once the mandate is accepted, they have 3 months to put together work program, 9 months to draft and approve communication standards and 30 months to determine product specification.

5.14. JS: This is a massive piece of work. Standards organisation made clear that 9 month timetable is not realistic. Can't meet objectives of mandate. But omission have driven it forward. Because it's becoming such a big issue in Europe – stopping innovation moving forward and meters being produced. Needs to be done urgently.

5.15. JS: But there's been a coordination group set up with a series of members. There will be a steering group looking after the process. We have enough trouble in UK trying to agree, let alone Europe – so timescales could be said to be optimistic, but sure they will do their best. Meeting in Europe some time in last week in May where members of the group will come together and one of the objectives that JB is trying to put forward, is we as meter owners and operators, need to be defining to Europe and standards organisation what data flows are going to be there, how we see smart metering system configured, what are the options for the system, and make sure the comms people understand what we're asking them to do. If they don't then we'll never have a product suitable for our needs.

5.16. JS: Lots of further reports to come.

5.17. SR: are you coordinating a lot of this?

5.18. JS: no, believe the responsibility of UK GM industry to define what it wants, can only do with consultation with suppliers, (some aren't that active).

5.19. MB: though all suppliers are engaged at some level or other.

5.20. JS: Draft mandate published on 12 March.

5.21. JS: Howard porter suggests the value of SM in Europe £150-200bn. (UK think is around £8bn).

5.22. MB: if he's talking about elec, gas, heat and water, it's a big number.

5.23. MB: Problem with smart meters at the moment is security – there's none.

5.24. JS: we just define the meter, communication goes out in various flows, and links to comms standard used to others. So we need to define what flows on info need to go back and forward. If we don't get that right that's where problem is.

5.25. MB: it's not an EU standard. But some standards have been suggested. One other thing is one platform for all. Actaris in Sweden experience was to cover elec

requirements, some GPRS meters, some on PLC and some on local radio network. To get that all working on a centralised comms system is going to be extremely complex task for the UK.

5.26. JS: In SELEC group as home automation. Could manage heating/lighting/house and then you can start to see value in these products.

5.27. MB: interesting, but experience outside Europe, utilities (states) doing the home control end, are fourth generation customers, they aren't doing this from a standing start. For the UK to try and do this from a standing start it's almost certain to fail. Have to go in some small steps, and accept that there's some costs to that.

5.28. SR: part of this is managing expectations and being realistic about delivery.

5.29. MB: if it delivers good billing and info, it can be accurate and timely, then can be good.

6. Moving Meters (Ian Smith – IGEM)

6.1. IS: Going back a couple of years, concern has been expressed that Corgi installers, who are not Ofgem approved meter installers, were possibly doing meter work that legally they might not have been entitled to do. So IS formed a group to look into it, and they've got 13 of the key parties involved, and there are others wishing to get involved. There was a meeting on 9th February at IGEM which established broad categories of work that the installers may/may not be doing – from disconnecting/reconnecting meters, to disconnecting meters and moving it to room next door etc. They tried to categorise the work involved and legislation/standard involved.

6.2. Currently about half way through, another meeting tomorrow (28th March) to fill in gaps, possibly one more, then can report back. **ACTION**

7. Reports/Updates

7.1. HSE – Nicola Wade

7.1.1. NW: medium pressure meters faults – thanks for feedback on the scale of the issue. Feeling that it's not as industry wide as first lead to believe. Technical draft bulletin circulated after last MAMCoP meeting, understand comments been fairly limited, so no major objections to current content?

7.1.2. IS: Objects

7.1.3. NW: options still remain for industry to come forward with alternative solutions, but no one's been forthcoming during months of discussion. So will remain At Risk until other steps are taken to resolve by industry, but doesn't look as industry wide a fault as thought – depends on the companies who have this problem to develop solutions and see if they can bring risk rating down.

7.1.4. SR: what is the obligation of categorising the at risk? What will MAMs do?

7.1.5. NW: installers will have to advise the customer, switch off with permission, customer will have to be advised that there is a fault on their installation pipework (not meter) then customer has to pursue with supplier and develop (as is on number of housing estates) to get the pipework repositioned – no other options.

- 7.1.6. SR: installation or service pipework?
- 7.1.7. NW: installation
- 7.1.8. JS: may involve service work
- 7.1.9. IS: history – supposed to be solution around, but we haven't seen the detail – issue regarding At Risk, our suggestion was that if there is a solution (e.g. make installation comply with standard) then it shouldn't be at risk, should just be not to current standard – but solution doesn't seem to be coming forward.
- 7.1.10. IH: meter provider can't classify how they like – have "at risk", "dangerous" or "ok". They can't classify "not to current standards".
- 7.1.11. PD: limited scope – unsafe situations covers not to current standards – so should be able to identify at that level. But most installers seeing that would mark it down as "At Risk". Up to customer, if they decide to turn it back on it's up to them.
- 7.1.12. NW: no great debate, so industry did research as to risk level so GIUSP panel could judge on fact rather than possible future solutions. Avenue is always there for industry to come back and say they have an option to bring it into line with standards. Option may be to bring it down to NCS but for present it's "at risk". Important to note scale is not widespread.
- 7.1.13. JS: are solutions recognised by standard?
- 7.1.14. NW: there are no solutions, other than repositioning pipework. Unsafe sites will be coming out, 6th edition coming out with effect from 1st April. Produced and distributed by Gas Safe Register in hard copy to every installer. With exception of some large businesses who want to re-badge it and issue it out themselves. 5th edition did not come into effect on 1st March, so moving from the 4th to the 6th. For those working to the 5th, the content of the 6th edition is very similar to the 5th.
- 7.1.15. NW: Re: Gas Safe Register: transition arrangements – fairly careful in terms of timings to make sure people registered with Corgi until end of March – trying to alert people of the changes. Hopefully see increase in local and national media over next few weeks – trying to raise consumer awareness. Possibility of exploring some TV advertising to aid the process. Things like billboards and newspaper advertising etc will be out in next few weeks. Once GSR take the reigns they can go full pelt with publicity. HSE are working with them as well.
- 7.1.16. JS: will Corgi (phone) numbers get put forward to GSR?
- 7.1.17. NW: they will be different. Only numbers that will stay the same are corgi employees, contact numbers are different – range from 0800, also local STD call numbers.
- 7.1.18. IH – Northern Ireland and Channel Islands are staying with corgi until at least next year.
- 7.1.19. TS: Corgi will still be a company, but won't have the resources to take phone calls that they do now. Auto forward will not happen. On 31st March it all switches off. Mobile phone numbers will stay the same, everything else will change. Thinks that we need to realise that what GSR is doing is a mammoth job in a short amount of time. Things are very close to the wire. Matter of

working with that. Just don't lose focus on keeping people gas safe – that's the main thing.

7.1.20. PD: most of the gas-experienced people are still with Corgi, and those will move over the GSR on 31st March. About 230ish people.

7.1.21. AS: to ensure that only competent meter installers' are used the registration number of the individual CORGI installer up to the 31st March 2009 is held within the IGT's IT system which is designed to undertakes an automatic check when the meter form is returned. This identifies any individual not on the data base which allows a discreet check to be made of that individual installer to ensure he was CORGI registered. All IGTs undertake similar checks to prove competency

7.1.22. PD: actual data base on corgi turned off a few weeks ago. Will hopefully be redeveloped into Gas Safe Register one – not there atm.

7.1.23. AS: with the change over from CORGI to Capita registration on the 1st April 2009 the requirement was for all new meter installer's to receive their new Capita registration cards, this would allow IGTs' to input the meter installers discreet Capita Licence number into their IT systems to undertake the competency checks. To date Meter Installers' have indicated Capita have not been able to supply all new cards on time. As there has been a delay in the process IGT's have to review their systems to avoid not paying competent installers for work legitimately completed.

7.1.24. PD: GSR setting up new database, linking all the other things coming in, it's a massive job. Corgi has to keep going until 31st march – very difficult to say "Tuesday it's here, Wednesday it's over here".

7.1.25. AS: a big selling point of the transition from CORGI to Capita registration was that there would be a clean break on the 1st April 2009 and that all meter providers would receive their new cards by that date. Evidence indicates that this has not occurred

7.1.26. PD/TS: it will be, but there'll be some issues. If you have issues that are affecting you and you have contacts in Corgi then talk to them. They can help. Can help a lot more when they move into new place on 1st April.

7.2. ECV Handles – Tom Chevalier

7.2.1. TC: Version debating at the meeting in January. A few tweaks and changes made. Section 1 is background and principles, section 2 is the key elements "gas transporters do this, like provide handles, retain ownership etc", and MAM does the other items. Aim was to complete section 3 and 4. Recognised that there's a whole series of different types of handles. Looking for more input to that. Action from meeting in January – where should doc sit, hope was whether it could fit in MAMCoP some way. The question, as MAMCoP is on asset managers, these requirements are on transporters – would section 2 fit within MAMCoP? There are various sections within MAMCoP that other sections could logically fit in to, if people think it's appropriate.

7.2.2. TC: Looking through MAMCoP, there's bits like sealing, which requires sealing, which then goes to appendix on how to do it – could do a similar thing for handles?

7.2.3. IS: Suggests that 6400 covers maintenance.

- 7.2.4. JS: more an installation issue than MAM issue
- 7.2.5. IS: so would make 6400 a logical place to put it.
- 7.2.6. TC: would this be more difficult to put it in?
- 7.2.7. IS: than MAMCoP? Given timescales on MAMCoP changes, probably not.
- 7.2.8. IS: can get it into GM6
- 7.2.9. MB: mainly around domestic side though.
- 7.2.10. TS: could make reference in AOMI Cop
- 7.2.11. SR: thought it was more of an agreement by industry. In terms of better regulation approach, should we leave it to industry to come up with an agreement and operate on that basis?
- 7.2.12. TC: no obligation to do this, win win if they do though.
- 7.2.13. IS: some of this is technical, reading through, on a medium pressure installation you shouldn't mix up the two values (one shouldn't have a handle on it) – not mentioned in this.
- 7.2.14. TC: people should know what they're doing though, this is simply about providing the handle with a split pin in the right place. They should be capable of doing that although MP/LP is mentioned in document. This is just a distilled set which isn't trying to teach people to do what they already do.
- 7.2.15. MB: technical bit would be nice in 6400. Somewhere else hosting contact information going forward – annex. If you do it in 6400 it's hooked into MAMCoP anyway.
- 7.2.16. SR: view that it's industry agreement and not sure you need to put it into code.
- 7.2.17. KS: think it's more difficult to put into code.
- 7.2.18. SR: this is an option, but the code could go out of date quickly.
- 7.2.19. JS: code should be raised to a higher level.
- 7.2.20. TS: agreement could sit on Ofgem website
- 7.2.21. SR: we don't want to maintain agreements on behalf of industry, also, view that it shouldn't be in code.
- 7.2.22. TC: approach could be to fill it out with more contact details, see how it works, and review in 6 months/a year, leave as stand alone document.
- 7.2.23. SR: seems sensible.
- 7.2.24. NW: on that basis, could it go out as a technical bulletin?
- 7.2.25. TS: in regime now, can't see a problem, after Wednesday a bit more cautious but can't see why not.
- 7.2.26. SR: problem that AMO will be reviewing a batch of handles...

- 7.2.27. NW: more people that know about process the better.
- 7.2.28. TC: suggest that the MAM can sort it out for you, make the OAMI aware of it to talk to the MAM, but leave the MAM and transporter doing the communication and management.
- 7.2.29. IS: confident that DNOs have signed up to it?
- 7.2.30. TC: over the last 6 months, had comments back from a number of them yes, but would need to check.
- 7.2.31. IS: historically worried about liability.
- 7.2.32. TC: largest one was worried, but ok now.
- 7.2.33. SR: what is the plan for this document?
- 7.2.34. TC: need more contact details for each of the transporters and what they're willing to do.
- 7.2.35. SR: in terms of facilitating closing consultation on it, could circulate within MAMCoP to confirm everyone has signed on. Could do it as a contractual arrangement.
- 7.2.36. JS: 6400: check of the ECV, and if it doesn't meet the checks you contact the appropriate GT. So covered at a higher level.
- 7.2.37. TC: but if the MAM fitted the handle then it would meet the checks...
- 7.2.38. JS: sure, if it says if you've got a problem contact the GT - covered from the highest level but not the specific level.
- 7.2.39. TC: will try and complete and circulate. **ACTION**

7.3. CORGI – Phil Daniels

- 7.3.1. PD: Corgi website as we know it is closed down, the new Corgi website is up – for Corgi services. Says what they're still involved in. Info 18 months ago about stats available on Corgi website and places where assessments can be carried out should be taken over to the new gas register website. But until next week they don't know how far it will go. No link between the two websites, whole new content. Will advise of new contact details as soon as they have them
- 7.3.2. TS: approx. figures of re-registration, are about 43,000 business registered with 90,000 operatives. Good figures. Comparable with any other year – not dropped. Also increased number of new applications (he's being told – not seen evidence). Says that vast majority of larger businesses have got registered and should have their cards and should be ready on 1st April.
- 7.3.3. KS: no grace period?
- 7.3.4. TS: Legally none.
- 7.3.5. KS: numbers encouraging
- 7.3.6. TS: Agree. We went through a big campaign of contacting larger businesses explaining they need to get registered. Have been setting deadlines for this. Helping by being intermediary with GSR. Corgi head office have done work on

this too. Numbers saying there's still a few smaller businesses who haven't registered, but it's normal at this point.

7.3.7. PD: there is a few that don't read anything

7.3.8. TS: there is no grace time so it's a worry that a few people won't have covered their position.

7.3.9. SR: thought 120,000 operatives was the number?

7.3.10. TS: yes, but 90,000 at the moment, it fluctuates. Historically Corgi lose 5000-6000 registrations every registration period, then rebuild over the year.

7.3.11. IH: what about transition bodies? Do they have to redo criteria?

7.3.12. PD: ACS staying as it is. But will look into this as GSR. Nothing likely to happen until 6/7 months after new reg.

7.3.13. IH: what are assessment centres training new people on? Assessment 5 or 6?

7.3.14. PD: they have 5.. they take an assessment over a 5 year period – if they came on this week they train on what's there, though there's a substantial changes over a 5 year period they're not tested again until then. It's up to the individual and company to make sure they stay up to date. Otherwise every 5 weeks people would have to come in.

7.3.15. SR: I circulated memo from EU skills. So there's another branch of competence being developed.

7.3.16. PD: they're looking at routes to industry through EU Skills. There's no recognised training program to go to commercial and LPG sector. So how do people get into industry? Majority of people who are in that sector take domestic metering side then add ACS stuff to it through different training and work in industry, but no recognised way for someone to be trained and work purely as an industrial meter installer.

7.3.17. TC: : has been working with EU skills for 6 months, they're trying to develop skills and training for "UK plc" to make sure there's people who can do the job effectively for the UK. In electricity we've been working on meter worker skills (equivalent to Corgi for meter worker for elec) so cleaner sheet. Picking up on passport type approach. Looked at gas because they want similar thing on gas – but concern on overlap and duplication. But EU Skills do need careful direction.

7.3.18. PD: worked with ACS to make sure it's aligned with NVQ.

7.3.19. TC: the elec stuff – there's a series of module and one is talking to customers and getting into property – generic. Various modules then skills stuff like doing the meters. Very modular, but it's beneficial for training packages.

7.3.20. PD: that's good – because gas and elec have the same training to get into someone's house.

7.3.21. TC: Fitting AMR "things". When reviewing the IGEM GM/7 document the group wanted accredited process for going through it – bloke doing the work had a tick saying he was capable – can come out of EU skills direction.

7.3.22. IS: is going to meeting – few weeks away.

7.3.23. IS: question: some people reference technical bulletin numbers – is it true that when Corgi go to GSR you might have the tech bulletin but number will be different?

7.3.24. PD – can't give an answer yet. Will feedback

7.3.25. ACTION – TS: feedback processes and numbering

7.3.26. AW: AW highlighted that there are differing industry practices with regards I&C meter exchanges where the meter is fixed but has two flexi's attached. Some OAMIs believe that it is suitable for the flexis to be left in situ post exchange as long as the post meter outlet installation is labeled as not to current standard. Other OAMIs believe that this is insufficient and that the installation should be brought up to current standard by the installation of fixed pipework. Advice and guidance is sought.

7.3.27. PD: meter installations should only have one flexible connection.

7.3.28. JS: 6891 says can't have one within 600mm.

7.3.29. PD: suggest raise it at the meeting – not clear where you are. Could say you can have two flexes and it doesn't apply to the standards, or that it's at risk..depends what you've got an what we're looking at.

7.3.30. TS: interesting – why aren't you bringing that meter up to standard?

7.3.31. AW: AW highlighted that the Company presently follow the latter practice but were exploring the former with newly appointed (to the company) OAMIs with a view to minimising aborted visits. A standard industry approach would be preferred and advice and guidance from the board would be welcome.

7.3.32. TS: can say meter outlet finished at the end of the meter, and anything beyond that is not their responsibility, but don't want things flapping about because it's not good for the meter.

7.3.33. If you have an AOMI not following current practices to talk me and them and find out their views.

7.3.34. Come back to the point that it says "give due consideration to upgrade in current standards" - if some one has a problem with two flexes then perhaps they should be upgrading the meter.

7.3.35. IS: unsafe sits says what?

7.3.36. PD: doesn't say anything

7.3.37. KS: current practice for many years to do two flexes – book says consider bringing it up to standard, but main object is to fit a bracket.

7.3.38. IS: get questions on installation, questions on 6400, and they're just referred to Corgi.

7.3.39. TS: will make the judgement, just follow COPs. After the outlet of the meter, it's the customer's pipework and their responsibility. And if you feel it's not up to your standards you issue "not up to current standards" on it. But it's not your pipework. Historically "you" fitted both those flexes. But on 6400 you decided you didn't want the outlet flex, so now it's their responsibility. Then if you feel

that isn't right through installation standards give them a "not to current standards". They'll probably just bin it.

7.3.40. Question why you'd fit a brand new meter and not bring your installation up to standard.

7.3.41. PD: if it's hanging without a bracket it's more "at risk".

7.3.42. SR: is this a piece of work for a subgroup or technical guidance?

7.3.43. JS: no, standards are clear.

7.3.44. KS: agree, whilst we have opinions, standards are very clear of what they say. At the moment it says you can have two flexes

7.3.45. JS: no it doesn't

7.3.46. IS: this should be raised at the gas industry unsafe sites group.

7.3.47. JS: BS 6891 – can't have a flex within 600mm of an outlet.

7.3.48. TS: that's the conundrum of saying your meter responsibility finishes at the outlet of the meter.

7.3.49. MB: that's why it's worded like that. On normal U6 type installations, the installation ends at the outlet boss of the meter. Part of the 6891 problem, not your problem as a meter installer.

7.3.50. TS: so should be issuing not to current standards to owner of current outlet.

7.3.51. KS: so should go to the unsafe sites as you're/we're tending to re-categorise the situation.

7.3.52. IS: this is a chicken and egg situation – which doesn't comply – meter pipework or meter installation? G1 assumes that the installation of meter comes before pipework. How this stands in law ... ?

7.3.53. TS: probably doesn't stand at all.

7.3.54. MB: problem is talking about installations done before G1 came along.

7.3.55. TC: there's a fundamental problem that's brought up every day, and questions are raised, but no proper specification on this. As an industry we need to decide on this – otherwise competitive company takes the cheapest solution, rather than the most safe option. So if people have concerns on this you end up with potentially unsafe option...

7.3.56. TS: well it will still be safe

7.3.57. TC: matter of judgement

7.3.58. IS: suggest that the best forum for this is the industry unsafe sites group. Should write to sec. of this group and say it's an issue to be discussed at the next meeting/version.

7.3.59. TC: would support this.

7.3.60. IS: only place for it. Standards making bodies can say what you can do to correct an old installation.

7.3.61. **ACTION: TS to see if Corgi have a view on this.**

7.3.62. TC: do we want a corgi view or gas safe view?

7.3.63. NW: want to wait until secretary has cleared 6th edition in next few weeks.
Won't see a result in writing in the 7th edition for a while.

7.3.64. SR/IS: TB an alternative option.

7.3.65. TC: start the process, the view may come out in TB and be reflected in 7th edition later.

7.4. IGEM – Ian Smith

7.4.1. IS: GM6 – it's going to be issued for comment after next Monday.

7.4.2. Otherwise not much going on in terms of gas measurement.

7.4.3. SR25: on back on HSL work, IGEM has had the work validated and verified by Advantica, and therefore will be progressing with amendment of SR25 for hazardous area classification, which impacts on Gas metering installations by GM7b. Would hope that by end of this year would have started work on revised GM7b. Had to get some funding for more work to enable us to update SR25 and use the HSLs numbers, but more work to be done.

7.4.4. Not formal: DNOs to pay for it.

7.5. BSI – Mike Buss

7.5.1. MB: done already, standards are standards. Two standards – smart standard, or end up taking smart stuff into each of the standards. Will have impact on EU standards. In terms of UK standards, not much going on. Meter box standard out for comment. Volume conversion advice out for comment end of April.

8. AOB

8.1. TC – SLC for advance metering

8.1.1. TC: Standard Licence Condition (SLC) for advance metering should go into place April 6. Meeting tomorrow of Ofgem interoperability group. That SLC for gas metering not really a conflict with the MID and national code. Went to EC – unsure if they've come back with comments. As far as aware it's going to happen on 6th April.

8.1.2. MB: also heard nothing from Europeans.

8.1.3. JS: they can object at a later date if they don't comment

8.1.4. TC: they had 3 months notice to comment

8.1.5. JS: even if they missed it they can still comment later.

8.1.6. As a result, Ofgem interoperability group set up an AMR service provider COP. Trying to pin down what an AMR service is. Running along. One intention is to have a database of where AMR is commented to the meter. Gives MAMs visibility to who's connected to the meter.

- 8.1.7. Debate on how this will go forward, who will manage it, whether it's standalone database etc. etc.
- 8.1.8. Linked to this: discussion on creating framework MPU agreement to replace NG version – more thinned down. Recognise GM7 stuff that's changed and BSP COP. Raised tomorrow at the meeting by NG on behalf of the AMO. Recognition that even within the largest metering company what they have is a bit OTT and need to try and simplify it. If they can all agree then they'll get a framework document that is simpler and everyone can use.

- 8.1.9. Will go out to consultation

8.2. KS – clarification on qualifications for changing meter module

- 8.2.1. KS: wants guidance on clarification – one meter is changing its module. Can't get clarification whether you've got to be qualified/registered. Corgi didn't give very good answer. Quite a few thousand need to be done. Job to know if you have to be qualified/registered to do this work – to take a module off a PPM turns the supply off. As Corgi points out you don't actually "work" on the installation – so you don't have to be registered. So if you turn a supply off, and then relight an appliance, is that supply ok to be left working? Very grey.
- 8.2.2. PD: there was a problem some years ago with PPM meters – some problems with people who tend to have those meters are not the best customers - they do funny things inside the property e.g. taking appliances away and end up with open pipes etc. so end up with problems when you alter the meter.
- 8.2.3. IH: meter will have checks built in so too much gas can't go into the property. Controlled operation. Question still as to whether competent people need to carry out this work.
- 8.2.4. KS: where the consumer has made the decision to run out of gas. We're instigating turning the gas off this time. Don't lose pressure.
- 8.2.5. PD: gas safety requirements say if you turn gas off for short period of time and turn it back on it's not classified as work.
- 8.2.6. JS: but there's a duty of care...
- 8.2.7. TS: our answer would be why haven't you determined if it's gas work or not, and if not, then if you turn the gas off afterwards you need to go and relight those appliances. And under HSE do you think you're doing enough?
- 8.2.8. KS: But if you re-establish an appliance you're saying that appliance is ok to be left working.
- 8.2.9. Thing concerning is someone relighting an appliance that's not safe.
- 8.2.10. PD: that's the problem – identifying unsafe situations.
- 8.2.11. KS: Corgi says it doesn't constitute work, but you've got to identify an unsafe situation. Stuck in the middle. Corgi says you don't need to be registered, but you need to be able to identify an unsafe situation. So you need to be registered to do this!
- 8.2.12. IS: unless you find a COP 20 guy.
- 8.2.13. KS: well they wanted to use unregistered – but this is such a grey area.

8.2.14. JS: if there was an incident and something happened, what would be your defence?

8.2.15. IH: operation of a ppm valve, has always been deemed not constituting work.

8.3. IH – NG metering issue

8.3.1. IH: re NG metering – may be in contravention of MAMCoP in that we have an issue with meter washers and shore hardness. Trialling 85. If we chose to use those washers we won't comply with British Standard. Just a may-be.

8.3.2. SR: what's the logic?

8.3.3. IH: if we move to this washer that's 85, then the washer that sits is 91-96 hardness rating. But there has been a number of reported gas escapes from the time installation is gas tight and tested, a short period afterwards the meter washers have relaxed and gas has escaped.

8.3.4. IH: Manufacturers have changed their manufacturing process. They have said it's a bit on the hard side. In the past they produced a tube then sliced. Now they mould them directly. The composition material hasn't changed, but the process has changed.

8.3.5. SR: so relaxing due to manufacturing process?

8.3.6. IH: possibly. So just to make aware that this is an issue and we may change to softer washers.

8.3.7. IH: Did attempt to propose a change to the GSE25 but allegedly there was insufficient data at the time to make the change, so that may well need to change the 6400 if the info is proven.

8.3.8. MB: might not change 6400 but will to 746.

8.3.9. MB: concerned that if the manufacture process has changed and not material this shouldn't have affected it... might be something else.

8.3.10. NW: doesn't make sense that standards have to change because manufacturers change process so that their product now doesn't deliver to standard...

8.3.11. IH: their product delivers to standard, but doesn't perform in the field

8.3.12. MB: but this perhaps isn't the only parameter that has evolved, there's probably something else as well.

8.3.13. SR: why not ask manufacturer to revert to original process.

8.3.14. IH: not in position to answer that one. They may have other overriding legislation or something.. but don't know

8.3.15. NW: can't allow any MAM to go out of scope of MAMCoP on the basis of their selection of supplier. If they went with another supplier they could be compliant... can't go out of compliance because of their choice of supplier.

8.3.16. NW: Still need to be compliance with GSIUR regulations.

8.3.17. IS: but MAMCoP allows flexibility in the standards?

- 8.3.18. JB: any one else any problems?
- 8.3.19. SR: Does not appear to be a robust case for becoming non compliant, you could always change supplier or revert to the previous process.
- 8.3.20. SB: had a concern 12 months ago, and raised again by a couple of people, there was no evidence to support changing – might just have been a bad batch. Not been raised since.

8.4. TC: In Service Testing Work Group

- 8.4.1. TC: in service testing, Work group 3, reported MAMCoP in Feb, had comments back in terms of costing etc, once report is updated it will go out for consultation, go out as a national weights and measures consultation (national metering organisation)

8.4.2. **ACTION:** SR will forward this on.

8.5. TC: Lloyds Register MAMCoP Audit

- 8.5.1. TC: last year report of some slides from Lloyds register on MAMCoP audit etc. one comment was that board would get report every year ... helpful if we could get report every year.
- 8.5.2. **ACTION:** TM: can provide one at next meeting when audit process has been completed

9. Dates of next meetings

- 9.1. 16/06/2009
- 9.2. 08/09/2009
- 9.3. 15/12/2009

Action Log

Action Ref	Issue	Date when originally raised	Action	Owner
1	Review MAMCoP and CoP 1a/b	18/10/2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put on hold until new scheme in operations. Will be open letter/announcement on Ofgem website soon. MAMs to monitor website 	All
2	Appeals Process for MAMCoP/AIGT	17/01/2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SR to keep everyone posted on view from lawyers 	Ofgem
3	Commissioning and Auditing	16/10/2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NONE? 	
4	Moving Domestic Meter and OAMI CoPs	16/10/2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IS to report back on progress at next meeting 	IGEM
5	I&C Meter Obligation	22/01/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SR to chase MC for I&C MAM compliance letter SR: Chase this with formal letter to MD level (Andrew Wright) 	SR/ MC
6	Update on missing ECVH	16/10/2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC to circulate updated document with contacts 	TC
7	PEMs Workshop	28/08/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC to chase up suppliers – grateful for contacts 	TC
8	Capita and HSE	28/08/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SR to send out letter regarding Ofgem's intentions with OAMI 	SR
9	Meter Mimic	04/12/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC to inform trading standards of device fault (on-going) <p>(Update: BC has now written to trading standards: understands that all devices installed on Gas Meters have now been removed).</p>	BC

11	CORGI/GSR numbering	27/03/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TS to feedback on whether numbering of TBs will change	TS
12	Two Flexes on Meters	27/03/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TS to see if Corgi have a view on this	TS
13	In Service Testing workgroup	27/03/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SR to circulate consultation document	SR
14	Lloyds Register MAMCoP Audit	27/03/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TM to provide report at next meeting	TM

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
ENTERPRISE AND INDUSTRY DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
New Approach Industries, Tourism and CSR
Construction, Pressure Equipment, Metrology

Brussels, 12th March 2009
M/441 EN

Standardisation mandate to CEN, CENELEC and ETSI in the field of measuring instruments for the development of an open architecture for utility meters involving communication protocols enabling interoperability

Objective

The general objective of this mandate is to create European standards that will enable interoperability of utility meters (water, gas, electricity, heat), which can then improve the means by which customers' awareness of actual consumption can be raised in order to allow timely adaptation to their demands (commonly referred to as 'smart metering').

Background and justification

The Competitiveness Council on 25 September 2008¹ underlined that, in general, lack of standards, or the slow updating of existing standards hamper the uptake of innovation, whilst standardisation that is lively and strong has the power to accelerate the access of innovation to both domestic and global markets. It underlined the need for standardising bodies to act in a coordinated manner to promote European standards, to take better account of convergence of technologies and to involve all parties concerned in a transparent manner. The Council invited industry and other stakeholders to accelerate their cooperation in the development, implementation and use of standards supporting innovation in relation to the sustainable industrial policy and other areas particularly relevant for innovation. It also recommended fully utilising synergies.

Directive 2006/32/EC on energy end-use efficiency and energy services² concerns achieving an overall indicative energy savings target by each Member State. National energy efficiency action plans showing how the target is to be met must be prepared by Member States, as provided for by the Directive. Article 13 mentions the need for providing final consumers with competitively priced individual utility meters that accurately reflect the final customer's actual energy consumption and that provide

¹ Council Conclusions on standardisation and innovation , Competitiveness Council of 25 September 2008,
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/standards_policy/standardisation_innovation/doc/councilconclusions_20080925_en.pdf

² OJ L 114/64 of 27.04.2006

Responsible person: Daniel Henekuyk (daniel.henekuyk@ec.europa.eu)

information on actual time of use, in so far as it is technically possible, financially reasonable and proportionate in relation to potential energy savings.

Article 13 of Directive 2006/32/EC is a performance-related requirement which must be satisfied as fully as possible by means of measures which need not be technical specifications.

Directive 2004/22/EC on measuring instruments (MID)³ concerns full harmonisation of utility meters. It allows all functionalities that do not interfere with the metrological characteristics of the instrument. Most of these functionalities are not subject to any other limitations, i.e. MID allows any specification to be put into use. By means of Mandate M/374 of 20 October 2005 for Standardisation in the field of measuring instruments, CEN and CENELEC were invited to develop standards for utility meters.

There is fast technological development in the area of utility meters to provide customers with the necessary information to empower them through innovative management tools and services to optimize their energy use and to reduce their carbon emissions. It is possible to develop common solutions that enable interoperability which will enable mass production and full competition on the scale of the EU market to reduce the price of highly performing state of the art meters. However, the involvement of many different parties in the absence of harmonisation could result in a multitude of competing technological solutions, which although not fundamentally different, may nonetheless be mutually incompatible thereby fragmenting competition on the internal market. On the other hand, from a competitiveness point of view, Europe could become a market leader should harmonised solutions be developed, hence the need for European standardisation.

Standards already existing at the European level may not be sufficient for a full coverage, although they may be a useful base for future development. Proactive integration of various draft national standards may aid a rapid development.

Description of the mandated work

CEN, CENELEC and ETSI are requested to develop:

1. A European standard comprising a software and hardware open architecture for utility meters that supports secure bidirectional communication upstream and downstream through standardised interfaces and data exchange formats and allows advanced information and management and control systems for consumers and service suppliers. The architecture must be scalable to support from the simplest to the most complex applications. Furthermore, the architecture must consider current relevant communication media and be adaptable for future communication media. The communication standard of the open architecture must allow the secure interfacing for data exchanges with the protected metrological block.
2. European standards containing harmonised solutions for additional functionalities within an interoperable framework using where needed the above-mentioned open architecture for communication protocols. These solutions must be

³ OJ L 135/1 of 30.04.2004

standardised to achieve full interoperability. Solutions meant to be installed in living quarters should be silent, non-intrusive and safe.

3.

The standards to be developed must be performance-based and permit innovation in the protocols that enable remote reading of utility meters and advanced information and management services for consumers and suppliers. In particular, the standards shall permit fully integrated instruments, modular and multi-part solutions. Standards developed under this mandate and M/374 should not conflict with each other and other standards and any overlaps should be indicated.

CEN, CENELEC and ETSI should take into account international, European and national standards that have already been developed or are under development.

Execution of the mandate

CEN, CENELEC and ETSI shall present a work programme to the European Commission within 3 months of the acceptance of the mandate. This work programme shall include the precise time schedules for the work as well as a full list of the European standards to be developed for additional functionalities. After notifying the Standing Committee under Directive 98/34/EC, the European Commission will without delay inform CEN, CENELEC and ETSI of the proposed standards it accepts as being covered by this mandate.

The deliverables shall nevertheless be presented to the European Commission as follows:

- a. The European standard for communication shall be presented within 9 months of the acceptance of the mandate.
- b. The harmonised solutions for additional functions (European standards) shall be completed within 30 months of the acceptance of the mandate.

CEN, CENELEC and ETSI shall provide a combined progress report on the mandated work by the end of October 2010.

It is requested that deliverables indicate where they cover requirements which are necessary to comply with Directive 2004/22/EC (notably Annex I points 7.6, 8.1-8.5 and 10.5). Also deliverables should take into account applicable legal requirements concerning the confidentiality of personal data protected under Directive 95/46/EC⁴ and Directive 2002/58/EC⁵.

Given the many parties involved, e.g. consumers, instrument producers, third party instrument owners, transportation monopolies and energy suppliers, special attention should be paid to transparency during the process of developing these standards.

⁴ OJ L 281/31 of 23.11.1995.

⁵ OJ L 201/37 of 31.7.2002.

CEN, CENELEC and ETSI shall take the utmost account of any relevant developments in international standardisation when working on this mandate.

Acceptance by CEN of this mandate starts the standstill period referred to in Article 7 of the Directive 98/34/EEC of 22 June 1998⁶.

Organisations to be involved

As appropriate, CEN, CENELEC and ETSI will invite the representative organisations of consumers' interests (ANEC), environmental protection (ECOS), workers (ETUI-REHS) and small and medium-size enterprises (NORMAPME) to take part in the standardisation work.

CEN, CENELEC and ETSI shall also invite WELMEC (authorities of member states) and the Open Meter Project, in so far as it is relevant for the development of standards requested by this mandate, to take part in the work.

⁶ OJ L 204/37 of 21.7.1998



Smart Meters – CEN Input

**CEN/TC 237 N 466
2009-03-04**

Andreea Gulacsi

CEN/Management Centre – Brussels

andreea.gulacsi@cen.eu

CEN Technical Work (TCs)



- 5 TCs exist in the CEN 'metrology' sector that have developed standards which support the (*New Approach*) Measuring instruments Directive (2004/22/EC) - for water, gas and heat meters.
- CEN/TC 294 *Remote reading of meters* (one of the ICT technical committees), has developed 7 European Standards relevant to smart metering.
- DIN has submitted a Form A to CEN/TC 294 proposing to update its EN 13757-3: 2004 *Communication systems for and remote reading of meters - Dedicated application layer* in order to update and enhance it for smart metering which would respond to the proposed mandate for smart meters.



- **CEN/TC 92 Water Meters (SNV)**
 - Standardization for meters to measure volume flow of cold potable water and heated water enclosed in full conduits, irrespective of technology applied.
- **CEN/TC 171 Heat Cost Allocation (DIN)**
 - The overall goal of the committee is to support the innovative technology market by revision of the standards for heat cost allocators
- **CEN/TC 176 Heat Meters (DS)**
 - There is a general political will to be environmentally responsible and one way to obtain this goal is to support/require the use of individual energy metering
- **CEN/TC 237 Gas Meters (BSI)**
 - The Scope of CEN/TC 237 is "Standardization of the requirements for the construction, performance and safety of gas meters, including diaphragm, rotary displacement, turbine, ultrasonic domestic gas meters, and all associated conversion devices". A Technical Report on smart (gas) meter is currently being developed.
- **CEN/TC 318 Hydrometry (BSI)**
 - The standardization of methods, procedures, instruments and equipment related to techniques for hydrometric determinations of the water cycle.

CEN/TC 294



→ CEN/TC 294 Communication system for meters and remote reading

- Standardization of communication systems with meters and remote reading of meters for all kind of fluids and energies distributed by network and suitable also for household meters.
1. EN 13757-1:2002 *Part 1: Data exchange*
 2. EN 13757-2:2004 *Part 2: Physical and link layer*
 3. EN 13757-3:2004 *Part 3: Dedicated application layer*
 4. EN 13757-4:2005 *Part 4: Wireless meter readout (Radio meter reading for operation in the 868 MHz to 870 MHz SRD band)*
 5. EN 13757-5:2008 *Part 5: Wireless relaying*
 6. EN 13757-6:2008 *Part 6: Local Bus*
 7. EN 1434-3:2008 *Heat Meters - Part 3: Data exchange and interfaces*

CEN TC/294 Cooperation Proposals



- Electricity meters should use CEN link layer standards and wireless encryption proposal
- No competing standards from CENELEC/IEC
- Update application layer DLMS/OBIS (CLC/IEC)
- Cooperation on application profile (CEN/CLC)
- Add signature/authentification (ETSI/OIML)
- Add all above meter (Network, WAN ...) (ETSI)
- Add billing, end user interface etc.

CHESSS/Smart Meter Services



- CEN CMC/Sector Forum Energy Management, liaise with ISO/ PC 239 (network services billing);
- CEN and CENELEC develop a shared strategy for future standardization for 'smart house services and enabling technologies' (including meters) in order to ensure that:
 - multiple service provision is catered for
 - appliances and equipment are interoperable
 - customer choice is preserved; and
 - provision is made for customers to have access to information they require to properly manage their service usage.

CHESS/Smart Meter Services con't



- CEN and CENELEC propose a joint stakeholder meeting on the subject of 'interoperability' (end May 2009) with the following objectives:
 - Initiate a CWA to establish an interoperability framework for 'smart house services and enabling technologies';
 - Establish a programme of future standardization for 'smart house services and enabling technologies.'
- The meeting will provide the opportunity for public debate on smart meter standards issues, proposals for response to Mandate, etc.
- Overall, CEN supports the creation of an informal Coordination Group with relevant TCs and stakeholder participation to propose the ESOs response to the Mandate.

7