

Meeting Summary

TNUoS Task Force Meeting 7

Date: 27/07/2023 **Location:** Faraday House
Start: 10.00 **End:** 16:00

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Adam Morrison (AM)	Regrets	Joseph Dunn (JD)	Regrets
Aled Moses (AMo)	Attend	Joshua Logan (JL)	Attend
Anthony Diccico (AD)	Attend	Jo Zhou (JZ)	Attend
Binoy Dharsi (BD)	Regrets	Lauren Jauss (LJ)	Attend
Brendan Clarke (BC)	Attend	Luke Davison (LD)	Attend
Dave Tooby (DT)	Attend	Niall Coyle (NC)	Attend
David Muñoz (DM)	Attend	Nicky White (NW)	Regrets
Deborah Spencer (DS)	Attend	Paul Jones (PJ)	Attend
Edward Smith (ES)	Attend	Rachel McLeod (RM)	Attend
Elana Byrne (EB)	Attend	Sam Davies (SD)	Regrets
George Moran (GMO)	Attend	Sam Hughes (SH)	Regrets
Grace March (GMa)	Attend	Sam Street (SS)	Attend
Harriet Harmon (HH)	Attend	Simon Lord (SL)	Attend
James Stone (JS)	Attend	Sinan Kufeoglu (SK)	Attend
John Tindal (JT)	Attend	Stephen McKellar (SM)	Attend
Jon Wisdom (JW)	Attend		

Agenda Point 1: Introduction and Welcome

The Chair welcomed those attending the meeting both in person and virtually, including those attending as alternates and the TO representative attending as an observer.

Agenda Point 2: Action Review

Actions were reviewed and updates noted (please see the Actions section at the end of the document).

Agenda Point 3: Backgrounds & Reference Node – Further Considerations and Analysis

The consultants presented updates from questions raised in the previous deep dive session on Backgrounds and Reference Node.

First to be addressed was clarification on how the consultants' approach to using scaling factors to derive backgrounds differed to the previous 'pseudo-CBA approach' to develop scaling factors in the SQSS (the former identifying scenarios most likely to represent peak flows and trigger investment, and the latter identifying flows to determine network build at boundaries). The consultants acknowledged that while they've used a different approach (which is not an update to the original CBA), they are confident in a sufficient level of consistency with the previous SQSS approach and would expect any updated CBA approach to produce similar results. It was noted that when brought into the charging methodology, CBAs are less relevant as investment is assumed to be triggered by incremental flow, and the NOA (Network Options Assessment) plays a role in assessing optimal investment using a comprehensive range of backgrounds. A Task Force member raised a question regarding the variety of backgrounds used by the NOA. Although it was not confirmed, it is believed that the data used within NOA are very comprehensive.

The Task Force raised the question of updating the 'pseudo-CBA' approach and whether the case for change being drafted for Backgrounds could consider this. If sufficient information was available to form a modification it could be considered for exploration but, if further analysis was needed, the value of progressing this would need to be assessed against the other work packages being considered by the Task Force.

ACTION 1 (JT): Consider whether updating the 'pseudo-CBA approach' to scaling factors is currently feasible with the data available and whether case for change should include the analysis from the consultants.

A Task Force member asked about whether the 'new' backgrounds accurately reflected generation outputs and more dimensional view of number of circuits, and therefore whether current scaling factors were appropriate. I.e. if switching in the binary model of Year Round/Peak caused volatility, are the scaling factors fit for purpose to mitigate that?

The consultants explained that while some scenarios will inevitably be missed, their methodology created a representative range of scenarios which aligns with trends for Year Round/Peak outputs and demand. It was discussed that while Year Round and Peak Security are often close in reality, having them both (as opposed to just one background) would prevent charges changing significantly for different technology types (wind in particular) without flows changing. It was recognised that combining two backgrounds into one could have significant impacts to settlement as well as charges.

ACTION 2 (Frontier/LCP): Provide a viewpoint as to the extent to which scaling factors currently mitigate volatility.

ACTION 3 (Task Force): Consider whether backgrounds are complicating understanding of how charges work or a necessary element of the cost reflectivity of the model.

It was noted by a Task Force member that when considering Security Factors, an option may be to scale up Peak Security circuits (as built to higher standards), and not Year Round circuits, resulting in a greater difference in flows.

A Task Force member questioned whether the ESO would refresh the background/scaling factor analysis regularly, and whether this would introduce potential unpredictability to charging. The consultants have found that modelling for 2025 and 2035 showed consistency in the number and type of appropriate backgrounds and the impact on tariffs due to the strong directional flow on circuits.

A Task Force member raised that after Project TransmiT, there were two backgrounds onto which sharing was added, but the question hadn't been returned to as to whether one background *plus* sharing would have negated the need for a second background.

The consultants addressed a question from a previous meeting relating to weighting circuits by MWkm on the circuits vs the number of circuits to derive backgrounds, finding that the same scenarios still applied for 2025 and 2035 projections. For every half hour, the analysis looked at what the scaling factors were, the impact on the circuit and the max.

Addressing the question of how other types of storage impact the background modelling, the consultants showed a breakdown of load factors for pumped storage and battery storage and key factors affecting their behaviour (for 2025 and 2035). Similar trends were found.

Finally, a breakdown of the proportion of circuits well represented in the modelling from each TO region was shared for both 2025 and 2035 projections, demonstrating fair and expected representation for the different scenarios. There was a recognition that more could always be done in this area but not necessarily always with incremental value.

A Task Force member wanted clarity that Round 2 in the slides was a Peak Security equivalent whereas Round 1 & 3 were Year Round variants (with 3 being the scenario of high wind and low demand). It was noted that projections haven't included flexible demand or the effect of electrolysers (other than battery storage). For any future designs of backgrounds it was advised to consider objectives for technologies such as storage, relevant scaling for applying security standards (i.e. Peak circuits) and a suggestion was made by a Task Force member that for a better representation, a probability-weighted output could be explored (i.e. considering more time periods when technologies could be active/inactive).

The consultants shared more explanation as to the relative impacts of ALF (Annual Load Factor) on the reference node and whether the mechanics as described in the charging methodology made sense. In essence this was agreed as the ALF is used as a sort of proxy for how likely the plant will run within certain periods. The discussion then moved to whether a demand-weighted or generation-weighted reference node was applied, as this is expected to help inform the upcoming discussions on the reference node case for change (the draft this currently suggesting a move to generation-weighted node). It was noted that when ALF is applied, the relative signal for zonal charges is affected more with a demand-weighted reference node, with the question then being whether that's cost reflective. A Task Force member suggested that the effect of ALF can be considered as the impact of a decision to add generation/demand capacity, the subsequent effect on the load flows and consequential long term marginal costs.

A Task Force member raised concerns for what the absolute differences would be between applying different types of nodes, which will need to be considered (factoring in the generation cap and difference if below €2.50/MWh and impact on the adjustment value) and another member questioned whether a demand-weighted node, in effect, was the same as two generation-weighted nodes. An ESO representative referenced the potential stability questions for demand- or generation-weighted nodes in relation to generation turning on/off frequently and more stable siting for demand (as opposed to siting to accommodate offshore).

A Task Force member expressed their preference for a demand-weighted reference node based on the engineering principles of load flow, and considered any decision to change that to be a more political decision about whether revenue is collected from generation. They referenced the steps taken in the codes for ALF to be applied in areas where load factor is shared on the network (conventional/non-conventional generation) but questioned those code changes now if ALF becomes ineffective for an area running a single renewable technology.

ACTION 4 (JT, EB, DS): Share the draft case for change for the reference node for Task Force feedback ahead of Mtg 7.5.

In clarifying differences between a demand-weighted and generation-weighted reference node, a question was raised as to the academic precedent for use of a demand-weighted node with information to be brought to the next virtual session where the case for change will be discussed.

ACTION 5 (AMo): Share any academic preference for a demand/generation-weighted reference node.

Agenda Point 5: Shared/Not Shared - Deep Dive

The consultants shared their deep dive analysis on Shared/Not shared elements, reviewing whether the principles still hold, the impact of changing backgrounds on sharing and improvements that could be made.

It was found that the logic for including sharing still holds considering different technology types are possible within a zone, although the ability to share declines if lots of low carbon operates within that zone. The consultants found it difficult to see how the sharing factors could be calibrated, and a Task Force member agreed to share past work on sharing and diversity which resulted in the 50% threshold for boundary sharing factors. It was noted that the type of low carbon technology involved in sharing should be part of future considerations (onshore/offshore etc.), as well as other system considerations such as inertia and Electricity System Restoration Standards. It was clarified that the data used which was actual FPN (Final Physical Notification) data, so this would be prior to any operational system decisions being made.

ACTION 6 (Frontier/LCP): Review past calculations for sharing, provided by SL, to provide a recommendation for what work would be feasible now.

A Task Force member raised the point that the price of constraint was also a consideration of sharing (in addition to the correlation of constraints) as conventional technologies can be cheaper to constrain off the system than some renewables.

Questions raised were whether to consider how/if wind generation shares with wind generation and how solar is dealt with as it still affects the market but is not in the CUSC (Connection and Use of System Code).

ACTION 7 (Frontier/LCP): Consideration of renewables in sharing (e.g. wind vs wind, treatment of solar).

The consultants raised the topic of how storage impacts zonal sharing factors (i.e. charges for low carbon) as, for example, pumped storage can swing from charging to pumping to give flexibility in sharing. Demand flexibility could impact sharing factors in a similar way but if identifiable, could be considered in sharing factors (although adding complexity).

Consideration is also needed for:

- The types of signals that technologies respond to (i.e. market signals for conventional plant, environmental conditions for wind)
- How sharing is applied with different mixes of technologies responding to different signals
- Turning off certain technologies for energy reasons (reserve, system stability) rather than constraint reasons and the impact on sharing factors
- Whole system costs (for the impact on end consumers) when sharing is an element of bidding

While the consultants were not suggesting any fundamental changes to sharing, they raised the question of whether it's calibrated correctly or whether to adjust the shape of the threshold graph to accommodate certain technologies/flexible demand. While this may not be in scope specifically, it can be discussed as part of considering the 50% threshold for sharing factors.

There was further discussion around the economics of the technology mix and how carbon and low carbon are treated separately. There was recognition that if there is thermal within a zone this can be bid off cheaper than wind. This raised a further question from the Chair as to whether, in reality, wind is as expensive to the end consumer as the analysis showed. Given the interaction with Contracts for Difference (CfD) it is assumed to be a whole system cost rather than just BSUoS, and there are differences between bidding off supported and unsupported wind.

The Chair wanted the group to keep the core questions of cost reflectivity and predictability at the front of mind for assessing the need for change, which was supported by the Authority representative. For example, whether changes in the methodology to incorporate less theoretical data increases volatility, with any potential impacts on long term investment signals (i.e. the effects on existing plant vs investment plant).

There was a suggestion that sharing could be locked in as what happens in the zone could impact all plant, even if not all plant makes investment choices. There is also a greater impact if a similar size plant is set up right next to another.

ACTION 8 (Frontier/LCP): Exploration of turning off sharing to see impacts on final charges and volatility.

Agenda Point 7: Shared/Not Shared – Feedback & Further Discussion

Regarding predictability as a more general concept in TNUoS, the consultants noted that TNUoS has a fair level of stability, with North-South flows causing most volatility (in turn this is affected most by network changes across zones).

Agenda Point 8: Methodology Data Inputs – Deep Dive

The consultants outlined five areas of potential concern regarding data inputs and the effect on charge volatility and predictability: i) ALFs ii) Charging bases, iii) Week 24 data, iv) Demand forecasts, v) TO data

i) ALFs

To address the concern that ALFs adjusted too slowly, the consultants outlined how they tested using a shorter time period for the forecast (1 year vs 5 years). They found 5 years was better due to 1 year of data posing a potential incentive risk, misrepresenting inactive periods and disrupting merit order.

ACTION 9 (Frontier/LCP): Consider calculating using a 5 year average (averaging all 5 years rather than the current method of removing the highest/lowest years' values and average the remaining 3 years).

Task Force members questioned whether mitigation is needed for when a plant is coming to the end of its life/load factors rapidly change and the effect of a 5 year forecast on those situations (e.g. could a % reduction be applied to ALF calculations). A Task Force member asked whether further analysis could be done to look at special circumstances for load factors decreasing quickly for CCGT, but it could be difficult to have a forward view which gives meaningful results.

An issue was raised as to using the higher value of FPN or HH (Half Hourly) due to the potential to overstate load factors for intermittent plant and be prone to forecast error.

ACTION 10 (Frontier/LCP): Consider whether deemed generation could be used as part of the ALF calculation.

ACTION 11 (JS): Consider the information available to share with consultants & TF re: potential new ESO products and impacts on FPN, and possible new data input modification

A Task Force member queried whether new ESO products that re-allocate generator positions before the FPN would affect this. The ESO representative agreed to consider this. The Authority representative noted that analysis may be required post product implementation to consider whether this warranted a change in isolation.

The change to using only FPNs was discussed with results shared for the impact on the Year Round components of the tariff for different technologies and positive/negative charge zones. In positive zones, generators pay network charges, in negative zones TNUoS credits are paid to generators, however if based on FPNs there may no longer be an incentive to bid on for constraints unless adjusted after.

ACTION 12 (Frontier/LCP): Absolute values to be shared for the impact of using FPN only on Year Round components of the tariff.

The consultants discussed how for intermittent plant there may be a case for finding a measure for pre-balancing output (currently FPN but it could be an alternative), but for conventional plant there is no 'one size fits all' change, suggesting the current situation remains as it is.

Considerations raised by the Task Force:

- How much complexity needs to be added to the ALF calculation if it does serve as a crude proxy measure?
- The possibility for higher impacts and discrimination against those in more constrained areas by using the FPN on Year Round components of the tariff (this was resolved by the consultants as for constrained areas FPN will be the highest measure and therefore forecast error will be the determining factor for charges)

- Should plant be penalised for forecast error?
- Should ALF be adjusted before a plant is offered on, or after bid/offer?
- Could 'Power Available' (i.e. PCap value from [CMP328](#)) be used if more robust than FPN? It was clarified that Power Available is only used for Power Park Modules.
- How the ALF discussion aligns with the Background work (consider at Mtg 7.5)

The Authority representative suggested that a conversation could be had (based on the current analysis available) about the use of FPN in the ALF calculation and possible alternative data sources. This could lead to a 'quick win' modification for industry to pick up, however it was noted by a Task Force member that there would be links between this and the work on backgrounds.

The Authority representative advised the group that when considering changes to ALF/a data input, linking it with any reform to backgrounds will then involve much longer lead times.

ii) Charging bases

Large changes between forecasts and final tariffs have been seen in the past, but with a general reduction over more recent years (with exceptions in 2021-22 for COVID and 2023-24 for the economic downturn), and as residual is a fixed charge now, this is seen as less of a concern.

The impact of a possible change to a generation-weighted reference node should be considered.

iii) Week 24 data

The primary concern raised for this topic was the lack of transparency in how each DNO (Distribution Network Operator) forecasts this data and if any inconsistency may impact the quality of the data. Forecasts are out of scope for the Task Force but more transparency/more peer review could be considered.

ACTION 13 (JS, NW): Contact DNOs for information on key assumptions used in their Wk 24 forecasting.

ACTION 14 (JZ): Consider aligning Week 24 data with the SQSS change and move to gross demand.

iv) Inconsistent demand data (used in charge calculation)

Both Week 24 (nodal) data and ESO triad demand forecast (zonal) are used in charge calculations but are derived separately for different purposes.

While they could be homogenised, the ESO currently deem the DNOs as best placed to provide nodal data, but this may be resolved if changes to the Week 24 consistency are resolved.

v) TO data

The consultants considered possible ways to solve near term changes to tariffs between price control periods and TNUoS volatility which are caused by 5 year reviews.

The Task Force discussed whether some of the TO data inputs could be updated more regularly (e.g. expansion factors and expansion constant based on [CMP315](#) & [CMP375](#) proposal, possibility for security factors). It was discussed that the test for this would be predictability (over what period, to be decided) rather than volatility. A suggestion was made that suppliers and generators could have more visibility around methodology, but this might not be possible as there is a need to be mindful of commercial sensitivity issues e.g. Expansion Constant TO-owned data.

Suggestions were:

- An annual forecast, but only updated every five years to provide a trajectory which could help planning tariffs
- Lags added after the price control (this could have issues for recovery of revenue/cashflow)
- Freezing charges for investors over longer periods

ACTION 15 (JS, NW): Contact TOs for a view on what data inputs could be more regularly updated (re: locational tariff calculations) with a material impact and their view on TO inputs to the methodology being deferred and whether this impacts any recovery of revenue.

Agenda Point 10: Methodology Data Inputs – Feedback & Further Discussion

Covered as part of Agenda point 8

Agenda Point 11: Workstream Plan – Scope of Works, Interdependencies & Indicative Timelines

The ESO member shared the updated Workstream Plan which explored refined scopes of work for the defects/areas for review, where there are interdependencies between defects and which defects have longer/shorter timelines.

Volunteers were requested from the Task Force to be assigned to workstreams and develop them.

For each defect package a 'straw man' view on the principle-based ('quick win') questions and longer-lead questions will be needed for the Task Force to review together.

The Authority representative expressed the need for a well-rounded view on topics with fair representation from relevant groups on relevant workstreams. The Chair suggested Task Force members are involved with at least two workstreams where possible, one as a lead and one as a support with a suggestion that ESO could lead on data inputs.

Alternates were also encouraged to take part with workstream packages.

ACTION 16 (Task Force): Respond to the email requesting workstream assignments.

Agenda Point 12: Next Steps & Meeting Close

Next Meetings

- Mtg 7.5 - diary invites shared for August virtual meeting on 18 August
- Mtg 8 - September face-to-face meeting, 15 September. Specific location TBC shortly
- Diary availability being scoped for November and December meetings

Action Item Log

Action items: In progress and completed since last meeting

<u>ID/ date</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Status</u>
1 27/07	3	Consider whether updating the 'pseudo-CBA approach' to scaling factors is currently feasible with the data available and whether case for change should include the analysis from the consultants	JT	Consider as part of Backgrounds case for change	Mtg 8	Open
2 27/07	3	Provide a viewpoint as to the extent to which scaling factors currently mitigate volatility	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 7.5/8	Open
3 27/07	3	Consider whether backgrounds are complicating understanding of how charges work or a necessary element of the cost reflectivity of the model.	Task Force		Mtg 7.5	Open
4 27/07	3	Share the draft case for change for the reference node for Task Force feedback ahead of Mtg 7.5	JT, EB, DS		1 Aug	Open
5 27/07	3	Share any academic preference for a demand-/generation-weighted reference node	AMo	Pass on to TF to consider ahead of Mtg 7.5 (18 Aug)	18 Aug	Open
6 27/07	5	Review past calculations for sharing to provide a recommendation for what work would be feasible now	Frontier/LCP	Information shared by SL 28 Jul	Mtg 8	Open
7 27/07	5	Consideration of renewables in sharing (wind vs wind, treatment of solar).	Frontier/LCP	JS to assess information needed	Mtg 8	Open
8 27/07	5	Exploration of turning off sharing to see impacts on final charges and volatility	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 8	Open
9 27/07	8	Consider calculating using a 5 year average rather than current 5 year method	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 8	Open
10 27/07	8	Consider whether deemed generation could be used as part of the ALF calculation.	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 6-10	Open
11 27/07	8	Consider the information available to share with consultants & TF re: potential new ESO products and impacts	JS		4 Aug	Open

		on FPN, and possible new data input modification				
12 27/07	8	Absolute values to be shared for the impact of using FPN only on Year Round components of the tariff.	Frontier/LCP	Material impacts possible for different scales of plant	Mtg 8	Open
13 27/07	8	Contact DNOs for information on key assumptions used in their Wk 24 forecasting.	JS, NW		Mtg 8	Open
14 27/07	8	Consider aligning Week 24 data with the SQSS change and move to gross demand.	JZ		Mtg 8	Open
15 27/07	8	Contact TOs for a view on what data inputs could be more regularly updated (re: locational tariff calculations) with a material impact and their view on revenue being deferred for a year	JS, NW		Mtg 8	Open
16 27/07	11	Respond to the email requesting workstream assignments.	Task Force		02 Aug	Open

Action items: Open actions from previous meetings

<u>ID/ date</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Status</u>
1 26/06	3-7	How much of each background represents different regions	Frontier/LCP	Completed - addressed in Mtg 7 slides	Mtg 7	Closed
3 26/06	3-7	Results of weighting circuits in the modelling to be shared with the Task Force (i.e. to show no significant change)	Frontier/LCP	Completed - addressed in Mtg 7 slides	Mtg 7	Closed
4 26/06	3-7	Explore possibility of identifying similar backgrounds with different interconnector flows. Information to be shared with the consultants from the ESO in relation to the BSUoS (Balancing Services Use of System charge) Task Force work relating to this.	Frontier/LCP and JS	NW and JS to provide BSUoS IC work but possibility another FES scenario to be run might meet the request	Mtg 7.5/8	Open

5 26/06	3-7	Can indicative monetary values be provided for the impacts of the different backgrounds on differently-sized projects.	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 6-10	Open
6 26/06	3-7	Consider whether there is an impact of other types of storage being included in the technology types of background.	Frontier/LCP	Addressed in Mtg 7 slides	Mtg 7	Closed
7 26/06	3-7	Additional analysis shared on metrics used to compare volatility between actual and estimated charges.	Frontier/LCP		TBC – Frontier need a steer on what is required	Open
8 26/06	3-7	Consideration of a wider range of charging years in the data set.	Frontier/LCP		Mtg 7	Closed
10 26/06	3-7	Bring together the Task Force representatives and the ESO SQSS Review team (when in a position to do so) to discuss potentially parallel/overlapping interests.	JS, SS to explore with BD	To feed into case for change if required	TBC	Open
11 26/06	8-10	Consultants are to explore the questions raised on zoning	Frontier/LCP	Considering what adding more zones would do to the existing Ref. Node work? Clarity needed around the definition for zones & differing from sharing factors. Frontier to provide additional note for pack?	Mtg 7	Open
12 26/06	8-10	Revisit ESO work on embedded generation in relation to the transport model and share with the Task Force if relevant.	JS & NW		To consider as part of demand generation element of next work package	Open
13 26/06	8-10	The consultants are to check results showing limited change in the non-shared Year Round scenario when the reference node was changed	Frontier/LCP	Frontier-happy with result – Links to Action 11 26/06 and part of an explanation note	Mtg 7	Closed

14 26/06	12	Task Force members are to engage industry colleagues and stakeholders and feed back at the next virtual meeting (incl. substantive effects on other work)	Task Force		Mtg 7.5	Open
15 26/06	12	Draft the defect for backgrounds ahead of the next virtual meeting	JS, JT, LJ	Case for change with defect identified (with JS, NW)	Mtg 7.5	Open
16 26/06	12	Draft the case for change on the Reference Node ahead of the next meeting	BD, JT, colleague of AM	Note from JT to be shared with the TF	Note shared w.c. 31/07 Discussed Mtg 7.5	Open
17 26/06		Update from OTNR sub-group	JT		Mtg 7.5/8	Open
3 17/05	3	Share the question re: Technology Type & users' capabilities aid in constructing backgrounds with Frontier-LCP for consideration.	NW		TBC	Closed
4 17/05	3	Assign the 20 defects in the shortlist to their Categories & how they are linked. Scopes of work for each category/grouping to be created. Task Force asked to review this list with work packages assigned across the group	JS, NW	Update to be shared at Mtg 7	Mtg 7	Closed
6 17/05	7	ESO to proceed with the wider-remit zoning modification	JS	Drafted but further review needed - Updated to be provided at Aug TCMF	August	Open
1 26/04	1	Provide update on recruiting Non-Domestic user reps to Task Force	JS & NW	Discussions ongoing for a named rep. Non-Domestic Supplier forums updated by JS	Ongoing	Open
8 26/04	7	Further work on design vs cost reflectivity to be presented at Mtg 6	JS & NW	Feedback from legal and SQSS to be shared by JS via feed into case for change relating to Backgrounds	Mtg 7.5	Open

9 26/04	7	Technical input needed on deviation from SQSS and legal implications	JS & NW	Forms part of Item 8 above	Mtg7.5	Closed
10 26/04	7	Investigate more granular data sources for DNO embedded distribution to support the methodology & analytics	JS	Need TF to identify the data needs before exploring sources (part of Distributed Generation work)	TBC	Open
11 26/04	8	Actions allocated across the TF group for topics progressing for further development or into draft modifications	JS	Packages to be agreed and volunteers sought via email post Mtg 7	Post Mtg 7	Open
