

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public and any Members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

SEC Change Sub-Committee Meeting 50_1804

18 March 2023, 10:00 – 11:45

Teleconference

SECCSC_50_1804 – Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	CSC Member
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)
	Emslie Law (EL)
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (CB) (<i>alternate for Daniel Davies</i>)
Electricity Network Parties	Kelly Kinsman (KK)
Other SEC Parties	Jeff Studholme (JS)
	Alastair Cobb (AC)

Representing	Attendee
DCC	David Walsh (DW)
	Tom Rothery (TR)
Ofgem	Scott McPhillimy (SMcP)
SECAS	Rachel Black (RB) (<i>Meeting Secretary</i>)
	Ali Beard (AB)
	Bradley Baker (BB)
	Mike Fenn (MF) (<i>part meeting</i>)
	Kev Duddy (KD)
	Mohammedanwar Sumro (MS)
	Ben Giblin (BG) (<i>part meeting</i>)

Apologies:

Representing	CSC Member
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies

1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Chair welcomed members to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) meeting.

The CSC noted that no comments had been raised on the last meeting minutes. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
47/02	The DCC to provide SECAS with the DCC 2022 Statement of Service Exemptions (SoSE).
The DCC (TR) confirmed that the DCC 2022 SoSE was proceeding through its final review. They advised that they expect it to be published in the coming weeks. The Chair advised that the action would remain open until the document is published on the DCC website. Status: OPEN	

3. SEC Modification Progression

MP214 'Clarification of Acceptable DCC User IDs for Import and Export Suppliers'

SECAS (BG) presented the CSC with a summary of [MP214 'Clarification of Acceptable DCC User IDs for Import and Export Suppliers'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

A CSC member (EJ) asked if this modification can be used by both new DCC Users and existing DCC Users which would like to only use one ID in the DCC System. SECAS (BG) advised that this change will likely only be used by new DCC Users. However, they noted that there is nothing in the DCC System to prevent existing current Users from changing to one DCC User ID if they wish. A CSC member (EL) agreed with this, but advised that current Users should stick with using two IDs, as it can be problematic for them to change to one ID. The CSC member explained that the DCC has multiple entries, and making changes to them could result in requests being blocked or quarantined if they are not associated with the correct party on the system. The CSC member noted that this modification would correct this issue for future Users.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that MP214 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report

- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP214 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification

MP222 'CPL submission efficiency improvements'

SECAS (BB) presented the CSC with a summary of [MP222 'CPL submission efficiency improvements'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

No comments were received from the CSC.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP222 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification

DP226 'Incorporation of Category 3 Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Batch 10'

SECAS (MS) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP226 'Incorporation of Category 3 Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Batch 10'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

No comments were received from the CSC.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP226 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP226 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP226 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification

DP229 'Notification of material change to User Systems to include decommissioning'

SECAS (KD) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP229 'Notification of material change to User Systems to include decommissioning'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

A CSC member (JS) asked if a Supplier failure will be captured in this update, and will a failed Supplier continue to abide by the obligations to decommission in an orderly manner. SECAS (KD) advised that the Security Sub Committee (SSC) is only contacted by Suppliers who are going through an orderly exit. The CSC member noted that there has been an increase in disorderly exits over the last few years. Another CSC member (CB) advised that in situations where a Shared Resource Provider is being used by the defaulting Party, they would not decommission until it is agreed by everyone involved. They advised that this approach is used as consumers will be negatively impacted if decommissioning takes place while there is still traffic going through the system.

The Chair acknowledged the comments made, and agreed that the issue of capturing disorderly exits should be looked into separately from this modification.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP229 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP229 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP229 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification

ACTION 50/01: SECAS to confirm how decommissioning is notified to the SSC and subsequently managed during disorderly exits.

DP232 'ACB Certs on I&C'

SECAS (MS) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP232 'ACB Certs on I&C'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

A CSC member (AC) expressed confusion around the prenotification of Devices and how this factored into the issue. The proposal appears to be focused on not knowing which certificate is on a Device in a mixed population of certificates but was unclear how this related to pre-notified Devices. SECAS (MS) advised that there is currently only one ACB Certificate, but once the new ACB Certificate is introduced at the end of 2023, the DCC will need to be pre-notified. The CSC member acknowledged this and asked if there would be any need to retry this if the DCC had been pre-notified of the information on the Device in the first place. SECAS (MS) advised they would take this back to the Proposer for consideration.

A CSC member (EL) asked who had decided that there will be new ACB Certificates issued every four years. SECAS (MS) advised that this has been planned by the DCC. Another CSC member (AC) advised that this had been discussed at the SSC CPA Issue Resolution Sub-Group (SCIRS) on 17 April 2023, and it was advised that the DCC is consulting with the SSC on this. The first CSC member (EL) proposed that this change is putting the responsibility of installation and commissioning on Suppliers. They noted that the ACB Certificates will be released every four years, but the SSC is not leading this change, despite it being a matter of increasing security. The CSC member raised concerns around the rationale for why new ACB Certificates should be introduced every four years, which is central to this modification. They also asked if there will be a change to the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) needed by June 2024.

A CSC member (CB) advised that if there is a DUIS change, a User can decide when they want to take advantage of this. However, if it is hard stop, it would require all DCC Users to change to the new DUIS version by June 2024, which will be a big challenge. They advised that a modification had been raised in the past to deal with something similar, but it had not reached approval. That modification had questioned if there was a need for a retrospective population for this change, and the member considered it would be good to consider this here.

A CSC member (JS) noted that this modification may have been brought to the CSC prematurely, as it has not been fully discussed at the SSC and the SCIRS meetings yet. The Chair acknowledged that there seems to be outstanding questions around what is happening with the ACB Certificates which will affect whether and how to proceed with this modification.

The DCC (DW) clarified that the SSC Change Request is going live in June 2024, and that it is not being suggested that this modification will go live in June 2024. The DCC also acknowledged that this would have a large impact on Suppliers. A CSC member (EL) queried who has decided this change needs to happen. The DCC advised that they are unsure.

The Chair summarised that an outcome from the SSC and SCIRS discussions is needed before this modification can move forward, and suggested that this be brought back to the CSC next month following these discussions. A CSC member (AC) asked if the SSC Chair could come to the next meeting this modification will be scheduled for to provide more information to the CSC. They also noted that this modification depends more on the outcome from SSC meeting on 26 April 2023 than the SCIRS meeting. Another CSC member (CB) added that it would be beneficial to understand what implications updating the DUIS will have and if it will need to be updated on a particular date, what the alternative plan is if this is not supported, and if there is a need for a retrospective application. The CSC member also noted that they did not think there is the capability to move everyone onto the same DUIS version in such a short space of time.

The Chair acknowledged the concerns raised, and advised that this will be brought back to the CSC next month.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that DP232 should stay in the Development Stage, as further feedback is needed from the SSC to fully define and understand the issue

DP239 'Enduring Solution for Resolving SMETS2 Device Certificate Misalignment Issue'

SECAS (BB) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP239 'Enduring Solution for Resolving SMETS2 Device Certificate Misalignment Issue'](#), recommending it remain in the Development Stage.

A CSC member (JS) asked if it can be investigated how many meters are physically removed prior to the resolution. They had seen many meters being physically removed shortly after installation due to a failed commission, and queried if this could be related to the issue being considered under this modification. SECAS (BB) advised that they would investigate this.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that further development is required to define and understand the issue

DP240 'Service Request Management'

SECAS (MF) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP240 'Service Request Management'](#), recommending it remain in the Development Stage.

A CSC member (EL) asked if the volumes exceeding system capacity are related to requests around the management of smart meters or the collection of data, with increasing requests for the latter impacting on the former. They noted that this will have a large impact on Suppliers and Users in

managing the Device. SECAS (MF) agreed that this should be investigated further, as they are currently only looking into unexpected occurrences, whereas industry events can have a certain element of planning and management outside of the SEC arrangements. SECAS highlighted that looking into both instances will be important. The Chair agreed, and requested that this will be drawn out in the issue statement. SECAS added that the DCC is also looking for feedback from Service Users to see what they want as part of any solution. The CSC member highlighted that there are many Users who put in Service Requests (SRs) who do not have Licence obligations to fulfil. They asked what obligations are on these Users. The CSC member also highlighted that there will be many Users who will want their SRs to be prioritised.

A CSC member (JS) pointed out an overlap between this modification, [SECMP0028 'Prioritising System Messages'](#) and Part A of [DP218 'Review of the SEC Charging Methodology'](#). They considered that if there are ad-hoc SRs coming from Service Users, it will be difficult to figure out which SRs are anomalies. The CSC member asked how this modification can be distinguished from DP218 and other modifications relating to traffic management. SECAS (MF) advised that they would discuss these links with the DCC. The Chair requested these points be included in the Modification Report to ensure any overlaps are addressed.

A CSC member (EJ) noted that the plan in the Modification Report implied Supplier input is not being requested until this becomes a Modification Proposal. However, a request for information (RFI) is planned to be sent to SEC Parties to consider what should be included in the scope. The CSC member asked for clarity around scope decisions being made before a Draft Proposal is converted to a Modification Proposal. SECAS (MF) advised that the RFI, which will be issued in the Refinement Process, will help to better understand the business requirements and what should be included in the scope of the solution, but the work undertaken in the Development Stage will be to quantify the impact of the issue.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that further development is required to define and understand the issue

4. SEC Modification Timetables

SECAS (AB) provided an update on the timetables for Modification Proposals, providing updated work packages for modifications that have reached the end of their previously agreed packages of work.

While discussing the amended work packages, a CSC member (AC) advised that they had hoped to see more information on the splitting of DP218. SECAS (AB) advised that this has not been finalised yet, as they are waiting on more details from the DCC in relation to forecasting and the allocation of costs, which was discussed in an ad-hoc Working Group meeting in March. SECAS also advised that there were questions raised around transactional costs, which the DCC will also be providing information on. The CSC member asked why this is not reflected here. SECAS advised that when they present the CSC with the work packages, they give a view of what SECAS plans to do with these modifications over the next few months, and an update will then be provided once the work package has been completed. The Chair noted that if the CSC would like to see more updates on modifications such as DP218, then SECAS could provide updates in the CSC papers. SECAS (AB) agreed, and advised they could provide stand-alone updates on modifications such as this. The CSC member observed that the CSC has to work through a lot of modifications before they reach the prioritisation of modifications, and there is an expectation for the CSC to be more involved with the prioritisation of modifications.

A CSC member (EL) agreed, and suggested that the issue is that they are unsure of what is involved in the process of prioritisation. They proposed that this part of the meeting could be moved to the top of the agenda to help with engagement. Another CSC member (JS) added that the CSC does not seem to have a clear decision-making process, and some modifications seem to be pushed through without having any support. They felt there should be more discussion in CSC meetings around prioritisation and allow the CSC to review and moderate the priorities determined by SECAS.

SECAS advised that prioritisation is looked at when a new Draft Proposal is brought before the CSC, where they discuss the criteria used to assess its importance, and how much effort should be put into it. However, SECAS proposed that more time could be spent on these sections in future meetings. A CSC member (AC) also requested the timelines and prioritisation for all the modifications that are in progress be provided for review, as the timelines for some existing modifications may need to be displaced to accommodate more important new proposals that have been raised. SECAS agreed with this, and suggested that a prioritisation table could be presented to the CSC in order for them to view the prioritisation of various modifications.

The Chair acknowledged the feedback received, and requested SECAS take this into consideration for future meetings.

The CSC:

- **APPROVED** the packages of work and the progression timetables outlined in the paper

5. SEC Releases Update

SECAS (MF) presented an update on progress with the upcoming SEC Releases.

A CSC member (EJ) asked if the red-amber-green (RAG) status of a modification is based on for the risk of it being decided upon in time for inclusion in its planned release, or is it based on a delivery risk. SECAS (MF) advised that it is based on if a modification will be approved in time for its targeted release. They advised that they have reached out to the DCC to provide more information on progress with delivery against the timeline between approval and implementation. If there are any risks to this, then they will be highlighted, and updates will be provided to the Operations Group (OPSG) and the Testing Advisory Group (TAG). SECAS advised that they have asked for this data to be provided so it can be incorporated into the SEC Release Updates.

The CSC member (EJ) also asked if [MP162 'SEC changes required to deliver MHHS'](#) is still expected to be delivered in June 2024, noting that the wider market-wide half-hourly settlement (MHHS) delivery timeline has moved back. The Chair confirmed that MP162 will still be delivered in June 2024 as planned.

The CSC:

- **APPROVED** the changes to the scope of the June 2023 SEC Release
- **NOTED** the updates on the SEC Releases provided in the paper

6. Any other business (AOB)

The Chair advised that this would be their last meeting chairing the CSC, as they are moving on to another role within SECAS. The Chair advised that Ali Beard (SECAS) will take over as the new CSC Chair from May onwards.

There was no further business, and the Chair closed the meeting.

Next Meeting: 16 May 2023

DRAFT