

This document is classified as **Clear** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Recipients can distribute this information to the world, there is no limit on disclosure. Information may be shared without restriction subject to copyright.

SEC Change Sub-Committee Meeting 56_1710

17 October 2023, 10:00 – 12:45

Teleconference

SECCSC_56_1710 – Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	CSC Member
Change Sub-Committee Chair	Ali Beard (AB)
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)
	Emslie Law (EL)
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)
Network Parties	Kelly Kinsman (KK)
Other SEC Parties	Jeff Studholme (JS)

Representing	Attendee
DCC	Chris Thompson (CT)
	David Walsh (DW)
	Jayne Thorpe (JT) <i>(part meeting)</i>
OFGEM	Scott McPhillimy (SMcP)
Utilita	George MacGregor (GMcG) <i>(part meeting)</i>
	Kevin Clark (KC) <i>(part meeting)</i>
SMS PLC	David Lane (DL)
	Tom Woolley (TW) <i>(part meeting)</i>
N3rgy	Matt Roderick (MR) <i>(part meeting)</i>
SMKI PMA	Gordon Hextall (GH) <i>(part meeting)</i>
Security Sub-Committee	James Hosen (JH) <i>(part meeting)</i>
SECAS	Rachel Black <i>(Meeting Secretary)</i>
	Kev Duddy (KD)

Representing	Attendee
	Ben Giblin (BG)
	Simon Grimwood (SG)
	Liz Woods (EW)
	Mohammedanwar Sumro (MS)

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

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

The CSC noted that comments had been raised on the last meeting minutes. The CSC **AGREED** the amendments to be made and **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. SEC Modification Progression

DP250 'Correction of an error in GBCS'

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) (KD) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP250 'Correction of an error in GBCS'](#), recommending it be progressed as a Fast-Track Modification.

A CSC member (EJ) highlighted a typographical error they noticed in the Modification Report regarding the implementation date of the original error. SECAS noted this and advised they would fix this before the Modification Report is published.

The member also noted that there are not 15 Working Days between the meeting and the November 2023 SEC Release date, and queried the process if a subsequent objection was received. The Chair advised that if objections are received after 2 November, then the changes would be removed from the SEC Release. However, the Chair advised that Parties are not directly impacted, as the housekeeping changes are focused on areas of the specifications relating to Communications Service Providers (CSPs) and ensuring they have the correct specifications for future developments.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP250 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP250 should be progressed and approved as a Fast-Track Modification
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach

There will now be 15 Working Days for any SEC Party who wishes to object the CSC's decision. This referral period will close at 5pm on Wednesday 8 November 2023. If no objections are received, the decision will be final.

DP251 'Transfer of Secret Key Material'

SECAS (EW) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP251 'Transfer of Secret Key Material'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

A CSC member (DD) requested clarity on the difference between Secret Key Material and Private Key Material. The Chair of the Smart Metering Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) and Proposer (GH) advised that the difference was just terminology, the SEC refers to Secret Key Material as a generic term to cover current and future Transfers of Secret Key Material. They added that the Transitional Change of Supplier (TCoS) Private Key is a specific instance of Secret Key Material that needs to be transferred and there are likely to be other instances of different Private Keys to be transferred in the future. They both fall under SMKI PMA and it is giving approval for the Data Communications Company Key Infrastructure (DCCIKI) Certificate to be used on this occasion, although it is concerned that the current process may not be secure enough to transfer a different key in the future. SECAS advised that they would explain the use of the different terms in the Modification Report.

A CSC member (EJ) ask why a Refinement Consultation is not being held. The Chair advised that there is no need for a Refinement Consultation in this instance, as a solution has already been agreed by the SMKI PMA and the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), and they wish to progress the Modification in a timely manner. However, the Chair highlighted that industry will be able to respond to the Modification Report Consultation if they have any concerns, and these will be addressed when DP251 is brought to the Change Board.

Another CSC member (JS) advised they are supportive of DP251 progressing, but queried if the issue and impact has been clearly understood by the CSC. The member noted that the CSC has not been provided with much evidence of the importance of this modification and advised that it appears to be a risk rather than an issue. The Proposer (GH) noted that if this change does not go ahead, DCC will not be able to meet the TCoS to Enduring Change of Supplier (ECoS) migration timetable. They added that the Data Communications Company (DCC) is under pressure to migrate from TCoS to ECoS by mid-2024. The proposals have been discussed at SMKI PMA in June and July 2023, as well as held two workshops in August and September 2023 to ensure a secure means of transfer of Secret Key Materials. The Proposer added that there has been a great deal of analysis on how it can be achieved with input from the SMKI Specialist, DESNZ and the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) Chair. If the DCC uses a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) which is not governed by the SEC, SEC Parties are carrying the risk if this is not changed. The CSC member noted this. The Chair advised that the member can still raise concerns by responding to the Modification Report Consultation.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP251 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP251 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report

- **APPROVED** the implementation approach

MP219 'Accessing Consumption Data on behalf of SEC Parties'

SECAS (BG) presented the CSC with a summary of [MP219 'Accessing Consumption Data on behalf of SEC Parties'](#), noting the send-back direction from OFGEM and the further investigation which needs to take place before the modification can be re-submitted to the Authority. As such, SECAS recommended that this modification re-enter the Refinement Process.

The DCC (DW) acknowledge the request from OFGEM for information about the impact of MP219 on traffic across the DCC System. The DCC noted that this modification is a non-system impacting change and therefore no Preliminary Assessment was requested. They added that SECAS could make a request to DCC for this information, noting that DCC is currently working on the Preliminary Assessment for [MP235 'Enhanced Meter Data Access for Other Users'](#) which will give estimates about Other User traffic.

A CSC member (JS) noted that the four main areas of concern expressed by OFGEM had all been discussed in various sub-committees throughout the modification process. The Proposer (MR) expressed confusion around the reasons OFGEM had for sending back MP219, noting that MP219 seeks to align the SEC with standard General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). OFGEM (SMcP) advised that they were unable to provide any further rationale behind the send-back, however SECAS would update the CSC following a meeting taking place later in the week.

Another CSC member (EL) queried what opinions the CSC was being asked to provide on the modification. They questioned if another CSC meeting would be held once SECAS and OFGEM had discussed the changes which need to be made to the Modification Report, noting the reasoning why MP219 was re-entering the Refinement Process.

SECAS (BG) advised that they plan to bring the modification back to the CSC in November once the additional information has been established and included.

The Proposer highlighted that MP219 was raised in August 2022 with the aim of supporting the Demand-Flexibility Service (DFS) winter 2022 programme expressing concern that it will not be implemented in time with the 2023 DFS programme. The Proposer stated that there has been support for this modification from nine Suppliers and that the OFGEM send-back will negatively impact Consumers as they will find it harder to engage with the DFS scheme. The Chair asked the Proposer for evidence that there is support from Suppliers. The Proposer advised that they could not disclose that information in an open forum, however they would be willing to disclose this information with SECAS who could share this with OFGEM.

A CSC member (EJ) raised concern regarding whether SECAS could meet its timetable of having discussed MP219 with supportive Parties by the week of 23 October 2023. The Chair noted that SECAS could return to the Working Group and issue a second Refinement Consultation to gather support for the should the CSC deem it necessary. They added that this would likely not provide the information which OFGEM have requested and therefore SECAS is not recommending this. A CSC member (EJ) questioned how SECAS would guarantee they had collated a sufficient number of responses from supportive Parties to pass onto OFGEM. The Chair advised that SECAS would work with the Proposer to speak with Parties who are interested in using their services and these examples would be included (anonymously) in the Modification Report.

Another CSC member (JS) acknowledged that SECAS have frequently asked for feedback, but questioned the reliability of the information to be provided by the Proposer if the supporting Parties

have not come forward directly to state their support. The member agreed with the Proposer's frustration regarding the timeline, as most of the points have been addressed previously. The Proposer advised that they are not trying to sell services, but primarily wish to support consumers during the winter period. In relation to the question of support for this modification, SMS PLC (TW) whose organisation is a sister company of the Proposers organisation, advised that they have received emails from Suppliers requesting that this modification be implemented as an Ad-Hoc Release. A CSC member (EL) advised their belief there is no support from Suppliers for this modification. SECAS (BG) highlighted that they received nine responses during the consultation process that were supportive of this modification.

The Chair asked the CSC what additional information can be provided to OFGEM to support the MP219 business case. SECAS advised that there are enough examples of people supporting this modification to suffice. The Chair agreed and suggested that the supporting emails be added as part of an appendix for OFGEM. SECAS (KD) advised that the communications SMS PLC are referring to are actually responses to the MRC and suggested asking the responding Parties for more feedback on their answers. The Chair agreed with this and confirmed that SECAS will speak to the supporting Parties and the Proposer to gain more information for OFGEM to enable it to make a decision.

The Proposer reminded the members that this modification will align the SEC with GDPR mechanisms, allowing the Data Processor to act on behalf of the Data Controller without first collecting the Unambiguous Consent of each Energy Consumer.

SMS PLC (TW) queried why SECAS need to discuss the concerns raised with Citizens Advice. The Chair advised that OFGEM have asked what SECAS are doing to address Citizens Advice's concerns noted in the modification report. SMS PLC (TW) noted this but suggested that these concerns have already been addressed. The Chair advised that SECAS will discuss this with OFGEM to gain further insight into what they need to address with Citizens Advice. SMS PLC suggested confirming with OFGEM what is required before confirming the timeline. The Chair advised that OFGEM have provided a clear request of what they require, and the timeline proposed aims to address those concerns.

The Chair asked the CSC if they support the proposed timetable or preferred another Refinement Consultation and Working Group to be held. A CSC member (EL) advised that the only option they see as correct is for SECAS to go through the process again, with SECAS gaining further information from their meeting with OFGEM. The Chair asked if the member was supportive of the proposed timeline. The member advised that they were supportive of the timeline, but noted their belief it may be subject to change as a result of the large package of work which needs to be completed. The Chair advised that this modification would return to the CSC in November, so the timeline can be addressed again if any changes need to be made. The Chair anticipated that the modification will be ready to move to the Opine Stage in November. Another CSC member (DD) agreed with (EL). The member suggested that a Refinement Consultation would not be required, as there is already lots of information available regarding this modification. The member highlighted that the CSC agreed there was sufficient support when this modification was last presented to the CSC and agreed to let OFGEM make the decision. The member suggested there was nothing further the Working Group or CSC could discuss.

The CSC member (EL) highlighted the importance of ensuring there are supportive Parties. The member also asked if the CSC could be provided with an update on the meeting between SECAS and OFGEM. The Chair advised that an email can be sent to the members after the meeting. The Chair explained that MP219 was brought back before the CSC as they needed to be informed of the OFGEM send back letter.

The Chair proposed that the CSC agree the timetable, assuming there are no changes following the meeting with OFGEM. The Chair advised that the CSC will be made aware if there are any changes.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the package of work and the timetable for MP219.

ACTION 56/01: SECAS to obtain feedback on support for MP219.

ACTION 56/02: SECAS to communicate to the CSC what was discussed in their meeting with OFGEM.

DP244 'Device Alerts for Smart Meter Credit Replenishment'

SECAS (SG) presented the CSC with a summary of Draft Proposal [DP244 'Device Alerts for Smart Meter Credit Replenishment'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

A CSC member (EL) highlighted that Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) and Data Service Provider (DSP) changes will need to be considered with this modification, as they will need to change their processing to include these Alerts. The member also stated that technical specifications may need to change.

Another CSC member (JS) questioned how many organisations will sign off on this modification when the costs seem to outweigh the benefits. SECAS advised that they are hoping to determine the costs during the Refinement Consultation, following a Preliminary Assessment from the DCC. The member noted this, and asked if more time and effort should be used on this if there is already a good idea of the costs involved. The Proposer (KC) advised that there is not a clear enough understanding of the costs and would prefer to go through the Refinement Process to make it clearer. The Chair advised that the Proposer has the right to progress their modification, and the CSC also has the right to query it and ask for more work to be complete.

The Chair suggested asking the DCC for an estimated cost. A CSC member (EL) advised that this proposal has been an issue for quite some time, and needs to be addressed, regardless of the costs involved. Another CSC member (EJ) asked if it is possible to request an estimation of the cost from the DCC while the modification is still in the Draft Proposal stage. The member queried how much this would cost, and would it essentially mean the DCC will be asked to obtain costs twice, and therefore double the cost of this. The DCC (DW) advised that they do not give estimated costs without business requirements being developed, and then a Preliminary Assessment being requested. The Chair noted this, but advised they could compare it to the costs of similar modifications that have been raised in the past. A CSC member (JS) queried if SECAS could investigate the cheapest cost that could be associated with the modification. The DCC advised that this would be difficult to estimate, as it depends on if there are text only changes, non-system impacting changes, or Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS) changes, which are very costly. The DCC noted that there are few GBSC changes that have cost less than £10 million. The DCC added that it would be difficult to get a response that will give much information without a Preliminary Assessment being officially requested.

The Chair asked the CSC if they would like this modification to move to the Refinement Process so a Preliminary Assessment can be officially requested, or leave it in the Development Stage and obtain an estimated cost. A CSC member (EJ) questioned the urgency of this modification. The member stated that if this will take a long time to implement, delaying it for another month may not alter the timeline too much. The Proposer advised that there is no urgency associated with this modification, so

Managed by

can wait another month if the CSC prefers. The DCC advised they would prefer if a Preliminary Assessment could be officially requested so the most accurate information can be given. A CSC member (DD) agreed with the DCC. Another CSC member (JS) stated that the only thing that makes this modification different is that they already know there will not be a positive cost benefit analysis.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP244 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP244 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the proposed timetable for MP244

DP248 'RDP Requirements for DCC Gateway Connections'

SECAS (MS) presented the CSC with a summary of Draft Proposal [DP248 'RDP Requirements for DCC Gateway Connections'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

A CSC member (DD) queried how the Central Switching Service (CSS) is communicating with the DCC User Gateway if a virtual connection is not currently allowed under the SEC. The DCC advised that it appears to be similar to Market Wide Half-Hourly, where the DCC accept data virtually. In this instance, the DCC are taking data from the CSS. The member noted this, and asked if anything needs to be done, or if it is a wording change. The Chair advised that the CSS is separate from the SEC. SECAS (KD) suggested that the CSS is separate because it did not exist originally, and the Registration Data Providers (RDPs) are listed as needing this gateway connection. SECAS advised that an Authority-Determined modification (MP200) was implemented and changed the requirement of that registration data, but it did not specify how the connection should occur. The member asked if there is still a connection to the DCC that should be physical, and noted that it suggests the CSS connection is not compliant with the SEC. The Chair advised that SECAS will investigate this.

Another CSC member (EL) asked if this is included under the Code of Connection (Coco). The DCC confirmed that it is and is mentioned under Market Wide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS). The Chair advised that this modification was raised because the SEC specifies that RDPs currently have to connect to the DCC through a physical gateway. The DCC asked if the title will be changed to no longer include RDPs, or is general connectivity to the DCC and all Users being scoped. The DCC noted that to include all Users would require a bigger solution including significant System changes. SECAS (MS) agreed, and advised that the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) had suggested that the requirements should be extended to all DCC Users. The DCC noted this, but stated that they had given feedback that if it is only related to RDPs it is manageable, but if it is to include all connectivity it becomes a much larger issue. The Chair advised that changing the title means it will be assessed from a SECAS perspective, based on all the information they have received, including the complications associated with the widening of the scope. The Chair advised that SECAS will work with the Proposer to decide if they will confine the scope to RDPs only and it will be noted in the Modification Report that they considered it in its entirety before narrowing it down. The DCC noted the TABASC comment, but the DSP have advised it is straightforward for the RDP file to be sent via the Cloud. A CSC member (DD) advised that they had made the comment at TABASC, as the Modification Report wording was not specific to RDPs, but they have no preference either way. The member noted that a lot of items will be moving to a cloud-based programme in the future.

The Chair advised that SECAS will answer all the comments raised and highlight the complexity of the issue. The Chair stated that all considerations will be included in the Modification Report.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP248 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP248 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the proposed timetable for MP248

ACTION 56/03: SECAS to confirm how the CSS to DCC gateway is governed.

DP253 'Traffic Management - User Actions Required'

SECAS (SG) presented the CSC with a summary of Draft Proposal [DP253 'Traffic Management - User Actions Required'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

The DCC (DW) suggested that they would need to confirm the scope. They advised that in a recent Operations Group (OPSG) meeting, concern was raised regarding the pressure on DCC completing the Price Control Changes successfully. The DCC advised that there were some issues with the last price control change that may be considered in the scope. The Proposer (GMcG) advised that they had spoken to the DCC representative at the OPSG meeting about the changes that the DCC are looking to bring forward, and queried if they should continue with this Draft Proposal. The DCC representative stated that this could still be taken forward, but the DCC might put forward a modification over the next few months to codify what is required here. The Proposer stated that the aim of this modification is to tackle the issue of traffic capacity.

A CSC member (EJ) asked if this modification is following on from [DP240 'Service Request Management'](#) which has been withdrawn, as it seems similar in scope. The Chair advised that it is separate, as DP240 was focused on DCC System capacity rather than User management of traffic.

In relation to the discussion of the Price Change events, a CSC member (DD) stated that they were under the impression that the management of these events has improved since previous event. The member asked if Parties are following the DCC guidance that was issued by Panel. The Proposer advised that the last Price Change event was better than previous, but they are still looking for an enduring process. The member noted this, and raised concerns about how this will impact Adaptor Providers. The Proposer advised that this modification would implement ways of working that go beyond the Price Change window, and gives power to the SEC and its Sub-Committees to form a performance assurance regime. However, it will require Users to take action by reporting on whether their activities are having a negative impact on traffic. The Proposer advised that no financial penalties will be imposed on those who do not follow the guidelines.

A CSC member (EJ) asked if this is an Authority-Determined or Self-Governance Modification. The Chair advised that it is currently a Self-Governance Modification. A representative of OFGEM in attendance (SM) advised OFGEM are unfamiliar with the proposal but will review the information and advise if they feel the proposal should be Authority-Determined.

Another CSC member (JS) noted that it seems like a pragmatic approach, and looks like it will be quick to complete, and will improve consumer services.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP253 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP253 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the proposed timetable for MP253

DP254 'Changes to GFI Arrangements'

SECAS (SG) presented the CSC with a summary of Draft Proposal [DP254 'Changes to GFI Arrangements'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

A CSC member (DD) queried why this has only been brought to the CSC now, given that the Service Provider contract is about to end. The member also raised concerns regarding what will happen when the Service Provider contract does end next month, as it will not be renewed. SECAS (SG) advised that new tools will not be produced, and is something the DCC will have to address. The member noted that the contract will have ended before a solution is reached. The Chair noted that new tools are not needed unless a new DCC User requires access to the GFI Tool, and highlighted there will be no means of replacing tools if they are broken. The member stated that this service is provided for manufacturers to test their Devices, and if the contract ends next month there will be no means of updating this. SECAS advised that the functionality will still remain, and will support GBCS Interface Testing For Industry (GFI) testing. The member asked if this would update the current tools. SECAS advised that this has not been confirmed by the DCC yet. The member highlighted that there are other providers of this service and the DCC should have contacted them to try to extend the availability of this service.

The CSC member (DD) noted that the question of the impact is not understood, but this modification needs to progress in order to understand the impact.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP254 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP254 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the proposed timetable for MP254

DP252 'Amending the process for Communications Hub returns'

SECAS (EW) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP252 'Amending the process for Communications Hub returns'](#), recommending it remain in the Development Stage.

A CSC member (EL) advised that SEC Section M does not state that the DCC cannot disclose who owns a Communications Hub (CH) due to confidentiality and asked why it is now being said it is confidential information. The Chair advised they will check with the SEC Lawyers. The Proposer (DL) advised that the reason this was raised was because SMS PLC has 20,000 CHs, and they do not know who they belong to. The member asked why a modification needs to be raised to gain this

information. The Chair advised there are other issues involved with the CH process. They stated that even if it is known who owns it, the process to return it is complicated, and the aim of this modification is to improve the process as a whole. The member noted this, and advised that this improvement has failed in the past due to the high costs imposed by the DCC.

Another CSC member (JS) advised that refurbishing CHs was discussed in the SSC CPA Issue Resolution Sub-Group (SCIRS). The member queried why the industry should be manufacturing new CHs when the DCC should be able to reissue 2/3G CHs. The member noted that they have received feedback from other MAPs, and it appears that there might be more benefits to this than is realised.

SECAS (EW) noted the comments raised, and advised they understand there are limits. SECAS advised that they need to look at the list of CH returns issues in order to support the business case. SECAS stated that they need to understand what is preventing the Communications Service Provider from triaging returns, and why they are recycled rather than refurbished. They noted that a lot of work needs to be done before this modification concludes.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that DP252 should stay in the Development Stage to fully define and understand the issues

3. SEC Modification Timetables

SECAS (BG) provided an update on the timetables for Modification Proposals, providing an updated Prioritisation Matrix and summaries of high and very high priority modifications.

While discussing 'User Manual Requirement', the CSC member (EL) noted that this had been attempted in the past, but failed due to confidentiality and commercial issues. The member advised that a lot of work would be needed to implement this, and much reassurance would need to be given to manufacturers. The member noted that as a Supplier they provide user instructions on their website. These are sourced from manufacturers and translated to be user friendly. The Chair noted this and advised that SECAS have worked with the British Electrotechnical and Allied Manufacturers Association (BEAMA) and the Energy Utilities Alliance (EUA) to form a simple list of things that should be in the User Guidance, and it should be in a separate document rather than the technical manual. These can be provided as a link on the SECAS website. The Chair highlighted that SECAS have been working on this for a while, and the Proposer wants it to progress. A CSC member (JS) agreed with the points raised by EL and expressed concern around the reluctance of the meter manufacturers. The member suggested that the Proposer could take the issue to the MAPs, who have a strong relationship with the meter manufacturers.

While discussing [MP165 'ESME Voltage Accuracy'](#), the CSC member (JS) raised concerns about the progression of this modification, as the majority of a recent Working Group was unsupportive of it. The Chair acknowledged this and agreed that there was not much support in TABASC for the proposed solution. The Chair noted that it is a controversial modification, and stated it is being discussed if the changes can take place within the SEC, or under another document. The member acknowledged this and highlighted that there are other unintended consequences around compliance of existing meters if these changes are made.

While discussing [MP207 'Allowing Registered Supplier Agents to Maintain Meter Firmware'](#), a CSC member (EL) stated that the Change Board rejected the modification's Impact Assessment request as they were unsupportive of the cost. The member asked if this is now considered an Authority-

Determined modification. The Chair advised that the Proposer has requested for this to become an Authority-Determined modification.

The CSC:

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

4. SEC Releases Update

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

The Chair advised that it is standard procedure for the DCC to present its views against the Live Service Criteria (LSC) to the OPSG and TAG approximately five weeks or less from the SEC Release date. The Sub-Committees then provide a recommendation to SECAS. However, due to operational elements of [MP122B 'Operational Metrics – Part 2'](#) not being implemented until 7 December 2023, the DCC is aiming to present its LSC passed by the OPSG and the Testing Advisory Group (TAG) on the 23 and 25 October respectively. The Chair advised that this means the DCC cannot submit the LSC review in time for approval at this CSC. Therefore, the Chair asked if the CSC would prefer to make an ex-committee decision or have an ad-hoc meeting on a Working Day between the 26 October to 1 November when the LSC review has been provided. A CSC member raised concerns regarding these dates occurring during half term, when some people will be on annual leave. The Chair noted this and suggested that the ex-committee decision could be sent to the CSC members after the 25 October once a decision has been made by TAG. The member noted this, and suggested that if the ex-committee decision is sent out after the 25 October, the deadline for members to respond could be 30 October.

Based on the above discussion, the CSC members agreed to the ex-committee decision. The Chair confirmed that SECAS will send the email to the CSC members on Wednesday 25 October once they have approval from TAG, and the deadline to respond will be close of play on Monday 30 October.

While discussing [MP162 'SEC changes required to deliver MHHS'](#), a CSC member (EJ) questioned why the implementation of the modification is split between February 2024 and June 2024. The Chair advised that the legal text changes are to be implemented in February, and the operational changes will be implemented in June. The Chair explained that it is split this way as the legal text changes to the Common Testing Scenarios Document (CTSD) are needed to allow Users to complete testing before the implementation of the operational changes in June.

A CSC member (DD) advised that there is an error with the February 2024 Release Implementation Document (RID) link on the SECAS website. The Chair noted this and advised that SECAS will resolve it.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the updates on the SEC Releases provided in the paper
- **AGREED** to hold an ex-committee vote on the go-live decision of the November 2023 SEC Release.

ACTION 56/04: SECAS to fix the February 2024 RID link on their website.
--

5. CSC Meeting Dates for 2024

SECAS (RB) presented the CSC with the proposed CSC meeting dates for 2024.

There were no comments, and the CSC **APPROVED** the meeting dates for 2024.

6. Modification Improvement Project update

The Chair gave the CSC a summary of the Modification Improvement Project that SECAS are undertaking to improve the current modification process.

A CSC member (JS) stated that it was positive that some of these improvements are already in place, but highlighted that some points become futile if you do not revisit the proposal of SEC Panel being permitted to withdraw modifications, or if you do not explore the idea of introduction a 'bar' Modification Proposals must meet in order to move through the process. Without these, the member stated that there will still be frustration with modifications returning to the CSC multiple times. The Chair acknowledged this, and reminded the CSC that they have the power to question if Modification Proposals meet a certain criterion to move through the process. The member noted this, and recommended that the CSC continue to be reminded of the Terms of Reference at the beginning of meetings.

Another CSC member (EJ) advised that there are concerns from members on Change Board who are not also members of CSC. The member highlighted that some of the Change Board members are concerned by a lack of visibility of why some modifications take longer to progress through the CSC before coming before the Change Board. The Chair acknowledged this, and advised they can give the Change Board members updates during their meetings going forward.

ACTION 56/05: SECAS to ask Change Board what information they would like on modification progress
--

7. Any other business (AOB)

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

Next Meeting: 21 November 2023