

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 60_2002

20 February 2024, 10:00 – 11:55

Teleconference

SECCSC_60_2002 – Final 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	Eimhin Doyle (ED) (<i>alternate for Philip Doyle</i>)

Representing	Attendee
DCC	David Walsh (DW)
	Bradley Baker (BB)
Ofgem	Grace Royall (GR)
	Jamie Flaherty (JF)
Centrica	Rochelle Harrison (RH)
Horizon	Carmen Strickland (CS) (<i>Part meeting</i>)
Utilita	George MacGregor (GMcG) (<i>Part meeting – Discussion of DP266</i>)
SECAS	Rachel Black (<i>Meeting Secretary</i>)
	Kev Duddy (KD)
	Mohammedanwar Sumro (MS)
	Simon Grimwood (SG)
	Ben Giblin (BG)

Managed by

Representing	Attendee
	Georgiana Severin (GS)
	Rainer Lischetzki (RL)

Apologies:

Representing	CSC Member
Other SEC Parties	Jeff Studholme (JS)
	Philip Doyle (PD)

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 **AGREED** the amendments to be made and **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. SEC Modification Progression

MP242 'Change to Operational Metrics to Measure on Success'

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) (SG) presented the CSC with a summary of [MP242 'Change to Operational Metrics to Measure on Success'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

The DCC (DW) advised that the Design, Build and Implementation cost is £262,000 and not £206,079 that was shown on the slide. The cost of £262,000 is to include the Data Service Provider (DSP) change, which has been included in the DCC's Impact Assessment. SECAS agreed, and advised this was an error in the slides. A member (EL) raised concerns regarding the cost per annum. The DCC advised that the costs of £156,000 per annum include the cost of running the infrastructure, 1 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) for providing and dispensing the reports, and any other charges involved. They advised that it will be the responsibility of one DCC to employee to carry out this work, as it will involve customised reports for each SEC Party. The Chair asked if this is covered in the Modification Report, and SECAS confirmed this. The Chair asked for confirmation that what is described as included in the £156,000 cost is written in the Impact Assessment report. The DCC confirmed it is.

Centrica (RH) suggested that SEC objective (a)¹ is also benefited by MP242. A member (DD) agreed with this.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that MP242 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report

¹ Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.

- **APPROVED** the implementation approach

DP264 'Updating Independence of SMDA Testing Provisions'

SECAS (GS) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP264 'Updating Independence of SMDA Testing Provisions'](#), recommending it be progressed to the Report Phase.

SECAS advised the CSC that the urgency has increased from one to two on account of Smart Metering Device Assurance Sub-Committee (SMDASC) looking to start the procurement exercise in April 2024. Therefore, the priority has changed from 'low' to 'medium' since the meeting documentation was sent out. The members noted this.

A member (EJ) asked for clarification around the potential conflict of interest within the DCC, and what is being done to address this. SECAS explained that this relates to the testing of interchangeability and interoperability of Devices, as DCC are responsible for the Communication Hubs. It has been noted that the DCC may have a conflict of interest if they are offering the testing service. The Chair added that this modification allows the DCC, and all SEC Parties, the opportunity to tender for the SMDA Testing Service that the SMDA Sub-Committee will be procuring. The contracts for the service can address potential conflicts, and this will be monitored by the SEC Panel.

The member asked why the restriction was included in the first place. SECAS advised that it was added at the time because Parties thought it was the fairest option. However, it has created a barrier to access the expertise and infrastructure within SEC Parties that could be used and so the recommendation now is that it should be removed.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP264 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP264 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach

DP263 'Improving transparency of DCC indicative costs'

SECAS (KD) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP263 'Improving transparency of DCC indicative costs'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

The Proposer (RH) added that the original SEC Sections J 'Charges' and K 'Charging Methodology' have not changed since the Smart Meter Implementation Programme (SMIP) began. They noted that since then, there have been many extra projects and programmes that the DCC has undertaken that have never been covered by charging statements, as the DCC are not obliged to include them.

When discussing the prioritisation of DP263, the Proposer suggested that the value could be increased.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP263 should be converted to a Modification Proposal

- **AGREED** that MP263 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the proposed timetable for MP263

DP268 'Certificate rotation and expired Certificates'

SECAS (MS) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP268 'Certificate rotation and expired Certificates'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

A member (DD) asked if this will only impact the DCC, as there are already obligations on Suppliers to complete these actions. SECAS confirmed this. The Chair added that there will be DCC system impacting costs.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and impact as being clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** that DP268 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** that MP268 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the proposed timetable for MP268

DP258 'Aligning requirements for System Outage notifications'

SECAS (MS) presented the CSC with a summary of [DP258 'Aligning requirements for System Outage notifications'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

A member (DD) asked if the outstanding work required in the Refinement Process is to specify the number of days for the notification. The Chair confirmed this. The member suggested that this action could be done in Development and then progressed to Report Phase. The Chair advised that there are still discussions that need to take place, either offline or at a Working Group meeting. The member noted this, and highlighted the low priority of DP258. The Chair suggested that DP258 is kept in the Development Stage, and SECAS will discuss with the Proposer and the Operations Group (OPSG) to confirm the solution and bring it back to the CSC to go to the Report Phase.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that DP258 should stay in the Development Stage to fully define and understand the issues

DP266 'Alternative SMETS1 UTRN Generation'

SECAS (BG) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP266 'Alternative SMETS1 UTRN Generation'](#), recommending it progress to the Refinement Process.

The DCC (DW) queried how DP266 is different to [MP094 'Supporting prepayment customers in no SM WAN scenarios'](#). SECAS advised that MP094 focuses on scenarios of intermittent and no Wide Area Network (WAN), while DP266 focuses on the scenarios where the DCC Total System is unavailable. The DCC noted that the current Proposed Solution for MP094 involves generating Unique Transaction Reference Numbers (UTRNs) when there is intermittent WAN. The DCC expressed concern that there could be significant overlap between these proposals. The Chair acknowledged this but noted that the scenarios are very different. The Proposer (GMcG) added that

DP266 has been raised due to outages of the DCC Total System and was seeking another means, not reliant on the DCC Total System, to generate UTRNs.

Another member (DD) suggested that any alternative route for generating SMETS1 UTRNs may also face issues and have outages. The Proposer considered that having two potential routes to generate UTRNs should provide a sufficient level of cover, as it is unlikely both generation routes would be unavailable at the same time. The Chair noted the figures in the Modification Report which stated the DCC Total System was unavailable for 5.23% of the total 'up time' during July to December 2023. They added that it would be expensive to have two systems for the short period when the DCC Total System is unavailable. The CSC member (DD) added that generation routes available cannot be guaranteed to always be available and questioned what the existing process Parties were using in this scenario. The Proposer advised that UTRN caching is a solution to this problem, however they deem it to be unacceptable.

The member (DD) queried whether any solution to this Draft Proposal should be applicable to SMETS1 and SMETS2 Devices. The Proposer advised there is a difference between SMETS1 and SMETS2 UTRN generation, noting most SMETS2 UTRN generation takes place within the Suppliers' system. As such, UTRN generation does not rely on the DCC Total System. They added that the dependency is different and there is more control over their own systems, leading to higher availability. The member (DD) asked for clarification that Suppliers and Adaptor Providers will need to have a solution for SMETS2 in place, and this Draft Proposal is only aiming at SMETS1 UTRNs. The Proposer confirmed this.

A member (EL) advised that there is an existing work around when this issue occurs, referencing information they had provided to SECAS.

The Chair noted that there was a lot of documentation sent to SECAS from EL in relation to looking at alternatives to SMETS1 UTRN generation. They proposed the CSC agree to keep DP266 in the Development Stage and look at the documentation. The Proposer agreed and suggested that it would be better to review the documentation. The Proposer advised that they do not have a defined solution yet, but stated it will have a consumer benefit. They suggested that if EL still has detailed records, then they can work with SECAS and industry to see if they can come up with a different solution.

The Chair asked if the SSC were supportive of DP266 moving forward. SECAS (BG) confirmed they were.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that DP266 should stay in the Development Stage to fully define and understand the issues

DP265 'Implementing ADT changes in response to a Security incident'

SECAS (GS) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP265 'Implementing ADT changes in response to a Security incident'](#), recommending it remain in the Development Stage.

A member (EJ) asked when DP265 will be taken to the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC). SECAS (GS) advised that the plan had been to only take DP265 to the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) but advised they can also bring it to TABASC. SECAS (KD) agreed it could go to TABASC but added that it depends on what the solution is likely to be, as TABASC may not have an interest if the solution does not require a system change. They also queried with members as to whether the level of interest users would necessitate the Refinement Processor whether it could move straight to the Report Phase. Another member (DD) asked if the

Managed by

user will have to resubmit the file to change the Anomaly Detection Threshold (ADT) levels to their original level. SECAS (KD) believed that the intention is for it to revert to the original level once the security incident is over, but this needs to be investigated further.

A member (EL) highlighted their concerns around dealing with ADTs. They also queried how much say the CSC will have in this matter if this is a recommendation from the SSC. They also queried the process for the user to reset the ADT values or whether there would be some form of feedback from the SSC or DCC. The Chair suggested that part of the solution should include communicating with users to improve their understanding. The member advised that they're setting their ADTs at reasonable levels, but it would be useful if they are made aware when something needs to be changed. They suggested that users will likely need to resubmit the file. The member also expressed concerns regarding Service Requests being quarantined.

A member (DD) advised that the governance and communication around this will need to be of a high quality.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that DP265 should stay in the Development Stage to fully define and understand the issues

DP267 'Facilitating the installation and commissioning of meters triaged under Use Case 004'

SECAS (MS) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP267 'Facilitating the installation and commissioning of meters triaged under Use Case 004'](#), recommending it remain in the Development Stage.

The Chair queried why DP267 has been give an Urgency of two. SECAS explained that Triage Facilities are being approved for use now, and some are already live. They advised they were unsure of the scale of the issue, but stated that there will be a certain number of Smart Meters that will fail at install and commission.

A member (DD) asked if this aligns with the issues raised in [MP239 'Enduring Solution for Resolving SMETS2 Device Certificate Misalignment Issue'](#). The DCC (DW) advised that MP239 is separate to DP267, as it relates to use case in a triage situation rather than misalignment of Device Certificates. However, they noted that DP267 may also have a non-system impacting solution. SECAS (RL) advised that both are trying to address certificate inconsistencies. They advised that DP267 addresses Devices outside of the smart metering system as the Device will have been removed from site. However, MP239 focuses on when a Device is still within the DCC system and the Certificate information has become misaligned, resulting in the smart meter being unable to respond to a request. The Chair advised they will look further into MP239, and come back to the CSC with a more detailed description of their differences and similarities.

The member (DD) queried why Device Certificates are only sometimes replaced. SECAS (KD) advised that it depends on how the manufacturer has set up their reset process. They advised that the SSC Chair has requested information from manufacturers to help scale the issue.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that DP267 should stay in the Development Stage to fully define and understand the issues

ACTION 60/01: SECAS to advise the CSC of the differences and similarities of MP239 and DP267.

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 [MP219 'Accessing Consumption Data on behalf of SEC Parties'](#), the Chair advised that it had been put on hold until the new Privacy Sub-Committee (PSC) has been set up. A member (EJ) asked if the meeting dates for the PSC had been confirmed yet. SECAS (BG) advised they would find out.

The CSC:

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

ACTION 60/02: SECAS to confirm when the meeting dates for the Privacy Sub-Committee will be.

4. SEC Releases Update

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

A member (EJ) queried why [MP235 'Enhanced Meter Data Access for Other Users'](#) is given a RAG status of 'green' for the June 2025 SEC Release, as it was said to be on hold during the SEC Modification Timetables update. The Chair advised that it is on hold. However, they advised if SECAS started work on it now it would be able to make that SEC Release, which is why it is given a RAG status of 'green'. They advised that the CSC will be made aware if the targeted implementation date would need to change.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the updates on the SEC Releases provided in the paper

5. Approval to implement the February 2024 SEC Release

SECAS (SG) requested the CSC approve the February 2024 SEC Release is ready to go live on Thursday 29 February 2024.

The CSC had no comments.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that the February 2024 SEC Release can be set live on 29 February 2024.

6. November 2023 Costs

The Chair presented the CSC with an update on the November 2023 SEC Release costs. They advised that the targeted cost had been £1,203,871. However, the actual cost was £4 million.

Centrica (RH) asked how this compares to previous SEC Releases. The Chair advised that SECAS are investigating this with the DCC. They advised that the last few SEC Releases had been done differently to other SEC Releases as they were partially maintenance SEC Releases. They stated that SECAS are looking into what the previous actual costs were in comparison to the targeted costs, and will bring the breakdown of costs back to the CSC.

The DCC (DW) advised that they are unsure if the figures given include the delivery of the Northbound Prioritisation mechanism. They noted that the November 2023 SEC Release included costs from CSP North that would not have been included in the original estimate. They suggested that there are other Change Requests that may have been included in the pricing scope other than SEC modifications. The Chair agreed.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the update

ACTION 60/03: SECAS to confirm where the additional costs from the November 2023 SEC Release originate from, and compare the target and actual costs for other previous SEC Releases.

7. DCC Assessments

The Chair presented the CSC with an update on the open DCC Assessments.

The DCC (DW) advised they are targeting a 15 Working Day response time instead of 20 Working Days for a Medium size change for [MP184 'Increase Smart Capability of SMETS2 Twin Element ESME to support Solar and Storage use cases'](#). They stated that they informed the Proposer that it might not be possible to implement MP184 without huge industry changes.

The Chair advised that the timescales highlighted were in relation to the DCC's Project Blue. They explained that this is a DCC initiative to handle change differently, and will look at the size of change and estimate if it will be small (15 Working Days), large (needs more than 15 Working Days), or very complex (more complicated and needs more time and design study). The Chair advised that the trial was meant to go live in January 2024, but now will not go ahead until March 2024. They explained that SECAS and the DCC were working on the assumption that Project Blue would have gone live, hence the DCC's reference to 'Medium 20 Working Days'. As the DCC stated, the Chair advised it would be complete within 15 Working Days instead. The proposal that was brought to the SEC Panel was that the DCC would give an update each month to the CSC on how change is being handled. However, some members of the SEC Panel suggested that the change should occur across the SEC, and be dealt with by TABASC. The SEC Panel Chair advised they would look at the operational model of the Smart Energy Code Company Limited (SECCo), and see where the oversight responsibility should reside. The Chair advised they are waiting for this discussion to take place.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the update

8. 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 member (EJ) asked if the draft of the escalation policy has been circulated. The Chair advised that it has been shared within SECAS, but will be shared with the materials for the Modification Improvement Project Workshop on Wednesday 28 February 2024.

9. Any other business (AOB)

SECAS (RB) advised the members that the CSC elections are now underway, and the deadline for the call for nominations is Friday 1 March 2024. They encouraged members to email sec.change@gemserv.com if they have any questions.

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

Next Meeting: 19 March 2024