

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 76_1706

17 June 2025, 10:00 – 12:25

Teleconference

SECCSC_76_1706 – Final Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	CSC Members	Organisation
Change Sub-Committee Chair	Ali Beard (AB)	Change Sub-Committee Chair
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
Large Suppliers	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
Small Suppliers	Charlie Sands (CS)	Fuse Energy
Network Parties	Kelly Kinsman (KK)	National Grid
Other SEC Parties	Philip Doyle (PD)	Reverve Ltd
Other SEC Parties	Gerdjan Busker (GB)	Prescience

Other Participants		
DCC (Data Communications Company)		
Bradley Baker (BB)	David Walsh (DW)	
Graeme Milligan (GM) <i>(part)</i>	David Rollason (DR) <i>(part)</i>	
Edward Russell (ER) <i>(part)</i>	Darren Smith (DS) <i>(part)</i>	
Ofgem		
Cristina Ullastre (CU)		
SECCo		
Robin Healey (RH)		
ENWL		
Catherine Duggan (CD) <i>(part)</i>		
Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS)		
Sophia Master (SM) <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	Khaleda Hussain (KH)	Georgie Severin (GS)

Marc Rhodes (MR)	Lydia Bentley (LB)	Talia Lattimore (TL)
Rainer Lischetzki (RL)		

Apologies:

Representing	CSC Members	Organisation
Consumers	Caroline Farquhar (CF)	Citizens Advice

1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

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

SECAS (SM) confirmed that no comments had been received on the minutes of the previous meeting. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
73/01	DCC to provide an update on the June 2024 SEC System Release Costs and the costs for all non-market wide elements at the next CSC Meeting. The DCC (DS) provided an update on the June 2024 SEC System Release Costs. The expected cost had been £3.7 million, however once it was complete and delivered, the total cost was £2.5 million. The reduction was attributed to regression testing being time and materials-based and the absence of defects, which meant no rework was required. The Chair (AB) queried whether the User Integration Testing (UIT) window had been reduced, and the DCC (DS) advised that this would need to be confirmed separately. The CSC members agreed that the action could be closed. Status: Closed
Action handed over from SWG	SECAS to review the modification process to determine if cost implications are being appropriately assessed (e.g. the inclusion of Opex costs as well as Capex). The Chair (AB) confirmed that this would be addressed as part of the Benefits Realisation Project. The CSC members agreed to close this action. Status: Closed

Action Reference	Action
75/01	SECAS to liaise with the DCC regarding the date on when assessments can be requested.
The Chair (AB) confirmed that assessments had now been requested from the new DSP. SECAS had already submitted a preliminary assessment request for MP169 and was awaiting a response. The Chair (AB) noted that the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) for assessments remained unchanged, and that the new DSP had been briefed accordingly. The DCC (DW) confirmed that the same timelines would apply. A member (EL) asked whether the SLAs would be met, and the Chair (AB) responded that this was the intention. The CSC members agreed that this action could also be closed. Status: Closed	

3. SEC Modification Progression

MP288 'Erroneous Section J Default Notices'

SECAS (LB) presented the CSC with a summary of [MP288 'Erroneous Section J Default Notices'](#) recommending it progress to the Report Phase.

A member (EL) expressed support for the modification but noted that it seemed disproportionate to require a full modification to address what is essentially a procedural loophole. The member (EL) highlighted that the issue reflects broader concerns with DCC finance processes and advised that there is a call to set up a finance Sub-Committee, which might have prevented the need for this change. SECAS (LB) acknowledged the concern but noted that the implementation cost is negligible and the change would provide clarity and prevent future issues.

SECAS (LB) confirmed that the legal drafting had been reviewed and supported by Network Parties and that the Refinement Consultation responses were unanimously in favour.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** MP288 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP288 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification.

MP290 'Incorporation of Category 3 Issue Resolution Proposal into the SEC – Batch 11 and GBCS Changes'

SECAS (MR) presented the CSC with a summary of [MP290 'Incorporation of Category 3 Issue Resolution Proposal into the SEC – Batch 11 and GBCS Changes'](#) recommending it progress to the Report Phase.

A member (EJ) noted that Category 3 Issue Resolution Proposals are confusing in terms of what DCC Assessment they need. The Chair (AB) explained that although an initial Preliminary Assessment is carried out by the DCC another Assessment is needed from the Service Providers to confirm that there are no System changes needed. The Chair (AB) noted that the change aligns with the upcoming

SEC Schedule 8 Great Britain Companion Specifications (GBCS) update in November and that there are no system changes or DCC costs involved.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** MP290 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP290 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification.

DP295 'Amendment to SMETS1 Cache Solution'

SECAS (MR) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP295 'Amendment to SMETS1 Cache Solution'](#) recommending it progress directly to the Report Phase.

A member (DD) queried whether the additional data storage would incur extra costs. The DCC (BB) confirmed that the change is a configuration change and would not result in additional costs. A member (EJ) asked whether 27 hours was the optimal cut-off point. The DCC (GM) explained that analysis showed 27 hours as the peak point for benefit, with no further gains beyond that.

The Chair (AB) noted that the change had not gone through the Refinement process due to its simplicity and lack of cost, but that the Security Sub-Committee had expressed support.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** DP295 should be converted to a Modification
- **AGREED** MP295 should be progressed to the Report Phase
- **APPROVED** the Modification Report
- **APPROVED** the implementation approach
- **AGREED** that MP295 should be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification.

DP293 'Deferment of DCC Planned Maintenance during Adverse Weather'

SECAS (LB) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP293 'Deferment of DCC Planned Maintenance during Adverse Weather'](#) recommending it progress to the Refinement Stage.

A member (EJ) advised that it is not only the Data Service Provider (DSP) and the DCC Service Providers, but also the wider SEC users who are impacted. SECAS (LB) advised they will take this on board as they progress and explore the impact of the solution. A member (EL) advised they have had incidents where planned maintenance and Business Continuity Disaster Recovery (BCDR) events have been deferred. There have been several instances where customers have been notified of things they cannot do, only to go back to them and advise they were incorrect.

ENWL (CD) advised that they are aware that there was a previous Modification ([MP166 – 'Adverse Weather Planned Maintenance Process'](#)). However, ENWL (CD) and SECAS (LB) both noted that there is a difference between the two modifications; when MP166 was considered, an adverse weather event had never occurred at the same time as a DCC Planned Maintenance, and as such the impacts were theoretical. They went on to note that in December 2024 there was such an overlap,

however, and other users were impacted due to the storm. ENWL (CD) are seeking an agreed set of criteria which could be met in order to trigger a threshold to seek the deferment.

A member (DD) queried if this would impact six Service Providers for DSP 2, rather than just one for the current DSP. They stated that the architecture is a lot different with DSP2, which will need to be taken into consideration. ENWL (CD) advised they will be seeking anything that would prevent them having access to the Smart Meters. SECAS (LB) advised discussions have taken place with DCC colleagues about the size and scope of the impact, which will be something they will look into as the modification progresses. The Chair (AB) advised that SECAS (TL) will be discussing a modification in regard to the Review of DCC Maintenance Activities and Temporary Additional Allowance and these two modifications may impact on each other, but SECAS will ensure these are dealt with holistically.

A member (EJ) queried if there are categorisation to the storms. SECAS (LB) advised that SECAS have linked to the Meteorological (Met) Office pages for their prioritisation and how the Met Office calculate the ratings.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** DP293 should be converted to a Modification
- **AGREED** MP293 should progress to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the first package of work and the timetable for MP293

DP294 'Review of DCC Maintenance Activities and Temporary Additional Allowance'

SECAS (TL) presented the CSC with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP294 'Review of DCC Maintenance Activities and Temporary Additional Allowance'](#) recommending it progress to the Refinement Stage.

A member (EJ) queried if the temporary additional allowance for Planned Maintenance is for one six-month period or until the new DSP is delivered. The DCC (DR) advised that the temporary additional allowance will be for six months of the year (Summer) every year up to the point of data migration for the new DSP.

A member (EJ) queried the reference to 100,000 in the definitions of Planned and Unplanned Maintenance and asked if the Device inferred to would be a Device connected to 100,000 Communications Hubs. The DCC (DR) advised it would be a meter or an In-home Display (IHD) or a Prepayment Interface Device (PPMID) that is connected to 100,000 Communications Hubs

A member (EJ) queried if the urgency on the Prioritisation Matrix is low urgency. The DCC (DR) advised that this modification may not be implemented for this summer. The DCC (ER) advised this could potentially be implemented in the latter parts of the year, however, it might only be for two months of this year. The DCC are looking to get this in as soon as possible but it is also possible to request any additional allowance needed in the meantime via existing governance.

A member (EJ) queried why a member (EL) is co-sponsoring this modification. The member (EL) advised they were in the midst of raising a modification around the current definition of Unplanned Maintenance at the same time the DCC were looking to introduce additional Maintenance Activities and the temporary additional allowance. It was suggested that the two were combined for efficiency reasons. It was noted that there are parts of the modification which are DCC specific.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood
- **AGREED** DP294 should be converted to a Modification Proposal
- **AGREED** MP294 should be progressed to the Refinement Process
- **AGREED** the first package of work and the timetable for MP294

4. SEC Modification Timetables

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

A member (EJ) believed that MP169 had been requested and queried the return date. The Chair (AB) confirmed they have requested MP169, and the return date will be early next week.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the updates on the SEC Modification Timetables.

5. Post Decision Delivery and Ofgem expected decision dates

SECAS (KH) presented an update on the Post Decision Delivery.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the updates on the Post Decision Delivery.

6. SEC Releases Update

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

A member (EJ) queried the Ofgem Consumer Consent work streams are being monitored. The Chair (AB) advised this is not being monitored currently but SECAS (BG) will be able to provide an update on this.

The DCC (DW) advised that MP239 will be going ahead but will not be going ahead on Future Services Management (FSM) in June 2025. MP252 will be going ahead in November 2025 but not on FSM. There will be a later release of FSM and the FSM functionality for the two modifications will be in place then.

The CSC:

- **NOTED** the updates on the SEC Releases

ACTION: 76/01 SECAS to find out what action Parties need to take and what training will be available on how to use the functionality implemented by MP252

ACTION: 76/02 SECAS to give an update on the impact of Consumer Consent workstreams

7. Update on Jun 24 Release costs

The DCC (DS) provided an update on the Jun 2024 Release cost which is reflected in the Actions.

ACTION: 76/03 DCC to confirm what the savings were on UIT costs for June 24 SEC Release

8. CSC Go / No-Go Decision – June 2025 SEC Release

SECAS (GS) presented an update on progress with the upcoming CSC Go / No-Go Decision June 2025 SEC Release.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that the June 2025 SEC Release should go ahead.

9. June 2026 Baseline

SECAS (GS) confirmed that, as of the current meeting, there were no system-impacting modifications scheduled for implementation in the June 2026 Release.

The Chair (AB) explained that this checkpoint is a standard part of the Release planning process, as DCC System-impacting modifications typically require a 12-month lead time to allow for Design, Build, and Testing (DBT) activities. While there may be other changes planned for that period, none currently meet the criteria for inclusion in the SEC Release baseline.

No objections or concerns were raised by Committee members, and the Committee agreed to proceed with baselining the Release with no system-impacting content.

10. Nov 2025 SEC Release Review TAD

SECAS (GS) confirmed that the only DCC System-impacting modification currently included in the release is MP252, which has already been approved for implementation.

SECAS (GS) clarified that MP268, which had previously been considered for inclusion, is no longer system-impacting and will proceed as a legal text only change. Similarly, MP283 and MP286 are also legal text changes and do not require system implementation support.

The CSC:

NOTED the update on the November 2025 SEC Release Review TAD.

11. MHHS Urgent Mod Process

The Chair (AB) provided an update on discussions held with the Market-Wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Programme and Ofgem regarding the potential need for an urgent modification process to support MHHS go-live. The MHHS Programme had expressed interest in ensuring that an urgent route exists for implementing changes quickly, should any issues arise during or after go-live.

The Chair (AB) explained that SEC already has an established Urgent modification process in place, which includes defined criteria and procedures for expedited progression. The Chair (AB) confirmed that this process is considered sufficient for the needs of the SEC and that no additional changes are currently proposed.

A member (EL) raised concerns that the MHHS Programme may not fully understand the complexity and lead times associated with SEC modifications, particularly those involving System changes or firmware updates. The member (EL) emphasised that even if a modification is deemed urgent, the delivery timeline is still constrained by the technical and operational realities of the DCC and SEC Parties. He cautioned against the assumption that urgent changes could be implemented immediately.

The DCC (DW) supported this view, noting that while the DCC can respond quickly to some changes, any modification requiring system development or impacting the DSP would still require significant lead time. They added that the DCC is already engaged with the MHHS Programme and is monitoring any developments that may affect SEC systems.

The Chair (AB) concluded that the existing Urgent modification process remains appropriate and that any future requests for urgent changes would be assessed on a case-by-case basis using the current framework.

12. Any other business (AOB)

A Member (EJ) raised concerns regarding the classification of meeting papers, noting that while there had been some improvement in recent months, inconsistencies remained. They highlighted that some papers were still being marked as Red or Amber without clear justification, and that this limited the ability of Parties to share and discuss materials internally. The member (EJ) requested a further review of the paper classification process to ensure that ratings are applied appropriately and consistently.

A member (EL) supported this view and added that in some cases, entire slide decks had been marked as Red due to a single slide, without a separate version being provided for wider circulation. The member (EL) emphasised the importance of transparency and requested that future slide packs be split where necessary to allow for clearer dissemination of non-sensitive content.

The Chair (AB) acknowledged these concerns and confirmed that SECAS would review the current classification approach. SECCo (RH) confirmed that a green version of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) paper referenced by EJ had now been finalised and would be published shortly, with a Clear version to follow. SECCo (RH) also agreed to explore the possibility of separating slide packs by classification level to improve accessibility.

ACTION: 76/04 SECCo (RH) to confirm Paper Classification approach with SECAS Governance Team

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

Next Meeting: 15 July 2025