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.

MP265 'ADT Changes'

October 2024 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Amy Cox (AC)	EDF
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
	Francesca Scott (FS)	EDF
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
Other SEC Parties	Beth Tatton (BT)	Calisen Metering
	Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
Network Parties	Hajrah Asif (HA)	Northern Powergrid
	Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB)	David Walsh (DW)	Gav Parrott (GP)
Paul McShane (PMcS)		
SECAS		
Simon Grimwood (SG) *WG Chair*	Rachel Black (RBl) *Meeting Secretary*	Georgie Severin (GSe) *Lead Analyst*
Ali Beard (AB)	Elizabeth Woods (EW)	Marc Rhodes (MRh)

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, and a view of the proposed solution.

Background

- Currently, Service Users will provide the DCC with their own Anomaly Detection Threshold (ADT) files, which detail Service Request forecast and expected pattern of demand.
- In the event of a system compromise, the DCC cannot overwrite the Service User ADT, and this limits the readiness to mitigate the recovery.
- The DCC are not able to amend ADTs to prevent large numbers of Service Requests from being quarantined in the recovery process.

Potential Solution

The potential solution would be to amend SEC Appendix AA to specifically allow the DCC to override User-set ADTs to help recovery after a Compromise, under the recommendations of the Security Sub-Committee (SSC).

Issues Group Discussion

A member of the Working Group (BT) questioned how the process would work if the amendment of ADTs would only come under authorisation of the SSC. SECAS (GS) explained that once a Compromise happens, the SSC and the DCC meet as part of the Smart Metering Incident Response Team (SMIRT) and at that point they would decide next steps, including SSCs recommendation for ADTs to be temporarily amended.

Another member of the Working Group (JM) questioned what would happen once the ADTs have been reverted to their original numbers as presumably it would cause backlog of Service Requests. ADTs are set both Northbound and Southbound and setting these to zero for a period of time and reverting back may cause issues. The DCC (DW) confirmed that the aim for the DCC to amend these ADTs in recovering from a Compromise and only revert back to the original ADT levels once quarantined messages and alert backlogs have cleared. The DCC goes on to say that it would be a judgement call depending on the scale of the issue.

Another member of the Working Group (SK) questioned whether during the recovery period, the DCC would look at a backup processes, such as emails notifying the Service User that ADT limits had been exceeded. SECAS (GS) confirmed this would be the aim.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to request the Preliminary Assessment;
- SECAS to bring the modification back to Working Group; and
- SECAS to present the modification to TABASC.