

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.

MP271 ‘Sub-Committee seats for Other Users, Meter Data Retrievers and Registered Supplier Agents’

September 2024 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Sharon Armitage (SA)	EON
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
	Francesca Scott (FS)	EDF
	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	Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
	Rob Heath (RH)	Calisen
	Beth Tatton (BT)	Calisen
	Ian Lovatt (IL)	Chameleon
	Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
	Michael Snowden (MS)	Secure
	Jeff Studholme (JS)	Smart Meter Assets
	James Murphy (JM)	Stark
Network Parties	Kelly Kinsman (KK)	National Grid Electricity Distribution
	Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN

Other Participants		
DCC		
David Walsh (DW)		
SECAS		
Alison Beard (SG) <i>Working Group Chair</i>	Rachel Black (AS) <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	Ben Giblin (BG) <i>Lead Analyst</i>
Georgie Severin (GSe)	Elizabeth Woods (EW)	Marc Rhodes (MR)

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue, impact and the Proposed Solution.

Issue

- The Other SEC Party (OSP) category currently has around 150 members, making it the largest constituency which compromises a variety of different types of organisations.
- The Proposer believes due to the size and differing nature of the OSP category, it is difficult for the existing OSP representatives to fully represent the entire constituency.
- Data Communications Company (DCC) Users have different requirements to the rest of the group and with usage forecast to increase in the coming years, the Proposer believes that increased representation would be beneficial.

Proposed Solution

- The Proposed Solution is to reallocate one existing Other SEC Party seat at the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) and Change Board to a Party acting in the role of Other User (OU), Meter Data Retriever (MDR) or Registered Supplier Agent (RSA).

Terms of Reference Changes

- The Proposer would also like to make changes to the membership of the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) and Operations Group (OPSG). Changes to these Sub-Committees take place via the Terms of Reference outside of the scope of MP271, with members needing to provide a consensus view on the proposed alterations before SEC Panel makes the final approval.

Working Group Discussion

SECAS (BG) provided an overview of the issue, impact and the Proposed Solution.

Applications for OSP Sub-Committee seats

A Working Group member (JS) questioned how many OSPs had applied for seats at TABASC, OPSG, CSC and Change Board in recent years. They added that in some instances, no OSPs had applied to represent the constituency and seats remained vacant. They noted that information on the number of OU, MDR and RSA who had applied for OSP seats would allow Parties to look at the scale of the issue. The Proposer (JM) commented that they had applied for Sub-Committee seats but had been unsuccessful, noting this may have been due to their lack of industry knowledge or because of Manufacturers voting for other Manufacturers to represent them. They added that the aim of the modification is to increase engagement and ensure OSPs who are DCC Users are represented.

SECAS (BG) noted other comments received before the meeting about this modification leading to less representation for OSPs, if no OU, MDR or RSA applied for a seat which had been specifically

assigned to them. They added that a clause will be added into the legal text so that if no OU, MDR or RSA apply for a seat then any Party in the OSP category who has applied could fill the seat.

Engagement from OSPs

A Working Group member (RB) noted that the existing OSP Panel representatives engaged with OSPs to gain their votes, which is something other Parties should also do if they want to be elected. (RB) and (KC) questioned whether there are examples of OSPs not having their issues resolved by representatives.

(JS) noted that they are rarely approached by OSPs in their role as an OSP representative at CSC. They added existing OSP representatives could do more to engage with other Parties in the category to collate their views. (BT) noted that they had not seen many OSP representatives proactively engaging with the constituency and questioned how the representatives can accurately represent the constituency without first surveying their views. (MB) noted that the classification of papers and notes from certain Sub-Committees means they are difficult to distribute to all OSPs. They questioned whether the roles and responsibilities of OSP representatives should be updated to remind representatives of their responsibilities.

(RB) noted that the issue of representation for OSPs will not be fixed through this modification and believed that SECAS should investigate how this can be improved. (EJ) noted that of the 159 Parties within the OSP category, only eight attended the Working Group meeting. They added that if this was a major issue for OSPs they would have attended as the Working Group is an open forum to all SEC Parties.

Functions of Sub-Committees

A Working Group member (EJ) noted the differing functions of the four Sub-Committees which the Proposer would like to change. They added that at TABASC and OPSG, OSP representatives are providing guidance and industry knowledge, whereas at CSC and Change Board the role of the OSP representative is to represent the entire constituency's views. They concluded that these differences should be considered when the modification is discussed at each Sub-Committee.

Alteration of Proposed Solution

A Working Group member (IL) questioned why existing OSP seats were being reallocated and why the Proposed Solution did not include adding new seats for OU, MDR and RSA. (MB) noted these comments, adding that although the existing OSP representatives at TABASC are classed as Manufacturers, they produce vastly different Devices and have differing issues and knowledge. They noted that creating a specific DCC User group may be useful.

The Proposer (JM) noted that the initial Proposed Solution was to create a new Party category and new seats for OU, MDR and RSA however this was altered following feedback from the Issues Group relating to giving power to Parties who do not contribute to paying DCC charges.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS (BG) to examine the number of applications from OSPs for seats at Change Board, TABASC, CSC and OPSG to determine the scale of the issue.
- SECAS (BG) to discuss MP271 and the associated changes with OSP Panel representatives.
- SECAS (AB) to discuss how to improve engagement within the OSP constituency.