

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.

‘MP289 - BCDR Engagement’

June 2025 Working Group – Meeting Summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	Centrica
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Shane Scarsbrook	SSE
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Sharon Armitage (SA)	E.ON
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
Other SEC Parties	David Jones (DJ)	Alt Han Company
	Rob Heath (RH)	Calisen Metering
	Danny Hold (DH)	Department of Energy Security and Net Zero
	Martin Bell (MB)	Energy & Utilities Alliance
	Michael Snowdon (MS)	Secure Meters
Network Parties	Kirsty Maddock (KM)	National Grid Electricity Distribution
	James Shippey (JS)	Northern Powergrid
Ofgem	Christina Ullastre (CS)	Ofgem

Other Participants		
DCC		
David Walsh (DW)	Rina Singh (RS)	
SECAS		
Ben Giblin (BG) <i>Chair</i>	Holly Graves (HG) <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	Lydia Bentley (LB)
Talia Lattimore (TL)	Georgie Severin (GSe)	Marc Rhodes
Simon Grimwood (SG)	Ali Beard (AB)	

Overview

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

Current Arrangements

- Smart Energy Code (SEC) Section H 'DCC Services' Clause 10 sets out provisions related to Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR), including how the Data Communications Company (DCC) must engage with SEC Parties ahead of testing.
- The current provisions were put in place under [SECMP0029 'Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Testing Amendments'](#) in 2018 and require the DCC to consult and notify SEC Parties and the SEC Panel of its intention to carry out BCDR testing. This includes providing a BCDR Test Schedule at least 60 Working Days before any test is due to commence.

Issue

- The DCC's approach to Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) testing has evolved since the arrangements were first put in place.
- The current SEC Party engagement/notification requirements may no longer be appropriate in every instance of BCDR testing.
 - There are also currently different engagement requirements across outage activities and advanced planning, and the Proposer believes that this makes it difficult to engage Parties in an efficient and joined up manner.

Impacts

- The Proposer believes that the combination of different engagement requirements across different outage activities and the need for advanced planning can make it difficult to engage Parties in an efficient and joined up manner.
- In addition to this, SEC Parties currently have no formal visibility over how the DCC approaches its BCDR Tests in terms of the assessment on, and the approach to, testing. This means Parties may have little insight into the benefits of testing and why its conducted.

Proposed Solution

- The Proposer is looking to:
 - Amend the current requirements for engagement and notification regarding BCDR Testing, considering the DCC's current approach to BCDR testing; and
 - Formalise the production and availability of the DCC's BCDR Testing Approach document with a requirement to review the approach on a regular basis.

Working Group Discussion

The Working Group considered the information provided by SECAS on the issue identified and the Proposed Solution.

A Working Group member (MB) advised that they had read the DCC BCDR Testing Approach document provided and noted that from a technical perspective, it mentions stakeholder engagement but not specifically how this will happen. They added that all the process governance sits with the DCC whereas other arrangements go through TAG. They advised that when dealing with BCDR matters, customers should be fully informed.

The DCC (RS) responded noting that they had made a note of the comment and would feed it back.

A Working Group member (SA) asked for further clarification regarding the information that is and is not included in BCDR notifications.

The DCC (RS) responded that the DCC provide information with regards to which Service Providers will be conducting testing and when. Then closer to the time of a test, further details regarding the testing and what can be expected is provided.

The Working Group member (SA) noted that the DCC will know what requires testing when it is arranged with SPs. The DCC confirmed that this is the case, but the detail is provided closer to the time of the test as it would be too much information to include in the notifications.

A Working Group member (MB) asked how changes to this document will be managed. They added that the testing approach document as per SEC Section H, when deviated from, gets varied. They asked if the DCC Testing Approach document will be treated in the same way.

The DCC (RS) responded that they would take that question away and confirm ahead of the next Workgroup meeting.

Next Steps

- SECAS to continue work on the Modification and present progress at next meeting.
- The DCC to provide further information at the next meeting