

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public and any Members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

SEC Change Board Meeting 72_2311

23 November 2022, 10:00– 10:55

Teleconference

SECCB_72_2311 - Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	David Rodger (DR)
	Emma Johnson (EJ)
	Sharon Armitage (SA)
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (CB)
	Andrew Green (AG) (<i>alternate for Gareth Evans</i>)
Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)
	Stephen Charlton (SC)
	Andy Clasper (ACI)
Other SEC Parties	Alastair Cobb (ACo)
	Kevin McIntyre (KMcl) (<i>alternate for Patrick Caiger-Smith</i>)
Consumers	Euan Graham (EG)
Representing	Other Participants
Data Communications Company (DCC)	David Walsh (DW)
	Christopher Thompson (CT)
SECAS	Rachel Black (RB) (<i>Meeting Secretariat</i>)
	Ali Beard (AB)
	Mike Fenn (MF)
Ofgem	Scott McPhillimy (SMcP)

	Jamie Flaherty (JF)
--	---------------------

Apologies:

Representing	Participant
Large Suppliers	Emslie Law
	Robert Johnstone
Small Suppliers	Gareth Evans
Other SEC Parties	Patrick Caiger-Smith

1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Meeting Secretary (RB) noted that proposed changes to the text of the previous meeting minutes had been received. The Change Board was shown the proposed changes and asked if it approved of them. The Change Board **APPROVED** the proposed changes, and **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
67/01	SECAS and the DCC to ensure that the relevant DCC guidance documents are prepared and proactively circulated to Users suitably in advance of the SSI and MP109 changes being implemented.
The Change Board had no comments, and the Chair advised that the action was now complete. Status: Closed	
69/02	DCC to provide clarity on how the Enhanced Self-Service (ESS) changes overlap with the MP176 changes, and how this may affect the MP176 implementation costs.
The Chair proposed to close this action. SECAS (MF) advised that they would check with the Change Board member (EL) who had originally raised this point before the action was marked as closed. The Change Board had no comments. Status: Closed	
71/01	The DCC to provide a view on the share of the MP162 costs each Supplier would be apportioned.
A member (GS) asked if there was scope to put additional modifications in the same release as MP162 'SEC changes required to deliver MHHS' , as originally it had been stated that the market-wide half-hourly settlement (MHHS) programme would have its own release due to complexity. They stated that it was not definite that other modifications could be added to this release. The DCC (DW) noted other modifications could be implemented alongside MP162, and this would realise cost-savings. The Chair advised this action would remain open until the MP162 costs had been finalised. Status: Open	

3. Change Board Votes

MP122B 'Operational Metrics – Part 2'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP122B 'Operational Metrics – Part 2'](#).

The Proposer (GS) asked if they could be sent the Change Request (CR) number for the Incident Category 3, 4 and 5 reporting which forms part of this modification. The DCC (DW) advised that this reporting is being carried out by an internal team within the DCC, and they will find a reference for this to send to the Proposer.

A member (EJ) asked for further clarity around the function of a new group, called the Performance Measurement Review Group (PMRG), within the Operations Group (OPSG). The member queried whether the PMRG would be looking at ways to introduce these reporting changes if MP122B was not approved, and whether that might provide a cheaper solution to the identified shortfalls in reporting. SECAS (MF) agreed to provide feedback on the remit of the PMRG after the meeting.

The Proposer (GS) acknowledged that the solution is expensive, but highlighted that MP122B assists in improving the accuracy of DCC reporting. They advised that without MP122B, the DCC will not be able to improve its reporting of timings of Alerts coming into its infrastructure and being sent to the User. Without this, the DCC cannot be held accountable for its performance. The DCC (DW) also noted the DCC requires the reporting to hold its Service Providers accountable for performance. The member considered that if this modification is rejected it will likely come before the Change Board again, as this accuracy is required.

The Change Board agreed to proceed to vote. The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	3	0	1	Approve
Small Suppliers	2	0	0	Approve
Network Parties	2	0	1	Approve
Other SEC Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Consumers	1	0	0	Approve
Overall conclusion:				Approve

The view of the Change Board is that MP122B will better facilitate SEC Objectives (b)¹ and (g)² for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report. One member also considered that the modification would better facilitate SEC Objective (a)³, though all other members considered it neutral against this objective. Members acknowledged the high costs but considered that the importance of introducing this additional monitoring of the DCC's performance was necessary.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** that this Modification Proposal should proceed to vote
- **AGREED** the Modification Proposal be **APPROVED** under Self-Governance, and;

¹ Enable the DCC to comply at all times with the General Objectives of the DCC (as defined in the DCC Licence), and to efficiently discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the DCC Licence.

² Facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of this Code.

³ Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.

- **PROVIDED** rationale for this decision against the General SEC Objectives

There will now be 10 Working Days for any SEC Party who wishes to refer the Change Board's decision to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC). This referral period will close at **5pm on Wednesday 7 December 2022**. If no referrals are notified, the decision will be final.

ACTION 72/01 The DCC to send the Change Request (CR) number for the Incident Category 3, 4 and 5 part of the MP122B solution to the Proposer.

ACTION 72/02 SECAS to provide further clarity of the scope of the PMRG.

4. Impact Assessment Requests

MP211 'Aligning the SMI with the CPL'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP211 'Aligning the SMI with the CPL'](#).

SECAS (AB) reminded the members that the Modification Report provided was classified as an Amber document. However, the Change Board's discussions did not include the confidential information and so can be classified as White.

A member (ACo) raised concerns around the prioritisation of this modification, given other issues being discussed, as they stated that there were already controls in place to prevent these issues from happening. SECAS (AB) advised that they would inform the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) of these concerns, but highlighted that this is an issue that the SSC has been concerned about for some time. There was discussion around whether this issue had been brought before the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC). However, SECAS (AB) reminded the members that the question for the Change Board today was whether they agreed with the costs involved in requesting the Impact Assessment (IA).

A member (KMcl) asked for clarity on how high or low the risk of the issue occurring is. The Chair agreed that the business case would need to be developed in order to assess this. A member (ACo) suggested that the modification is discussed with the TABASC to get a view on the priority of this change compared to other DCC System changes being progressed before a decision is made. SECAS (AB) stated that the SSC advised in a recent assessment that it was a risk, but did not specify if it was high or low.

SECAS (AB) noted that if this IA request is not accepted in this meeting, then the modification will likely miss its targeted release date in November 2023. The Chair proposed that SECAS will take this back to the SSC and TABASC in order to clarify the points raised by Change Board members and the level of risk involved in this issue. The IA request will be brought before the Change Board next month with this additional information.

The Change Board agreed to proceed to vote. The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	1	3	0	Reject
Small Suppliers	0	2	0	Reject
Network Parties	0	3	0	Reject
Other SEC Parties	0	2	0	Reject
Consumers	0	1	0	Reject
Overall conclusion:				Reject

The Change Board agreed that they would vote on the IA request for MP211 next month once the requested additional information had been received from the SSC and the TABASC. Members felt there was merit in waiting a further month to get clarity on the severity of the risk and the priority of this change. One member disagreed, feeling that if the SSC had noted this as a risk then the modification should proceed now.

The Change Board:

- **REJECTED** this DCC Impact Assessment request.

5. Any Other Business

The Meeting Secretariat (RB) informed the members that the Change Board Elections for 2022 were now underway. The call for nominations had been sent out on 18 November 2022, and the deadline for responses is 9 December 2022. The members were encouraged to contact SECAS if they had any questions.

There were no other items for discussion, and the Chair closed the meeting.

Next scheduled meeting date: 21 December 2022