

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 Board Meeting 85

20 December 2023, 10:00 – 11:10

Teleconference

SECCB_85_2012 – Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	Ali Beard (AB)
Large Suppliers	David Rodger (DR)
	Emma Johnson (EJ)
	Kevin Clark (KC)
	Sharon Armitage (SA)
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)
	Emslie Law (EL)
Small Suppliers	Gareth Evans (GE)
	Christie Thomson (CT)
	Carolyn Burns (CB)
Network Parties	Jacqueline D'Angelo (JDA)
	Rachael Prosser (RP)
	Andy Clasper (AC)
Other SEC Parties	Ian Lovatt (IL)
	Patrick Caiger-Smith (PCS)
	Nick Winfield (NW)
Consumers	Caroline Farquhar (CF)

Representing	Other Participants
Data Communications Company (DCC)	David Walsh (DW)
Ofgem	Scott McPhillimy (SMcP)
Utilita	George MacGregor (<i>Part meeting – Discussion of SECMP0028</i>)
SECAS	Rachel Black (RB) (<i>Meeting Secretariat</i>)
	Ben Giblin (BG)
	Kev Duddy (KD)
	Simon Grimwood (SG)
	Georgiana Severin (GS)

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Meeting Secretary (RB) informed the Change Board that no comments had been received on the previous meeting minutes. The Change Board **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
71/01	The DCC to provide a view on the share of the MP162 costs each Supplier would be apportioned.
The DCC (DW) advised that there is no further update since last month. Status: Open	

3. Change Board Votes

SECMP0028 'Prioritising System Messages'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [SECMP0028 'Prioritising System Messages'](#).

A member (JDA) commented that the suggested prioritisation categories appear to be driven by Suppliers. They stated that Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) would differ from the table shown, and asked if it would be possible for DNOs to change the priorities. SECAS (SG) acknowledged this, and advised that SECAS received lots of feedback from DNOs during the Refinement Consultation on

specific Service Request Variants (SRVs) that were assigned priority. They advised that messages which were important to DNOs were escalated to ensure they fit in the matrix. However, they added that the matrix is configurable, but noted that the proposed five levels of prioritisation may not be in line with DNOs' expectations. The Proposer (GMcG) advised that more discussion around individual classifications of SRVs needs to happen, but there will be adequate time for this to take place before implementation. They stated that a list defining the priority levels within the mechanism, as well as a breakdown of the specific priorities given to each SRV will need to be ready prior to Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) circa June 2024. However, they highlighted that the list would remain flexible and subject to change, even after implementation. They agreed that the priorities of some DNOs were not taken into consideration, but there will be time to do this. They advised that this will be facilitated through the DCC consultation and Sub-Committee input.

Another member (EL) raised concerns about SECMP0028 becoming more complicated when additional requirements are being included for Other Users and priorities. They suggested that a clear breakdown is needed of what is being prioritised, the different types of prioritisations, and the actual issue it is addressing. They commented that the aim of SECMP0028 was to address Consumers in critical situations being put back on supply, but did not understand how this relates to it. They queried if the five levels of prioritisation meet the business requirements. The Proposer noted this, and advised the five priority levels remain as they are, and the discussion needs to focus on if everything in the priority levels is correctly classified. The Proposer highlighted that they anticipate further capacity limitations in the future, and SECMP0028 will provide an important safety net to ensure Consumers will stay on supply.

A member (SA) asked when this mechanism will be active. The DCC (DW) advised that the design principle is for the mechanism to always be running. The Chair clarified that they do not expect the mechanism to be in effect all the time, only during periods of very high traffic. However, it will always be running in the background until it is needed. The member noted this, and asked if this relates to incident management situations, and asked who will ensure that prioritisation is aligned with the DCC process. The DCC advised that it will not be impacted by incident management, but this can be clarified.

A member (IL) noted that the Change Board is being asked to vote on SECMP0028 without the list being finalised. SECAS advised that the overall solution is to implement the prioritisation mechanism in the Data Service Provider (DSP). They advised that so far there have been no objections to the mechanism, and it has been agreed that it would be useful. They stated that the only remaining issue is the priority levels assigned to each Service Request (SR). They advised that it has been brought to various sub-committees, but ongoing work will need to be done. They added that the priority levels will be managed within a Code Required document called the Traffic Management Mechanism document, and the DCC have advised they do not need a finalised list until PIT is due to begin, but the list can still be subsequently amended as per the governance process of the Traffic Management Mechanism document. They advised the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub Committee (TABASC) have accepted the solution itself but are unsupportive of the prioritisation levels of each SR at present. However, they stated the solution is ready to be voted on, but the other details will need to be worked on, as they are configurable. The member noted this, and asked what will happen when the list needs to be changed after SECMP0028 has been voted on. SECAS advised that the DCC will consult with SEC Parties, and the proposed changes will then be presented to sub-committees. The SEC Panel will then give the final approval. The member noted this, and advised they agree with progressing SECMP0028, but commented that it appears odd that the Change Board is essentially voting for work to continue. The Chair noted this, and acknowledged the risk of agreeing to implement a mechanism when the list has not been finalised yet. However, this should be complete

by June 2024. The member asked if there has been a situation similar to this in the past. The DCC advised that a similar situation occurred when [SECMP0062 'Northbound Application Traffic Management - Alert Storm Protection'](#) was voted on, which dealt with a governance list that could be changed after the Change Board vote. The member noted this, and asked for confirmation that User Roles and the initiating Party are not part of the prioritisation. SECAS confirmed this.

Another member (JDA) expressed confusion as to how the original aim of SECMP0028 was to assist with the prioritisation of Consumers, has ended up in this situation. They expressed concern that there will be complications once the list is opened to all the Suppliers and DNOs. The Proposer noted this and advised that SECMP0028 has been in progress for several years. They stated that the initial proposal was for two levels of prioritisation, based on how they impacted supply. They advised they are uncertain what decisions and discussions have occurred to lead it to this point, but the original aim of SECMP0028 remains the same. The member commented that everything relating to their DNO organisation would belong to Priority 4, and agreed that more work will need to be done. The Chair reminded members that this mechanism will only apply for very short periods of time when they DCC is at full capacity, and the system will continue as normal otherwise. The Proposer agreed.

A member (EL) asked if there will be any changes to costs after SECMP0028 has been voted on. The DCC stated that the price that has been quoted here will remain the same. They added that if the Change Board send the modification back to refinement [rather than voting today] and there is a request for another Impact Assessment then there might be a change to the cost, but as it stands nothing will change.

A member (EJ) queried why there is a sudden urgency about SECMP0028 being implemented. They asked if it is to allow adequate time for the build to be complete before the November 2024 SEC Release. They noted that it appears to be agreed that the prioritisations are a good idea, but the individual prioritise are not correct. The DCC agreed with this, and advised they need 12 months between approval and implementation. However, there is flexibility in this situation, as there are minimal System Integration Testing (SIT) and User Integration Testing requirements. They noted that it may have to be pushed back to the June 2025 SEC Release if it is not approved today but advised that it is important that today's decision is made based on if it is ready to be approved or not. The member acknowledged this, and queried how quickly a SR can be resolved if it is allocated the incorrect priority.

The DCC advised that SECMP0062 provided a good precedent. They stated that an Alert needed to be added to the list, and the DCC issued a consultation on it, which industry had 15 Working Days to respond to. After this, it was presented to the SEC Panel. The DCC advised that any change can go into the next maintenance release, which occurs every two months. They added that the six months being recommended for the final prioritisation list on implementation is so the DCC has adequate time to complete testing.

Another member (PCS) stated that the main problem appears to occur when they receive price updates at the beginning of the month and was concerned that some Consumers may not get timely top ups. They suggested that the issue will worsen as more extensive smart metering is implemented. However, they added that future work is to be carried out by the DCC and will not impact SEC Parties. They suggested that the fact the proposed list has not been agreed is not a reason for this modification to be rejected. SECAS acknowledged this and advised that the Sub-Committees will be involved in the finalisation of the priority levels. The Chair stated that there will be no impact on SEC Parties unless the DCC system is at capacity and the prioritisation system is in effect, potentially leading to minor delays to SRVs in some categories. However, they stated that the DCC do not

predict any SRVs will be outside their Target Response Times (TRTs), even when the prioritisation system is in effect.

The Chair clarified that the SEC Panel have the approval to change the priority list and will not be changing the mechanism that will be implemented via the modification itself.

A member (EJ) asked for clarification that this must be in place six months before implementation, to avoid delays. The Chair advised that the implementation will have to be in the November 2024 SEC Release as this is stated in the Modification Report. If the list is not in place circa six months before this, then the DCC will have to do their best to ensure an appropriate list is in place before this for testing to occur. They added that any changes people request will have to be included after this. The DCC advised that as far as the DCC total system and the DSP is concerned, this will be the same as any other list they test. They explained that it is not the content of the list that is being tested, only the mechanism and technical processes.

A member (SA) questioned what process will occur for a final decision to reach TABASC. SECAS advised that it will go to OPSG, TABASC and the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) for review beforehand. The Chair stated that SECAS do not plan to carry out any more consultations on SECMP0028, as it will be implemented into the SEC in November 2024. Any consultations that occur will be under Code Required document governance through the DCC and other Sub-Committees.

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

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	6	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	3	0	0	Approve
Network Parties	3	0	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	3	0	0	Approve
Consumers	1	0	0	Approve
Overall conclusion:				Approve

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that SECMP0028 will better facilitate SEC Objectives (a)¹ and (c)² for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report. Some members disagreed that it facilitated SEC Objective (c). Other members held the view that it also better facilitates SEC Objective (b)³.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** that this Modification Proposal should proceed to vote
- **APPROVED** the Modification Proposal under Self-Governance
- **PROVIDED** rationale for this decision against the General SEC Objectives

¹ Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.

² Facilitate Energy Consumers' management of their use of electricity and gas through the provision to them of appropriate information by means of Smart Metering Systems.

³ To enable the Data Communications Company to comply at all times with the General Objectives of the Data Communications Company (as defined in the Data Communications Company Licence), and to efficiently discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the Data Communications Company Licence.

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 Tuesday 9 January 2024**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

4. SEC Modification Timetable

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

A member (EJ) asked what took place in the November SEC Panel meeting in relation to [MP219 'Accessing Consumption Data on behalf of SEC Parties'](#). SECAS advised that changes to the Privacy Controls Framework (PCF) associated with MP219 were presented to the Panel for approval before the Modification Report Consultation could open. SECAS explained that the Panel believed a privacy sub-group should be established before a decision is taken on PCF changes associated with MP219. As such, the Panel is in the process of creating the new privacy sub-group and will make the decision regarding PCF changes when established. The Chair advised that once this decision had been made, the Modification Report Consultation for MP219 would open, allowing feedback on the Modification Report as well as the PCF changes.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the update

5. DCC Assessment

The Chair provided an update on the open DCC Assessments.

No comments were received from the Change Board.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the update

6. Modifications Improvement Project update

The Chair provided an update on the Modifications Improvement Project.

No comments were received from the Change Board.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the update

7. Any other business

SECAS (RB) advised the members that the Change Board election was now underway. They advised that if they, or anyone they knew, would like to be nominated, they could fill out the online nomination form on the SECAS website.

A member (JDA) asked what the next stage will be for SECMP0028. The Chair advised that there will be a 10 Working Day window for Parties to refer the Change Board's decision back to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC). If no objections are received, it will be implemented in the November 2024

SEC Release. The Chair advised that there is work to be done on the prioritisation list in the meantime. The DCC asked if the priority levels will be reviewed at TABASC or through an ad hoc group. SECAS (SG) advised that this will be clarified and communicated. The Chair advised that they would ensure the member is included on any invitations that are circulated to be involved in the discussions. Another member (RP) advised they would like to be included also. SECAS (KD) advised that TABASC stated they want to facilitate the discussions on SECMP0028's priority list.

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

Next scheduled meeting date: 24 January 2024