

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 86

24 January 2024, 10:00 – 12:10

Teleconference

SECCB_86_2401 – Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	Ali Beard (AB)
Large Suppliers	David Rodger (DR)
	Emma Johnson (EJ)
	Kevin Clark (KC)
	Alex Hurcombe (AHu)
	Emslie Law (EL)
Small Suppliers	Gareth Evans (GE)
	Carolyn Burns (CB)
Network Parties	Jacqueline D'Angelo (JDA)
	Andy Clasper (AC)
Other SEC Parties	Mike Pyke (MP) (<i>alternate for Ian Lovatt</i>)
	Nick Winfield (NW)
Consumers	Caroline Farquhar (CF)

Representing	Other Participants
Data Communications Company (DCC)	David Walsh (DW)
	Bradley Baker (BB) (<i>Part meeting – Agenda Item 3</i>)
Ofgem	Jamie Flaherty (JF)
Gemserv	Rainer Lischetzki (RL)

Representing	Other Participants
SECCO	Angela Love (AL) (<i>part meeting</i>)
SECAS	Rachel Black (RB) (<i>Meeting Secretariat</i>)
	Ben Giblin (BG)
	Kev Duddy (KD)
	Liz Woods (EW)
	Simon Grimwood (SG)
	Georgiana Severin (GS)
	Abigail Hermon (AHe)

Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Consumers	Caroline Farquhar (CF)
Large Suppliers	Sharon Armitage (SA)
Small Suppliers	Christie Thomson (CT)
Network Parties	Rachael Prosser (RP)
Other SEC Parties	Ian Lovatt (IL)
	Patrick Caiger-Smith (PCS)

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.
The Chair advised that the wording of this action has been amended as the costs depend on each Party's market share at the time the costs are invoiced. The target completion date for this was also amended to when MP162 'SEC changes required to deliver MHHS' is implemented (June 2024 SEC Release) and the final costs are made available. Status: Open	

3. Change Board Votes

MP231 'Firmware upgrade pathways'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP231 'Firmware upgrade pathways'](#).

A member (EJ) asked where the Firmware Information Repository (FIR) would be stored, and where the cost for hosting the central location would lie. SECAS (KD) advised that the FIR already exists and can be accessed via the Smart Energy Code (SEC) website, subject to having a SEC Party login. They explained that the implementation of MP231 will mean an additional field will be added to the FIR. The member noted this and asked if the concerns Manufacturers had about the commercial sensitivity had been addressed. SECAS advised that there had been discussions with Manufacturers about this, and confirmed they requested that the Zigbee stack information be accessible only to the Security Sub-Committee (SSC), which the Proposer agreed with.

Another member (AHu) queried what the SECAS implementation costs will be. SECAS (KD) advised it will be approximately £20,000.

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	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	0	0	2	Abstain
Consumers	0	0	0	Approve
Overall conclusion:				Approve

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that MP231 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a)¹ for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report.

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

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 February 2024**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

MP256 'SEC Alignment with DCC SMETS1 MHHS Capacity Requirements'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP256 'SEC Alignment with DCC SMETS1 MHHS Capacity Requirements'](#).

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

A member (JDA) queried why MP256 is focused on Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) 1 Devices only. SECAS (SG) advised that the DCC need to outline the process for SMETS1 Device information, as the SMETS2 process has already been outlined. The DCC (DW) added that the solution only applies to SMETS1 as SMETS2 is not being cached.

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

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	4	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	2	0	0	Approve
Network Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Consumers	0	0	0	Approve
Overall conclusion:				Approve

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that MP256 will better facilitate SEC Objectives (b)² and (c)³ for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report.

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

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 February 2024**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

MP259 'Triage System Interface Definition'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP259 'Triage System Interface Definition'](#).

No comments were received from the Change Board.

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

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers ⁴	5	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	2	0	0	Approve
Network Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Consumers	0	0	0	Approve

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ Please be advised the Large Supplier voting number increased by one as a Large Supplier member was not present for the previous votes.

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Overall conclusion:				Approve

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that MP259 will better facilitate SEC Objective (f)⁵ for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report.

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

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 February 2024**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

MP261 'Extending the Organisation Certificate Validity Period'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP261 'Extending the Organisation Certificate Validity Period'](#).

A member (AHu) asked if MP261 should be considered to better facilitate SEC Objective (f), rather than SEC Objective (c). SECAS (KD) advised that SEC Objective (c) was highlighted by one of the respondents to the Modification Report Consultation (MRC). The member acknowledged this and suggested SEC Objective (f) would have been more appropriate.

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

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	5	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	2	0	0	Approve
Network Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	2	0	0	Approve
Consumers	0	0	0	Approve
Overall conclusion:				Approve

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that MP261 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a) for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report. Some members also agreed that it will better facilitate SEC Objective (f).

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

⁵ Ensure the protection of Data and the security of Data and Systems in the operation of this Code.

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 February 2024**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

MP176 'Customer Analytics Reporting'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP176 'Customer Analytics Reporting'](#).

A member (EL) advised they had concerns regarding the costs. They stated that historically, they were offered this solution by the DCC as an Elective Communications Service (ECS), where they were working with the DCC to make an ECS viable, but with funding and backing from Ofgem. They advised that the DCC part way into the process, then realised they could not carry out this solution. They stated there appeared to be confusion within the DCC as to whether they could deliver this under the DCC Enhanced Self Service (ESS) programme or an ECS. The member stated that the DCC had secured funding and were working with some Suppliers to assist it in proving that ECS works. However, it was then said that this function could be delivered under MP176. Ultimately The member raised concerns around where the Ofgem funding for this went to when the DCC ESS programme was eventually scrapped. The DCC (DW) acknowledged this, but advised they did not have information on where the Ofgem funding was allocated. However, they confirmed that there is no part of the DCC ESS programme (including documentation, designs, coding, applications, or funding) that has been incorporated into MP176. They agreed there was confusion but clarified that MP176 is separate from the programme the member is referring to. The member noted that they are agreeable for MP176 to progress to vote today, however, would like to discuss this historical conversation with the DCC and advised this can be done offline.

SECAS (AHe) queried what the benefit to industry is of having the Alternative Solution. The DCC (DW) advised that the Proposed Solution will be carrying on static generation of reports in PDF and CSV format. They advised that the Alternative Solution costs more but will provide an interactive portal where users can view their own data, analyse their reports in various ways, and compare their performance to the performance of other Parties anonymously. They explained that the added functionality ensures a company only sees and retrieves their own data. They added that it has a unique Power BI interface specific to each user. SECAS (AHe) noted this but highlighted that the Alternative Solution costs approximately £330,000 more than the Proposed Solution, and queried if it is worth the added cost. The DCC stated that the Working Group was supportive of MP176 as a whole with preferences towards the Alternative Solution.

The Chair noted the above comments. They advised that SECAS are presenting two Solutions, and the Change Board are to decide which Solution to approve. They explained that the legal text will not come into effect until 31 December 2024. Therefore, if MP176 is approved at this meeting, the DCC will have from now until the 31 December 2024 to procure the development and implementation, or else they will be non-compliant with the SEC. The Chair added that the DCC cannot procure services to begin working on this until MP176 is approved.

A member (EL) asked how the implementation of MP176 will be managed. The Chair advised this will be managed under the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) which will be delivered under [MP224 'SEC Performance Assurance Framework'](#). The member noted this but highlighted that MP224 has not been approved for implementation yet. They also added that there will need to be training for users on how to use the portal. The DCC advised that the Impact Assessment outlines how this will be done, and added that it will be similar to [MP122A 'Operational Metrics'](#). The member acknowledged this, but advised that MP122A dealt with reports, whereas MP176 proposes to deal

with an entire interactive portal. The DCC advised there will be design workshops carried out with the DCC teams working on this. They added that SEC Parties who are interested can also participate, which will ensure their requests and requirements are met. They stated that this has all been factored into the final cost. The member advised that they need to understand where this will take place and noted that forums will need to be set up for this. The DCC advised that they will work with SECAS to put this in place, as this is something they have not done before. The member queried which part of SECAS will be governing this. The Chair advised that SECAS will investigate the outstanding queries. However, they suggested the governance might sit with the Operations Group (OPSG), but this has not been confirmed. The member noted this, but raised concerns that the Change Board will only be approving the cost and implementation date but have no confirmation of how this will be carried out.

Another member (JDA) requested that they and other Network Operators be invited to the development workshops. The DCC agreed, and encouraged anyone else who wants to be involved to contact them. The Chair advised that SECAS will ensure the workshops take place but stated that the DCC will need to drive the work.

A member (DR) noted that the Proposed Solution has a line item for an Application Support in the first-year costs that the Alternative Solution does not have. They asked if this is because there is no equivalent for the Alternative Solution. The DCC confirmed this. They explained that what happens in the Proposed Solution is that a coder will code the interface into a reporting solution that is personalised to each organisation, and it will run on its own after this. They advised that a DCC Full Time Employee (FTE) will collate all the data and divide it into information for specific Parties. They advised that the idea of the Alternative Solution is that it is automated after the interface is delivered. They added that it will be a business-as-usual change, and it will not be necessary for the DCC to increase its staffing because of this.

Another member (EJ) advised that in their response to the Modification Report Consultation, they queried if the Solution would take into account, that some Suppliers may have more than one Market Participant Identifier (MPID) and would need reporting views of both MPIDs on the same report. The DCC confirmed this, and advised this will be figured out with the DCC design and development team.

A member (EL) asked how the voting would be undertaken, as MP176 has two Solutions. The Chair advised that they would first ask members if they agree to proceed to vote. They advised they will then ask members which Solution they approve, or if they want to reject or abstain from voting. A member (EL) expressed confusion, and advised the weightings may not be accurate. Another member (JDA) suggested members should vote on the solution first, and then vote on approving MP176. The Chair advised that they were unsure if this could be done, as it is defined in the SEC how solutions are to be voted on. A member (EL) asked if it is defined in the SEC how to vote when there is an Alternative Solution. SECAS (KD) advised that it is included in SEC Section D8.2(c) and provided the excerpt for members to view. A member (EL) advised that they did not interpret the text outlined in the SEC in the same way that the Chair had proposed the voting should work. Another member (MP) raised concerns around potentially splitting a positive vote, which could ultimately lead to a rejection of the modification despite the majority of votes being for an approval (of one solution or the other). SECAS (AHe) proposed that each member advises if they vote to approve, reject, or abstain. If they approve, they can then advise which Solution they approve. The members agreed this would be the best approach. The Chair agreed, and advised they would address the confusion around voting on Alternative Solutions as part of the Modifications Improvement Project and make it clearer for any future votes where two Solutions were presented.

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

Party Category	Approve Proposed Solution	Approve Alternative Solution	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	1	4	0	0	Approve Alternative Solution
Small Suppliers	0	2	0	0	Approve Alternative Solution
Network Parties	0	1	0	1	Approve Alternative Solution
Other SEC Parties	0	1	0	1	Approve Alternative Solution
Consumers	-	-	-	-	-
Overall conclusion:					Approve Alternative Solution

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that MP176 (Alternative Solution) will better facilitate SEC Objective (a) for the reasons given by the Proposer in the Modification Report.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** that this Modification Proposal should proceed to vote
- **APPROVED** the Modification Proposal under Self-Governance
- **APPROVED** the Alternative Solution
- **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 February 2024**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

ACTION 86/01: SECAS to ensure that the DCC discusses the Ofgem funding for the DCC ESS programme with Change Board member (EL).

ACTION 86/02: SECAS to advise the Change Board of the governance and delivery process for the DCC's work on the implementation of the MP176 Alternative Solution

ACTION 86/03: The Chair to address the voting process of Modification Proposals when there is an Alternative Solution

4. Request for Impact Assessment

MP241 'Interoperability Checker Update'

The Chair advised that the Impact Assessment request for [MP241 'Interoperability Checker Update'](#) had been removed from the agenda as the Citizens Advice representative could not attend this meeting, and they have an interest in MP241.

A member (EJ) agreed this was a good idea, as they would like to hear the views of Citizens Advice before voting on this Impact Assessment request.

5. 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.

No comments were received from the Change Board.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the update

6. 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

7. 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

8. Any other business

SECAS (RB) thanked the members who had been nominated to return to Change Board for another term. They highlighted that the Network Parties (Gas) representative, Andy Clasper (Cadent Gas), would not be returning for another term. They thanked Andy for the input and knowledge they have provided while sitting on the Change Board. They advised that the new Network Parties (Gas) representative was Tom Stuart (Wales & West Utilities). The new term will begin on Thursday 1 February, meaning the first meeting of the new term will be Wednesday 21 February. SECAS advised that there are still vacant seats for any Large Supplier Party that does not currently have a representative on the Change Board. SECAS advised that if any of the members know someone who would like to be nominated to join the Change Board to contact SECAS at sec.change@gemserv.com.

The Chair advised the members that SECAS are planning a Modifications Improvement Project Workshop, with the date still to be confirmed. They advised members to contact SECAS at sec.change@gemserv.com if they wished to be invited to the workshop.

The Chair advised the members that the call for nominations for the Privacy Sub-Committee was sent out this morning. A member (AHu) advised they received the email and suggested it would be helpful to identify what skills a prospective member would require. SECAS (AHe) advised that the ideal candidate should have privacy and data expertise, but a specific qualification is not required. The Chair asked if it would be suitable to people who do not necessarily have smart meter expertise but have privacy and data expertise. SECAS (AHe) advised this has not been considered but would be a good idea. Another member (EJ) asked what the time commitment involved will be. SECAS (AHe) advised it will be a monthly meeting and last a few hours. They advised that the meeting documentation will be sent out five Working Days before the meeting, similar to current sub-committees.

SECAS (RB) advised that there will be a call for nominations for Change Sub-Committee (CSC) at the beginning of February. They advised that the seats up for election this term are one Large Supplier seat, one Small Supplier seat, one Electricity Network seat, and one Gas Network seat.

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

Next scheduled meeting date: 21 February 2024