

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 90

22 May 2024, 10:00 – 10:35

Teleconference

### SECCB\_90\_2205 – Draft Minutes

#### Attendees:

| Representing       | Change Board Members                    | Organisation                           |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Change Board Chair | Ali Beard                               | Change Board Chair                     |
| Large Suppliers    | Joey Manners (JM)                       | Octopus Energy                         |
|                    | David Rodger (DR)                       | Scottish Power                         |
|                    | Emslie Law (EL)                         | OVO                                    |
|                    | Emma Johnson (EJ)                       | British Gas                            |
|                    | Kevin Clark (KC)                        | Utilita                                |
|                    | Sharon Armitage (SA)                    | E.ON                                   |
| Small Suppliers    | Gareth Evans (GE)                       | Waters Wye                             |
|                    | Carolyn Burns (CB)                      | ESG Global                             |
| Network Parties    | Jacqueline D'Angelo (JDA)               | UK Power Networks                      |
|                    | Kelly Kinsman (KK) ( <i>Alternate</i> ) | National Grid Electricity Distribution |
|                    | Tom Stuart (TS)                         | WW Utilities                           |
| Other SEC Parties  | Ian Lovatt (IL)                         | Chameleon Technology                   |
|                    | Tony Pile (TP) ( <i>Alternate</i> )     | Landis+Gyr                             |
|                    | Patrick Caiger-Smith (PCS)              | GEO Together                           |

| Other Participants |                  |  |
|--------------------|------------------|--|
| DCC                |                  |  |
| Bradley Baker (BB) | David Walsh (DW) |  |

| Ofgem                                 |                 |                |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Grace Royall (GR)                     |                 |                |
| SECAS                                 |                 |                |
| Rachel Black (RB) (Meeting Secretary) | Ben Giblin (BG) | Kev Duddy (KD) |
| Simon Grimwood (SG)                   |                 |                |

## Apologies:

| Representing      | Change Board Members | Organisation                           |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Consumers         | Caroline Farquhar    | Citizens Advice                        |
| Large Suppliers   | Alex Hurcombe        | EDF                                    |
| Small Suppliers   | Christie Thomson     | SSE                                    |
| Network Parties   | Rachael Prosser      | National Grid Electricity Distribution |
| Other SEC Parties | Nick Winfield        | Landis+Gyr                             |

## 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.<br><br>The DCC (DW) advised that the DCC are focusing on the implementation costs, and not the Pre Integration Testing (PIT) costs. The Chair advised this will be amended.<br><b>Status:</b> Open          |
| 86/01            | SECAS to ensure that the DCC discusses the Ofgem funding for the DCC ESS programme with Change Board member (EL) regarding MP176.<br><br>The member (EL) advised the meeting had taken place to discuss this, and agreed to close the action.<br><b>Status:</b> Closed |
| 86/03            | The Chair to address the voting process of Modification Proposals when there is an Alternative Solution.                                                                                                                                                               |

| Action Reference | Action                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                  | <p>The member (EJ) noted the update, but queried why the Consumer Representative has the final casting vote in the situation of a split vote or an Alternative Solution. The Chair advised the Consumer Representative will be given a full brief before the meeting to ensure they make the most informed decision. The Chair also advised this situation does not occur often, and will not be of concern.</p> <p>Another member (SA) noted the proposal for members to attend a certain number of meetings, and highlighted the Consumer Representative might only attend a meeting when these rare scenarios occur. The Chair advised this is being reviewed in the Change Board Terms of Reference, and that the proposal will be for members to attend at least 50% of meetings, and miss no more than three meetings in a row. The member noted this, and observed that some discussions take place over a number of meetings, and expressed concern that the Consumer Representative would only need to attend some meetings. The Chair acknowledged this, and reminded members that this situation rarely occurs. They added that the Consumer Representative will also be given an in depth briefing by SECAS prior to the meeting in order for them to make an informed decision.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Closed</p> |
| 87/02            | <p>SECAS to investigate the process of requesting an Impact Assessment from the Change Board for very low cost and complexity solutions following on from the MP246 Impact Assessment discussion.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                  | <p>The DCC (DW) advised that where it says “same SP SMETS1 changes”, it should instead say “other SMETS1 and SMETS2 SP changes in the FIA is required”. The Chair clarified that this means there has to be a separate Impact Assessment cost except for one cheaper Service Provider, so an Impact Assessment is not complete for this Service Provider. The DCC agreed. They advised that because there is no charge, it is not added to the cost.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Closed</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 88/01            | <p>SECAS to amend an error in the MP264 Modification Report.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|                  | <p>SECAS completed this after the March meeting.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Closed</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 88/02            | <p>SECAS to confirm why the issue with DNOs is considered out of scope in relation to the MP239 Impact Assessment request.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|                  | <p>SECAS provided an update on this.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Closed</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 88/03            | <p>SECAS to check the formula for the Prioritisation Matrix is functioning correctly.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                  | <p>SECAS completed this after the March meeting.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Closed</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

### 3. Change Board Votes

#### MP260 'June 2024 SEC Release housekeeping'

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP260 'June 2024 SEC Release housekeeping'](#).

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     | 6       | 0      | 0       | Approve    |
| Small Suppliers     | 2       | 0      | 0       | Approve    |
| Network Parties     | 3       | 0      | 0       | Approve    |
| Other SEC Parties   | 3       | 0      | 0       | Approve    |
| Consumers           | -       | -      | -       | -          |
| Overall conclusion: |         |        |         | Approve    |

The view of the majority of the Change Board is that MP260 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a)<sup>1</sup> for the reasons given in the Modification Report Consultation responses.

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 Thursday 6 June 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.

No comments were received from the Change Board.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the update

### 5. Any other business

A member (EJ) noted that last month's Change Board meeting was cancelled, and there was only one modification presented for final vote this month. They queried if there was a reason for this, or if other modifications were not ready to be presented to the Change Board yet. SECAS (KD) agreed, and

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

advised that four modifications were approved at yesterday's Change Sub-Committee meeting to progress to the Report Phase. These modifications will be sent out for Modification Report Consultation, and will be presented at the next Change Board meeting.

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

**Next scheduled meeting date: 26 June 2024**

DRAFT