

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 98

22 January 2025, 10:00 – 12:00

Teleconference

SECCB_98_2201 – Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	Change Board Members	Organisation
Change Board Chair	Ali Beard	Change Board Chair
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Keith Thomson (KT) (<i>Alternate</i>)	Scottish Power
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (CB)	ESG Global
Network Parties	Rachael Prosser (RP)	National Grid Electricity Distribution
	Tom Stuart (TS)	WW Utilities
Other SEC Parties	Ian Lovatt (IL)	Chameleon
	Nick Winfield (NW)	Landis+Gyr
Consumers	Colin Griffiths (CG) (<i>Alternate</i>)	Citizens Advice

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB) (<i>Proposer of MP268</i>)	David Walsh (DW)	
Ofgem		

Ian Chalfon (IC)	Ellie Osobina (EO)	Cristina Ullastre (CU)
SECAS		
Ben Giblin (BG)	Simon Grimwood (SG)	Khaleda Hussain (KH)
Sophia Master (SM) (Meeting Secretary)	Marc Rhodes (MR)	Georgiana Severin (GS)
Paul Witton-Dauris (PWD)	Liz Woods (EW)	

Apologies:

Representing	Change Board Members	Organisation
Large Suppliers	Sharon Armitage (SA)	E.ON
Small Suppliers	Christie Thomson (CT)	SSE
Small Suppliers	Gareth Evans	Waters Wye
Network Parties	Jacqueline D'Angelo (JDA)	UK Power Networks
Other SEC Parties	Patrick Caiger-Smith (PCS)	GEO Together

1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Meeting Secretary (SM) informed the Change Board that comments had been received on the previous meeting minutes. The Change Board **APPROVED** the minutes as final.

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
96/01	The Chair to investigate what the consequences are if members do not attend at least 50% of meetings, or miss three meetings in a row, and if this is in relation to meetings within a twelve-month period.
	The Chair confirmed that this is specifically 50% in one year.
	Status: CLOSED

3. Change Board Vote

MP274 'Requirement for DCC Users to set TPS configurations'

The Change Board were invited to perform the final vote on [MP274 'Requirement for DCC Users to set TPS configurations'](#).

A member (AH) queried if MP274's Proposed Solution would form part of User Entry Process Testing (UEPT) for new Users and stated if Users are unable to provide evidence that Transactions per Second (TPS) limits then they wouldn't meet the required criteria to become a Data Communications

Company (DCC) User. The member (AH) also queried how existing DCC Users would be managed, and what the possible repercussions of not setting TPS limits would be. Another member (EL) advised that due to a lack of TPS limits being established, issues have appeared in various industry forums, notably the Operations Group (OPSG).

The DCC (DW) advised MP274's Proposed Solution would not be subject to UEPT. The Chair (AB) advised the DCC hold regular customer engagement meetings, where TPS limits will be discussed and subsequently questioned if a DCC User has not set any TPS limits. Once the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) has been established and becomes operational, any issues caused by not setting TPS limits would be investigated and addressed where applicable.

Another member (JM) advised there is ongoing discussion at the Technical and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) relating to enduring resolutions of this incident, beyond DCC Users needing to set TPS configurations. The member (JM) queried whether the DCC would return to the Change Board post implementation to give an overview of how many Users have not engaged with the DCC to set TPS limits. The DCC (DW) agreed this would be a good idea, but questioned if this should be specifically included in the SEC.

A member (AH) queried whether any actions taken from this Change Board session could be taken to the TABASC for discussion. A member (JM) advised if MP274 is approved for implementation by the Change Board, they (JM) would take an action to establish an agenda item at the TABASC for the DCC to present any statistics relating to DCC Users and TPS configurations.

The Change Board:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	6	0	0	Approved
Small Suppliers	1	0	0	Approved
Network Parties	2	0	0	Approved
Other SEC Parties	2	0	0	Approved
Consumers	1	0	0	Approved
Overall conclusion:				Approved

The Change Board unanimously believed that MP274 will better facilitate SEC Objectives (b)¹ and (g)² 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 relating to the General SEC Objectives

¹ 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 License), and to efficiently discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the Data Communications Company License.

² facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation 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 Panel. This referral period will close at **5pm on Wednesday 5 February 2025**. If no referrals are received, the decision will be final.

MP271 'Sub-Committee seats for Other Users, Meter Data Retrievers and Registered Supplier Agents'

The Change Board were invited to perform the final vote on [MP271 'Sub-Committee seats for Other Users, Meter Data Retrievers and Registered Supplier Agents'](#).

A member (CB) queried the final number of Modification Report Consultation responses. They noted that in the documentation they possessed, it appeared that only there were only five respondents. SECAS (BG) advised that it had received four late responses to the consultation, noting there had been nine total responses. Ofgem (CU) questioned whether there was a reason four Parties had submitted their consultation responses late. SECAS (BG) advised that there was no specific reason provided by the respondents, noting that there were a number of issues to clarify with the respondents regarding their submissions which explained why the documentation was not circulated to members before the meeting. SECAS (AB) noted that Parties are reminded that if they submit responses to consultations late the Proposer may not have time to consider them.

A Change Board member (RP) commented on the benefits highlighted by the Proposer. They noted they did not understand how the modification could prevent costs in future. SECAS (BG) advised the Proposer believes if there are no Other Users, Meter Data Retrievers or Registered Supplier Agents present at Sub-Committee meetings, this could lead to solutions being developed or issues being discussed without the input of these groups. In turn, the Proposer believes this could lead to costs for Parties as issues may not be identified. SECAS (BG) also noted one response to the Modification Report Consultation had advised it's organisation had experienced costs due to a lack of testing with Other Users. A Change Board member (EL) questioned how increased representation for Other Users, Meter Data Retrievers and Registered Supplier Agents at TABASC and Change Board would prevent costs. SECAS (BG) commented that it would provide these groups an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns about issues.

A Change Board member (NW) asked for clarification about the Proposed Solution in respect of the number of seats at TABASC and Change Board for OSPs. SECAS (BG) confirmed the Proposed Solution was to re-allocate one of the three existing OSP seats at the Change Board to an elected Other User, Meter Data Retriever or Registered Supplier Agent. The changes to the TABASC would involve adding a new seat for Other Users, Meter Data Retrievers and Registered Supplier Agents, which would increase the number of OSP representatives from two to three. The member (NW) questioned what would occur if no OU, MDR or RSA applied to fill the seat. SECAS (BG) noted that a clause had been added to the legal text to allow any Party from the OSP constituency to apply if no OU, MDR or RSA apply to the seat.

A member (EJ) stated they would like to delay the Change Board vote until next month, to allow members further time to consider the late responses to the Modification Report Consultation. They questioned whether a delay of a month would impact the targeted release. SECAS (BG) noted that this is an Authority-Determined modification so the timescale for decision was uncertain. SECAS (BG) commented that SECAS is targeting the modification for inclusion in the June 2025 SEC Release, and they believed a decision would be returned before the cut-off date for inclusion.

An Other SEC Party representative (IL) noted the Change Board Terms of Reference which state that members must represent their entire group. They noted there are 165 Other SEC Parties of which

only eight responded to the Modification Report Consultation. They noted they believed this did not give a representative view of perspectives from the entire Other SEC Party category. The Chair (AB) noted that SECAS has an open action to increase engagement with the OSP Party Category. SECAS (BG) also noted that since being raised, this modification was discussed at the OSP Engagement Call each month. They also noted that SECAS had been sending targeted emails to OSPs encouraging them to respond.

The Change Board:

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

The majority of the Change Board believed that MP271 will better facilitate SEC Objective (d)³ for the reasons given in the Modification Report Consultation responses.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** that this Modification Proposal should proceed to vote
- **RECOMMENDED** the Modification Proposal be **APPROVED** on the basis that it will be facilitate SEC Objectives (a)⁴ (c)⁵ and (d)⁶.
- **PROVIDED** rationale for this decision relating to the General SEC Objectives

This is an Authority-Determined modification and will now be sent to the Authority for final decision. SECAS will notify the Change Board when Ofgem returns it's decision.

MP268 'Certificate rotation and expired Certificates'

SECAS recommended that the Change Board **not** perform the final vote on [MP268 'Certificate rotation and expired Certificates'](#), and recommend it be sent back to the Change Sub-Committee due to the Proposed Solution changing (following the issuance of papers) to remove DCC System impacting portions.

The DCC (DW) advised that two forums had highlighted that MP268's requirements have been incorporated into the new DSP A member (EL) requested confirmation that MP268 is just a stopgap

³ Facilitate effective competition between persons engaged in, or in commercial activities connected with, the supply of energy.

⁴ Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.

⁵ 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.

⁶ Facilitate effective competition between persons engaged in, or in Commercial Activities connected with, the Supply of Energy.

before new DSP is live. SECAS (EW) and DCC (DW) confirmed this was the case. The member (EL) queried the relevance of the Modification Report Consultation responses noting that they were mainly on the costs associated with MP268. The Chair (AB) confirmed that the DCC have taken on board the feedback from the Modification Report Consultation responses and the cost has been removed from the Modification. A member (EJ) queried if the modification will require another Modification Report Consultation if the Solution and legal text is changing. The Chair (AB) confirmed that it will go to Change Sub-Committee for a new Modification Report to be approved, following which another Modification Report Consultation would be issued before returning to the Change Board for vote.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** this Modification Proposal should NOT proceed to vote
- **AGREED** this Modification Proposal should return to Change Sub-Committee for the Solution changes to be agreed.

4. SEC Modification Timetable

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

No comments were received from the Change Board.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the updates

5. Google Forms

SECAS (GS) provided an update on an alternative method of submitting responses to the Refinement Consultations and the Modification Report Consultations. This will be a Microsoft Form that would be sent out alongside the paper version.

A member (EL) highlighted that the form is not a Google Form, but a Microsoft Form. The Chair (AB) advised SECAS will look into whether there is a Google licence to include a Google form.

A member (AH) expressed support for the paper versions. As a large organisation, the member (AH) advised they seek the views of multiple people within their organisation when responding to consultations, and this is made easier with the paper format. Therefore, if there is a capability for respondents to save drafts and for them to use the same link to update the response until it is ready to submit. SECAS (GS) confirmed it can be edited later; however, it would require an initial submission before it can be re-edited. A question at the end of the form will be added that would allow Parties to confirm the form has been fully completed. SECAS will only start processing it once this has been confirmed. The Chair (AB) advised that closer to the consultation deadline, if the organisation has not marked the form as complete, SECAS will reach out to confirm with the organisation that the response is complete.

Another member (EJ) advised they would not use this form but shared that they believe it would be good option for other organisations. The member (EJ) advised they have noticed Government news articles on the use of AI analysing consultation responses They added that they would like to be kept informed, should SECAS decide to utilise AI as part of analysing consultation responses. The Chair

(AB) advised there have been internal discussions around utilising a ring-fenced AI to summarise consultation responses. Any trial would be to confirm whether the response summary produced by AI is reflective of the consultation responses.

A member (JM) assumed the Privacy and Security Sub-Committee will be involved in this process. There is an option to mark your responses confidential, so the member wondered what the implications would be before confidential information to be fed through an AI tool. The Chair (AB) confirmed anything that is marked as confidential then it will not be input into an AI.

6. Change Board Nominations / Elections

The Chair (AB) presented the Change Board Nominations. The Large Supplier and Small Supplier seats are all returning. Ben Elmy will be replacing Jacqueline D'Angelo in the Network Party seat. The other Network Party seats are remaining. The Other Sec Party seats are currently undergoing voting which will closed on 29 January 2025.

A member (EL) has requested if there is a way we can get visibility of if they have put forward a nomination as it seems to go into one sheet on the Website and they seem to overlap, and it is hard to keep a track. The Chair (AB) advised that SECAS will discuss with the Governance team to find a way to ensure this is clearer for the members voting.

7. Any other business

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

Next scheduled meeting date: 26 February 2025