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.

SECMP0013 'Smart Meter Device Diagnostics and Triage'

25th July 2016

Meeting 2 Minutes

Attendees:

Working Group 4 Members	Organisation
Nick Jones (SECMP0012 Proposer)	Siemens
David Lyons (SECMP0013 Proposer Representative)	EON
Chris Lawton	British Gas
Emslie Law	SSE
Noel Durkin	SSE

Representing	Other Attendees
DECC	James Gorie
DCC	Adam Pearce
	Eric Taylor (Part)
	Edward Mace
	Stuart Scott (Part)
SECAS	Adam Lattimore (Chair)
	Urszula Thorpe (Technical Support)
	Ian Swanson (Technical Support)
	David Barber (Modifications Lead)
	Keith Phakoe (Modifications Support)

Apologies:

Working Group 4 Members	Organisation

Graham Wood (SECMP0010 Proposer)	British Gas

1. SECMP0013: Smart Meter Device Diagnostics and Triage

1.1 Actions update

The WG discussed and agreed a provisional but not exhaustive list of items that would need to be cleared down from the device, including categorisation, and to keep on the device.

To remove:

- Personal data
- Meter data
- Consumption data
- Event logs
- Configuration data

To keep:

- Firmware
- Security logs (there is no way in the current GBCS to clear these logs as it might help attackers to hide their activities)

The items being removed should include anything that stops the meter being reused.

In terms of defining the interaction, the WG agreed that it needed to be simple within the bounds of a Service Request. The DCC was asked if any new Service Requests were needed, and DCC stated that one would be needed to release any residuals stopping total clear down of data.

It was felt that it would be necessary to pair a device to a CH that it had not been paired with before, and that a manual process would be necessary to look for the new network in the CH. Repeated pairing was raised as a potential problem for CH. But it was agreed that they should be able to handle hundreds of pairings without a problem.

To highlight the complexity of the install and commission/remove and decommission process for ESME and GSME devices, the WG were shown diagrams of the process involved for each scenario. This informed the discussion of the overview of the process.

The WG agreed that at present, the functionality of this modification is to address is for installation only. This is because churn events cause issues which may cause the necessary functionality need to be different to SECMP0013. There was acceptance that HAN Connected Auxiliary Load Control Switches (HCALCS) would need considering alongside just meters, although not necessarily at this stage.

The WG agreed that users wanted to be able to connect the device to the CH and subsequently to the HAN. Clear down should be total, so that the device can be reused in the future.

In order to further clarify the Service Requests required, the WG agreed that one would need to facilitate whitelisting for install events (churn, as mentioned would need a separate solution), and one to allow unjoining including clearing configurations and device logs.

The WG noted that while DNO licence issues might limit where an ESME can be reused, Suppliers were satisfied with reasonable geographical limitations on triaged devices, and that the issues surrounding 'sleepy' GSMEs can be dealt with.

Finally, while similarities with the SECMP0010 potential solution were noted, it was agreed that the two modifications were not dependant on one another and could continue to be mutually exclusive in their progress.

Regarding potential solutions, the WG discussed MPxN processes within other codes, to see if the mechanism for the provision and use of dummy MPxNs is possible, and what the cross code implications are (if any).

While a preference for the solution to operate within the live environment was expressed by the WG, the DCC put forward a suggestion of a ring fenced live environment which operated with non-industry generated MPxNs to complete the commissioning simulation.

This provoked discussion around what was in the validation, and whether this modification could change the validation level, and whether it would require access to the Registration Data Provider (RDP) feed to use registration data.

The WG felt that there needed to be clarity over exactly what environment was going to be used in this modification, either fully live (i.e. interacting with the whole network) or not.

Further, there was a desire expressed to see what the DCC could provide in either environment for

- Whitelisting – ESME/GSME to CH
- Un-whitelisting – Removal/decommissioning of device.

This will greatly inform the modification's direction of travel.