

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.

SECMP0028 ‘Prioritising System Messages’

Conclusions Report – version 1.0

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation and the decision of the Change Board regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

Summary of conclusions

Change Board

The Change Board voted to **approve** SECMP0028. It believed the modification better facilitated SEC Objectives (a)¹, (b)² and (c)³.

Modification Report Consultation

SECAS received seven responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Six respondents believed that the modification should be approved, and one respondent believed the modification should be rejected. Most respondents considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a).

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

² enable the DCC to comply at all times with the General Objectives of the DCC (as defined in the DCC Licence), and to efficiently discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the DCC 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;

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Priority Levels for individual Service Requests

Several respondents (Large Suppliers) noted they felt the priority levels assigned to individual Service Requests (SRs) were not fully developed, and required more time and consideration before implementation into a Code Required Document. Specific SRs were mentioned within some responses, highlighting a preferred priority level from that respondent. The SRs are noted below:

- SRV 2.5 'Activate Emergency Credit' – increase from P3 up to either P1 or P2
- SRV 4.10 'Read Network Data' – Must be P1 or P2
- SRV 4.18 'Read Meter Balance' – increase from P3 up to either P1 or P2
- SRV 11.3 'Activate Firmware' – increase from P3 up to either P1 or P2
- SRV 7.4 'Read Supply Status' – Must be P1 or P2

Another respondent (Large Supplier) requested a review of the priorities assigned to SRs in the Southbound prioritisation workstream against that of the responses and Alerts prioritised in the Northbound prioritisation workstream completed by the DCC.

Governance

One respondent (Large Supplier) agreed with the approach to establish the priority levels within a Code Required Document to avoid new modifications when changes are required. However, they noted it wasn't clear how long it would take for changes to be implemented to the Code Required Document via the proposed governance process.

TABASC Feedback

Outside of the Consultation, TABASC members agreed that the technical solution (Southbound Prioritisation Mechanism) was fit for purpose. However, they noted that the Priority Levels should not be approved in their current form. The TABASC Chair noted that the Code Required document already had a governance process approved and amendments to the document should follow that process, outside of the modification. TABASC members agreed that final approval of the priority levels should rest with them, which would feed into the DCC changes. The DCC will need the final priority levels approved six months in advance of implementation which would give a deadline of May 2024.

Alternative processing

One respondent (Network Operator) noted they have concerns and felt that there should be an alternative method of prioritisation considered. They suggested each priority level between 1-5 is assigned a percentage of the processing capacity within the DCC Total System, ensuring all priority levels are always being processed.

Sub-Committee Input

Another respondent (Large Supplier) noted that input from the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) was not present within the modification report, and requested this be included. The respondent had previously expressed concern about the potential risk relating to 'Denial of Service', but this had been addressed by SSC. This has now been added to the Modification Report v1.1.

Change Board vote

Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to **approve** SECMP0028 under Self-Governance.

The vote breakdown is summarised below:

Change Board Vote				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
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
Consumer Representative	1	0	0	Approve
Overall outcome:				APPROVE

Views against the General SEC Objectives

Objective (a)

All Change Board members believed that SECMP0028 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a).

Objective (b)

Some Change Board members believed that SECMP0028 will better facilitate SEC Objective (b).

Objective (c)

Some Change Board members believed that SECMP0028 will better facilitate SEC Objectives (c).

Change Board discussions

Southbound Prioritisation Mechanism Priority Levels

Feedback was provided by a member (Distribution Network Operator) in relation to the five priority levels included within the Proposed Solution. The member felt the levels were designed more with the perspective of a Supplier in mind. SECAS confirmed any feedback received from DNOs had been incorporated into the Proposed Solution for example increasing particular priority levels assigned to SRs. The Proposer noted feedback from the DNO, confirming DNO perspective can be incorporated in more detail when finalising the SRV priority levels.

Managed by

Another member (Large Supplier) raised concerns about SECMP0028 becoming more complicated when additional requirements are being included for Other Users and priorities. The member suggested a clear breakdown of what the priority levels are, and how they will be assigned to each SR, is required. The member queried if the five levels of prioritisation meet the business requirements. The Proposer agreed that future discussion needs to clearly establish the requirements of the priority levels.

Another member (Large Supplier) asked when this mechanism will be active. The DCC confirmed the design principle is for the mechanism to always be running, but will only impact periods with very high traffic. The member 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.

Another member (Other SEC Party) asked for confirmation that User Roles and the initiating Party are not part of the prioritisation, which was confirmed by SECAS.

Change Board Vote Clarification

A member (Other SEC Party) felt Change Board members were being asked to vote on SECMP0028 in an incomplete state. SECAS advised that the changes to the Smart Energy Code (SEC) would implement the prioritisation mechanism in the Data Service Provider (DSP) and the remaining element is the priority levels assigned to each Service Request (SR). The specific priority levels will be contained within the Code Required Document (Traffic Management Mechanism). The governance for changes to this document is already defined and sits outside of the modification process. Therefore, the Proposed Solution could be voted upon and the development of the priority levels can continue. SECAS also confirmed that the DCC only require a finalised list of priorities assigned to SRVs prior to Pre-Integration Testing (PIT), scheduled for May 2024.

SECAS confirmed the TABASC supported the mechanism, but had not agreed the priority levels. The Chair noted the risk of agreeing to implement a mechanism when the list has not been finalised.

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.

SECMP0028 Scope

A member (DNO) highlighted the original aim of SECMP0028 was to assist with the prioritisation of Consumers. They expressed concern with the complexity and noted 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, and based on how they impacted supply. The Proposer noted the scope of the modification has progressed significantly, but the aim remains the same. The Chair reminded members that this mechanism will only apply for very short periods of time when the DCC Total System is at full capacity, and the system will continue as normal otherwise.

SECMP0028 Costs

A member (Large Supplier) queried the potential of additional costs being added to the modification post approval due to the required definition of priority levels. The DCC confirmed the cost of the

modification will remain if the changes are related to the priority levels. The DCC would only cost changes if instructed by the Change Board to carry out a new Impact Assessment with new business requirements.

Modification Timeline

One member (Large Supplier) noted the apparent urgency about SECMP0028 being implemented. SECAS confirmed that Change Board approval is required in the meeting for implementation into the November 2024 SEC Release. The DCC agreed with this, and advised they need 12 months between approval and implementation but advised there is flexibility in this situation, as minimal System Integration Testing (SIT) and User Integration Testing (UIT) is required. SECAS confirmed that if the vote was deferred, the next targeted SEC Release would be June 2025. The DCC emphasised the importance of the Change Boards decision meeting approval criteria, rather than urgency to deliver.

Finalising Priority Levels

A member (Large Supplier) questioned the process to agree priority levels. SECAS advised that the priority levels will be presented to OPSG, TABASC and the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) for review beforehand. Any consultations that occur will be under a Code Required document governance through the DCC consultation and other Sub-Committee review, prior to requesting Panel approval. 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.