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.

TABASC Principles for Assessing Modification Proposals

v.1.3

April 2020

Revision History

Version	Date of Issue	Status	Change Summary
1.0	19/08/2016	Final	The TABASC agreed 4 Principles for publication
1.1	18/05/2017	Final	The TABASC agreed an additional Principle 5 'Use of the latest Protocol Standards' for publication
1.2	14/11/2019	Draft	The TABASC agreed amendments made to align with the current SEC version 6.20 and minor clarification changes.
1.3	05/05/2020	Final	The TABASC agreed amendments made to: - Principle 2 'Efficiency of Implementation' to include an implication to consider the cost effectiveness of a proposed change - Principle 4 'Change Relevance' to include a reference in its rationale to acknowledge the separate impacts against SMETS1 and SMETS2 before proceeding to any implications a SEC Modification proposal or its solution has.

1. Purpose

The Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) has a duty to provide support and advice in respect of Draft Proposals and Modification Proposals that affect or are likely to require change to the Technical Code Specifications, End-to-end Technical Architecture and/or Business Architecture.

The TABASC has approved a set of principles to facilitate the assessment of Modification Proposals going through the Refinement Process and provide input to the Panel, the Change Sub-Committee, the Change Board and the Working Group. This document lists and describes those principles.

2. Scope

The principles described in the following section are intended to aid the TABASC in the assessment of Modification Proposals on a case-by-case basis. The principles are not limiting and are envisaged to evolve over time.

The principles will also be made available to the groups above to advise on the nature of the TABASC's assessment. These principles do not take precedence over the SEC, which requires that Modification Proposals be assessed against SEC Objectives as part of the Modifications Process.

3. TABASC Principles to assess Modification Proposals

Each principle consists of five sections: Name, Statements, Rationale, and Implications as follows:

Principle 1	
Name	User Simplicity
Statements	Any solution should minimise operational complexity for Service Users with consideration of viability.
Rationale	The intent behind this principle is to prevent, as much as possible, each individual User being burdened with the design, development and management of additional systems and process complexity where it can be carried out by DCC. Both economic and technical viability shall be taken into consideration, depending on the Modification Proposal.
Implications	- Users will not be burdened with having to build in complexity to every system where DCC can do it once.

Principle 2	
Name	Efficiency of Implementation
Statements	Efficiencies in implementation should be ensured where possible.
Rationale	The intent behind this principle is to ensure that the change is implemented in the most efficient way such that it delivers greatest overall value, both from an operational and implementation approach. Where possible, multiple changes made to the same area are implemented as a single change in a coordinated manner.

Implications	- There will be a consideration of the cost effectiveness of change, specifically in regard to business and technical architecture. - There will be a consideration of the objective cost of the change and an analysis into whether the change best suits the technical and business architecture. - There will be efficiency of costs when implementing two or more relevant changes in a coordinated manner. - There will be efficiency of processes when implementing two or more relevant changes in a coordinated manner.

Principle 3	
Name	Design Integrity
Statements	Impact to the Technical/Business Architecture should be limited, unless significant benefit is identified.
Rationale	The intent behind this principle is to ensure stability of operating design and expected performance.
Implications	- Technical/ Business Architecture will remain stable. - Stability of Technical/ Business Architecture will provide Smart stakeholders with certainty and confidence in business continuity. - No significant performance degradation will be introduced by the design change.

Principle 4	
Name	Change Relevance
Statements	Change should not replicate existing business systems, processes and other industry code provisions or requirements, unless significant benefit is identified.
Rationale	The intent behind this principle is to assess the appropriateness and relevance of a specific change, so as to ensure that the Smart Metering System does not take on industry functions outside its remit without specific consideration of the benefits. Consideration will be given on the separate impacts on SMETS1 and SMETS2 Devices for assessing solutions.
Implications	- Smart resources will be allocated to Smart solutions only. - Work developed by Working Groups will not duplicate work developed elsewhere.

Principle 5	
Name	Use of the latest Protocol Standards
Statements	The Technical Architecture should consider keeping alignment with developments in the relevant open protocol standards used, as and when opportunities allow.
Rationale	The intent is to ensure developments in relevant open protocol standards used within the Technical Specifications remain fit for purpose. Opportunities include when a SEC modification requires functionality from a later version of the protocol specification, or when the review of the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical

	Architecture identifies constraints or reduced benefit realisation due to the use of older versions of the protocol specifications.
Implications	- GB Smart Metering infrastructure will keep pace of developments in relevant open protocol standards and, as a result, allow improvements in service quality and capability to be exercised. - Certification of Devices can remain fit for purpose with developments in the relevant open protocol standards. - An upgrade to the latest version of the relevant open protocol standard may impact the cost of a modification and therefore require additional justification. - If the efficiency and effectiveness review identifies benefit in moving to the latest version of the specification, then a modification will need to be raised by industry and justified on its own merits.