

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.

<b>Paper Reference:</b>	<b>SECP_64_1101_14</b>
<b>Action:</b>	<b>For Information</b>

## SEC Panel Sub-Committee Report

### 1. Purpose

This paper provides the Panel with an update on recent activities from the Panel Sub-Committees. It highlights the key issues discussed and details specific points the Sub-Committees would like to bring to the Panel's attention. The Panel are requested to note the updates.

### 2. Operations Group

#### 2.1 DCC reporting

Report	Delivery per SEC	Content	Observations
Performance Measurement Report October 2018	On Time (SEC H13.4 – Monthly 25 working days following end of month).  Provided on time but re-issued 2 days later.	Per SEC H13.1. & L8.6  Revised version of report issued 10.12.18 as SECAS pointed out methodology applied to CPM1-3 measures had been changed without consultation. DCC have corrected.	Large number of exceptions noted in the CSPN region compared to Installation volumes.  No deliveries of Communication Hubs in October in the CSPN due to testing issues following a hard ware change.  150 Incorrect Hubs reported as installed in the CSPC&S regions.
DCC Responsible Communications Hub Returns Report  No report to review this month	(SEC F9.15 – Quarterly) The SEC does not prescribe when after end of quarter, the report is provided.	n/a	n/a

DCC Network Enhancement Report (Network Enhancement Plans - NEP) No report to review this month	(SEC F7.21 “within a reasonable period of time following each quarter that ends prior to 01 January 2021”).	n/a	n/a
Registration Data Provider (RDP) Incident Report November 2018	On Time (SEC Appendix AG 2.5.10 – Monthly - timing not specified).	Per SEC Appendix AG.	One record is over 105 days old and a second is reported as 56 days old, both these incidents have been escalated with the DCC for resolution.
Certificate Signing Request (CSR) Variance Report – Not received due to timing of OPSG December meeting	SEC L8.9 – 10 <sup>th</sup> Working Day following month end.	Per SEC L8.9(a),	n/a
Service Request (SR) Variance Reporting – September 2018 (October and November reports yet to be published)	(SEC H3.24 – 10 <sup>th</sup> working day of month)	2,115,548 requests were sent versus a forecast of 39,060,325.	n/a
Quarterly Problem Report No report to review this month	Per SEC Appendix AG Quarterly timing not specified within Appendix AG.	n/a	n/a

## 2.2 Ops Group Meeting Highlights

### DCC Performance Measurement Report (PMR)

SECAS provided a paper summarising key issues that have been noted in recent months; the Ops Group requested that the DCC formally respond to this by the next meeting. The Ops Group asked that SECAS provide a log of issues and inconsistencies noted with the report since the start of the regulatory year, for review, and the Ops Group agreed to manage this as an issue to drive possible resolution.

### Communication Hub deliveries Communication Service Provider North (CSPN)

The DCC confirmed that a lack of Communications Hub (Comms Hub) deliveries in the Communications Service Provider North region, was due to a hardware change. A recent configuration issue has also arisen with the latest Comms Hubs. The DCC advised that c.70,000 Comms Hubs may be affected and that a recall may happen. The DCC confirmed there were no health and safety concerns related to the matter.

## **Data Quality**

SECAS presented their draft paper for the Data Quality Issues Resolution Process, which had been amended following comments from Ops group members at OPSG\_14. The Ops Group approved the proposal for SECAS to coordinate the Data Quality work, including the process to be undertaken and initial priorities. The Ops Group noted that the work should be focussed where value could be added, and that flexibility in project definition might be required. SECAS will now commence mobilising the project team and developing a work plan to form the basis for regular reporting to both the Ops Group and Panel.

## **Business Continuity Disaster Recovery (BCDR) Test**

The DCC presented an overview of their plans to undertake Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) testing during March 2019. Members noted that all BCDR testing should be carried out on non-business days to ensure “Business as Usual” working is not affected. Members were frustrated that views they had expressed, in response to the DCC BCDR consultation, appeared to have been overlooked.

The DCC was asked how it might be able to provide assurance to reflect the implications of SMETS1 migration starting, post the planned BCDR test, noting that the test would not be representative of the enduring environment. The DCC said it would consider this and develop a forward plan of activity with identification of risks and mitigations.

## **Planned Maintenance**

The DCC raised this item under AOB.

The DCC said it had completed its review of Planned Maintenance activities undertaken July – November and would provide a final report to the Ops Group in January 2019. The DCC went on to say that it was going to consult on some potential changes to the way Planned Maintenance is undertaken, with a view to trialling this prior to submitting a formal SEC Modification. The Ops Group provided some initial feedback which the DCC will consider and then circulate a draft to Ops Group members for consideration. The Ops Group advised that the Sec Panel would need to agree to any such proposal.

The DCC further advised the Ops Group that they thought it desirable to carry out 18 additional hours of maintenance in Quarter 1, 2019, before the planned BCDR tests in March 2019. The Ops Group expressed frustration that this was not notified to Parties with the BCDR consultation in early December. The Ops Group also reminded the DCC that the SEC Panel had emphasised the need to adhere to SEC requirements for Planned Maintenance. Any proposed deviations would need to be approved by the SEC Panel.

## **3. Security Sub-Committee and SMKI PMA**

### **3.1 Assurance Status Decisions**

The Security Sub-Committee (SSC) set one assurance status in December 2018. Details can be found in confidential Appendix A.

### **3.2 SSC Highlights**

## **Ofgem Switching Programme ‘Transition Security Governance Group’ (TSGG)**

The SSC discussed Ofgem's intent to establish a wider industry security forum with industry representatives to align the SEC and the REC. The SSC discussed industry membership and the Group's objectives.

### **Security Self-Assessment Questions and Proposals**

The SSC agreed additional Security Self-Assessment questions for inclusion in Part 2 Appendix G of the Security Controls Framework (SCF) and agreed to the publication of SCF V1.15.

#### **[SECMP0057 'Users to notify SSC of a second or subsequent User System'](#)**

The consultation responses to the proposed modification to the SEC (published on 5 December 2018) regarding Users to notify SSC of a second or subsequent User System, were discussed. The SSC approved guidance for inclusion in SCF V1.15.

#### **[SECMP0037 'Pairing Local PPMIDs'](#)**

The SSC discussed a request from the Proposer of the Modification to make the risk assessment and risk treatment plan available. The SSC agreed to explain the requested context with the Proposer either via invitation to an SSC meeting or through a joint workshop but not to share the risk assessment documentation which is classified as **RED**.

### **SSC requirements for consultancy support to mitigate risks from type 1 and type 2 internet-connected devices.**

The SSC considered that the residual risks posed by internet-connected devices are above the acceptable risk appetite of the SSC and industry, and therefore wish to engage expert security consultants to identify mitigations for the risks from type 1 and type 2 internet-connected devices that will reduce the residual risk to an acceptable level. The SSC agreed to clarify the scope of the support, to include definitions of type 1 and type 2 devices from the SEC and to remove references to Consumer Access Devices (CAD).

## **4. Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) and Testing Advisory Group (TAG)**

### **4.1 TABASC Highlights**

#### **Updated TSIRS and Change Sub-Committee Interaction**

The TABASC agreed the updated interaction flowchart, which outlines the collaboration between the Technical Specification Issue Resolution Subgroup (TSIRS) and the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) when the TSIRS responsibility is transitioned to operate under the SEC in mid-2019, and assuming modification [SECMP0049 'Section D Review: Amendments to the Modification Process'](#) is approved.

#### **TABASC Response to DCC Communications Hub Firmware Management consultation**

The TABASC discussed the DCC Communications Hub Firmware Management consultation. The TABASC provided a response to the consultation highlighting specific areas in relation to the Technical and Business Architecture.

## **TABASC Response to DCC Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) Test Schedule consultation**

The TABASC discussed the DCC BCDR Test Schedule consultation. The TABASC responded highlighting a preference to perform BCDR tests on Sundays, seeking confirmation of further BCDR activities for SMETS1 Services and suggesting the Operations Group be involved with detailed scheduling or considering operational matters.

## **Updated SMETS 1 Service Release Technical Architecture Document (TAD) and Business Architecture Document (BAD) Review Approach**

The TABASC agreed an updated plan for identifying and capturing the necessary SMETS1 Service Release changes to the TAD, BAD and supporting Business Architecture Model (BAM). This included a revised timeline, commencing work in January 2019, with the intention to finalise the changes in line with SMETS1 Initial Operating Capability (IOC) go live. It also included the estimated resource requirements and the TABASC noted the need to reduce cost where possible. The benefits and delivery mechanism of the BAM will be investigated prior to it being updated.

## **DCC Production Proving**

The DCC provided a presentation on the DCC Production Proving capability. The TABASC provided feedback in relation to the Technical and Business Architecture aspects. The TABASC also discussed whether SMETS1 IOC delivery was dependent upon the DCC Production Proving capability being available for initial migrations.

## **DCC Testing Services Update**

The DCC provided a presentation on the emerging improvements to the DCC Testing Services. The TABASC noted the DCC's assurance that these services will remain equal to, or better than, existing services. The TABASC also noted that the DCC will retain a Contract Manager role, by appointing a Test Lab Operator, whose redacted contract will be published. The TABASC also debated whether the governance of the Test Lab solution should be transitional (BEIS) or enduring (SEC Panel).

## **4.2 TAG Highlights**

### **Release 2.0 Items**

The DCC provided an update on the outstanding testing issues that had affected Dual Band Communications Hub System Integration Testing (SIT) testing. The root causes have been identified and TAG agreed proposals for functional regression testing of the fixes.

The TAG and DCC discussed various items regarding Release 2.0 DIT testing using SMETS2v3 devices, including the planned revisions to account for the availability of sub-GHz Devices and challenges in testing dual band PPMIDs using sub-GHz HAN connections.

### **SMETS1 Items**

The DCC provided an update on the progress of SMETS1 Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) and SIT testing.

The DCC explained that Suppliers have migrated to a later version of firmware for one Device Model Combination (DMC); therefore, the coverage of Devices in the first SMETS1 Release (IOC) has dropped. TAG and DCC discussed the methods possible to address this reduction in test coverage.

The TAG and the DCC discussed challenges arising from the proximity of SIT closure and User Testing Services (UTS) starting. SECAS has arranged a follow-up meeting with the DCC, BEIS and a TAG member early in January to develop proposals, which will need to be presented to the Panel for approval.

### **Code Control**

The DCC provided an overview of the Code Control principles and policy, noting that a draft of the policy had been provided to the TAG. This activity seeks to address concerns raised ahead of Release 2.0 live and will discharge the action placed by BEIS on the DCC.

### **Defect Benchmarking**

The DCC provided an update on the Test and Defect-Fix Performance Benchmarking exercise that is being commissioned. Further updates will be provided as the work progresses and a final report will be made available to TAG.

## **5. Recommendations**

The Panel is requested to **NOTE** the content of this paper.

**Rebecca Jones**

**SECAS Team**

**4 January 2019**

### **Attachments:**

- **Appendix A – Security Assurance Status Update (RED)**