

Meeting TABASC_11_2010, 20th October 2016

10:00 – 16:00, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	TABASC Members
TABASC Chair	Julian Hughes
Large Suppliers	Emslie Law (alternate to Colin Rowland)
	Ashley Pocock
	Grahame Weir
	Tim Newton
	Andy Baugh (alternate to Stephanie Shepherd)
	Rochelle Harrison
Small Suppliers	Andy Knowles
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton
Gas Networks	Leigh Page
Other SEC Parties	Tim Boyle

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Seamus Gallagher
DCC	Sylvia Ovie (part)
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	David Barber (part)
	Joana Esgalhado (Meeting Secretary)
	Kevin Atkin (part)
	Gordon Hextal (part. via teleconf.)

Apologies	
Other SEC Parties	Andrew Campbell

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The draft minutes from the September 2016 TABASC meeting were updated to include minor amendments proposed and were agreed as final. All actions were marked as completed or on target for completion. The following updates were provided:

Action Reference	Update
TABASC09/06	SECAS informed the TABASC they are working on an enduring TAG function proposal to be brought to the November 2016 meeting. Action ONGOING .
TABASC10/01	SECAS informed the TABASC that feedback on the initial content of the Business Architecture Document (BAD) had been received following the deadline on 14 th October 2016. Responses to the feedback would be provided in due course. Action ONGOING .
TABASC10/06	SECAS confirmed the TABASC risk register is meant to capture operational risks and that the Panel's risk register should be used to escalate risks when needed. Action CLOSED .

2. Update on the BEIS Consultation on the SEC and Licence Amendments – September 2016

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the testing aspects set out in Chapter 2 of the BEIS consultation on the SEC and Licence amendments that ran between 22nd September 2016 and 17th October 2016.

Chapter 2 of the consultation set out proposed SEC amendments dealing with testing related to:

- government introduced SEC modifications for releases beyond DCC Live and the R1.X series of Releases¹;
- Registration Data Provider (RDP) entry process testing following DCC Live;
- changes to Section H of the SEC regarding alignment with the Enduring Testing Approach Document (ETAD) at Appendix J of the SEC; and
- the provision of variant Communications Hubs for testing.

The TABASC **NOTED** the presentation.

3. BEIS Update

BEIS informed the TABASC they received 18 responses to the consultation on the SEC and Licence amendments and that there would be a phased consultation response from BEIS. The initial instalment will relate to the Initial Enrolment Project Feasibility Report (IEPFR) and the rest of the

content will follow. BEIS further added that they are aiming for responses to be published by the end of the year with the parliamentary process to follow for designating content.

BEIS informed the TABASC that TBDG meetings will run on a two monthly cycle going forward and that the handing over of responsibilities is likely to ramp up in coming months. BEIS noted that this would be discussed further at the December TBDG meeting with an update to be provided by BEIS at the January TABSAC meeting.

BEIS also provided the TABASC with some updates from the latest TBDG meeting:

- In relation to the 868 and Dual-Band Communications Hub activity, it was noted that:
 - the Zigbee release is currently going through testing and the first application test event is scheduled to take place at the end of the month;
 - DCC will be completing the commercial arrangements and continuing work on developing the CRs required; and
 - Continuing to work towards a delivery date in February 2018.
- In relation to the Technical Specification Group 2 (TSG2) release, BEIS are making further amendments which will be circulated in January 2017 for baselining through TBDG.

BEIS added they are currently going through consultation responses regarding Technical Specifications version control and compatibility matrices.

The TABASC **NOTED** the content of the verbal update from BEIS.

4. DCC Update

The DCC provided the TABASC with an update on their Enterprise Architecture, as well as a demonstration of the Enterprise Repository the DCC are working on to make available online.

The DCC informed the group that initially only SEC Parties will be able to log in to the online Enterprise Architecture Repository, however, the DCC are looking into making it available to other organisations. The DCC noted that this is not a final product and will undergo continuous development with any feedback from the TABASC welcome.

A TABASC member expressed concerns regarding the sharing of the DCC's Enterprise Architecture with non-SEC parties. The DCC informed the group they have been liaising with the Security Sub-Committee (SCC), which expressed no concerns, and further added the DCC also underwent an internal risk assessment.

The DCC noted that their aim is to make the repository as open as possible, and to welcome feedback so they can continue to develop it.

Once the architecture matrices are developed and baselined they will be made available on the online repository. The information available at the moment comprises data models, applications and business processes, all classified using the eTOM framework. The DCC's goal is to create conceptual models that enable the understanding of SEC requirements. Going further, the idea is that there will be relevant links between the data models, applications and business processes.

Over time, the DCC hope to have matrices and catalogues linking to DCC objectives as laid out in the SEC. The intent is that as the model develops, the DCC will be able to use the architecture to impact assess Modification Proposals as well as major industry changes such as the ongoing activity relating to the Centralised Registration System.

The idea is that a base architecture will be available, as well as a target architecture: which will map expected changes such as those arising from Enrolment and Adoption.

A Service Provider diagram and the DCC user interface were also shown to the TABASC. The DCC noted how modifying a service request may flow down to affect many interactions and actually have a knock on effect on applications. The DCC aimed to provide the TABASC with an idea of the components and implications that need to be taken into account when impact assessing.

The DCC highlighted that there are properties linked to each component and that captured information can be viewed if clicking on certain elements.

A TABASC member queried whether there could be a session for people to get acquainted with this online repository and DCC said they will look into it. The DCC are also considering providing a SharePoint link for TABASC members to send their feedback.

It was queried how does this repository relate to the business architecture and technical architecture documents and the DCC stated there is no direct link however, they aim to work with SECAS to make sure that business architecture is linked to DCC processes.

The DCC informed the TABASC they aim to circulate an email shortly to grant Parties access to the online repository – the Parties will have to get back to the DCC, sign an access agreement and then access will be granted.

The DCC recognised that responses to early impact assessments have not been as quick as desirable, and stated they hope these will start to gain momentum.

The TABASC **NOTED** the content of the verbal update.

ACTION TABASC11/01: SECAS to circulate the presentation slides.

ACTION TABASC11/02: DCC to provide the SharePoint link for feedback on the online repository.

5. Sub-Committee Update

The TABASC Chair provided the TABASC with an update on the other Sub-Committees recent activities:

- SMKI PMA – there were no relevant updates to the TABASC.
- SSC – ongoing work through assessments, which are confidential. The SCC will also be reviewing the IEPFR report.

The TABASC **NOTED** the content of the verbal update.

6. Business Architecture Document Project Update

SECAS provided the TABASC with a status update on the Business Architecture Document (BAD) project currently underway. The update covered the previous three months of activities and expenditure and provided a breakdown of the activities and resource projected for the next three months, as well as the full project forecast out-turn. SECAS noted that the paper had been written using known run-rates based on the first three months' activities and informed the TABASC that since writing the paper, further discussions had taken place in order to provide efficiencies and reductions in the costs laid out in the paper.

SECAS noted that the first three months of the project had been more resource intensive than anticipated due to the initial activities required to set up the modelling tool being underestimated, as

well as quality and alignment activities between the document development and the modelling teams to ensure the outputs were fit for purpose and to a high quality standard.

Following the first three months, re-forecasting activity had taken place due to the original underestimation of the anticipated costs of the project. SECAS noted that the presented paper shows the worst case scenario for the BAD project resource and that further process efficiencies had been identified that will reduce modelling requirements and reduce cost in the coming months and next stages of the project. The forecast cost for the end project is currently estimated at £620,000, whereas the original anticipated cost was £450,000.

A TABASC member queried how this budget is controlled and signed off. It was confirmed that the project costs are recovered as part of the TABASC Technical Experts project line item in the Panel Approved Budget. This is reviewed on a monthly basis via the SECCo Board, however it was noted that they do not see the project breakdown rather just the total costs in relation to that line item. SECAS added that the current outlook for the budget line item as a whole is currently anticipated to be sufficient for the full year.

TABASC members expressed concern on the costs of the project and the controls that should have been in place to ensure costs were controlled and delivery managed, and that the TABASC should have been kept up to date with the project activities and costs. The TABASC Chair advised that he had had discussions with SECAS to ensure that sufficient controls have now been put in place. SECAS further noted that internal weekly reporting will take place with monthly reporting to the TABASC.

TABASC members discussed the efficiency and value for money elements of the project. A TABASC member suggested SECAS should undertake a lessons learned exercise and added that monthly project status updates will provide more transparency going forward.

The TABASC were informed that a portal is being worked on where TABASC members will be able to access and consult the current state of the models being developed.

SECAS agreed that they would provide updated paper based on the forecast costs presented in the meeting. The TABASC agreed for the project to continue whilst a lessons learnt and value for money exercise was undertaken, and noted that the project cost should not exceed the figures presented at the meeting.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the update.

ACTION TABASC11/03: SECAS to circulate updated paper based on the forecast costs presented in the meeting.

ACTION TABASC11/04: SECAS to undertake a lessons learnt exercise and provide a report at the next meeting.

7. Review of the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture

Gordon Hextall (GH) provided the TABASC with a paper following up on the work started at the previous meeting in regards to the review of the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture.

GH suggested to the TABASC to consider the objectives and the depth of the review and proposed discussions to focus on the approach and scoping of the review. GH pointed out that the SEC Panel had also tasked the TABASC with conducting a review of the Business Architecture and a review of

the Home Area Network (HAN) and asked whether there was any merit in conducting these reviews alongside or as part of the review of the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture. Further consideration is required of whether the reviews are conducted separately or together.

GH asked BEIS to explain the policy intent behind the SEC obligation and their expectations for the TABASC to follow when undertaking the reviews. BEIS stated that the anticipated aim of the review is to verify that the design is working, as well as to consider any amendments that could improve the design. BEIS added that it was envisaged the reviews could have a risk based approach and that should identify any issues that need or could be addressed. Furthermore, it could consider whether, in the wider state of industry and technology, there are any new developments or advances that could be integrated in the design to improve interoperability, user experience, and cost effectiveness. BEIS noted that the review is not meant to be an assurance review to assess whether standards are being met by the parties involved but rather to have a group of industry experts assess whether the existent architecture is fit-for-purpose and efficient to meet its goals; to assess the effectiveness of the design of the architecture.

It was queried whether 'effectiveness' related to the actual working system rather than the design on paper. It was agreed that there should be a level of assessing what has been implemented in reality in addition to assessing the architecture design. It was noted that specifying such boundaries is a difficult exercise.

It was noted that it would be more beneficial to focus on the outcomes rather than the architecture itself, and that even though we cannot remove implementation completely from the review, it should not be its main focus.

BEIS suggested that the review should take a risk-based approach and the DCC agreed this could be a good start. The DCC suggested identifying the main risks in relation to how the HAN has been implemented and addressing whether the current design of architecture mitigates such risks, noting that neither SMETS nor CHTS contain non-functional requirements. A TABASC member noted that HAN provisions are currently utilised through SMETS1 and that the risks will mainly lie in the phasing in of SMETS2 but the DCC pointed out that SMETS1 and SMETS2 have different risk profiles.

The TABASC Chair noted that TABASC should be focused in delivering a review that measures effectiveness from the perspective of the Consumer and Users. Specifically assessing that the architecture is useful, fit for purpose, efficient, identifying whether there is room to improve and whether the design of the architecture is going to be able to deal with change, as well as the cost of change.

A member noted that architecture documents should be assessed together, including the Security Architecture Document (SAD) and see how they are performing. The group agreed that at least to begin with, the review should focus on the business benefits of the architecture and whether there are any gaps that can be addressed.

A TABASC member noted that the TABASC should look at scenarios of industry future change, which may alter the risk profile of some areas.

It was noted that anything relating to DCC capacity, the DCC should be responsible for and that the DCC is but a component of the end-to-end system – and should be included in the review as such.

The TABASC questioned whether they should consider any potential reviews the Authority may undertake in relation to DCC performance. It was agreed that this should be considered and SECAS agreed to contact the Ofgem representative.

The TABASC discussed Appendix A of the paper which sets out a draft Statement of Requirements with some questions for the TABASC to consider. The TABASC agreed the Purpose set out in the document and discussed a number of items under the Objectives section.

Members of the TABASC noted that ‘industry best practice’ is difficult to define and suggested that allusion to “industry best practice” in the paper does not seem to capture considerations regarding future developments. The TABASC Chair stated that it is important to keep some form of “industry best practice” within the objectives and that the TABASC should make sure that the system supports what industry players are bringing into the market in terms of, for example, connected homes and new technologies such as Google Thread. The group suggested that the TABASC should leave futures for other initiatives and leave it out of this review, noting that the review ought to capture what there is today. It was further added that value for money for the consumer is arguably more important than following industry best practices.

The TABASC agreed that the three reviews should be risk-based and strategic and should not attempt to assess compliance and that usage is one of the key elements that should be looked at.

TABASC members agreed that the paper should be reworked and reflect discussions at the meeting, and to further review the draft Statement of Requirements and the questions asked in the document, and to provide any comments by the 4th November 2016.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper;
- **DISCUSSED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** the review should be risk-based, strategic, based on usage of systems and processes and not be an assessment of compliance.
- **AGREED** the paper should be reworked to include the points agreed above.

ACTION TABASC11/05: GH to further develop the paper to include a risk based, strategic approach to the reviews.

ACTION TABASC11/06: TABASC members to further review the draft Statement of Requirements and the questions posed and to provide feedback by the 4th November 2016.

ACTION TABASC11/07: SECAS to contact the Ofgem representative in regards to potential reviews the Authority may undertake in relation to DCC performance.

8. July – September 2016 Work Package Out-turn Report

The TABASC were presented with a paper providing an out-turn report on the Work Package for July – September 2016 and further information on the work package for October – December 2016, as requested by the TABASC.

A TABASC Member questioned how the TABASC costs were recovered. SECAS confirmed that the costs were recovered through the SEC Panel Budget which is invoiced through the DCC charges as a pass through cost.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

9. TABASC Members Election Update

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the ongoing Election process, including the nominations received:

- Large Suppliers
 - Ashley Pocock (re-nomination)
 - Rochelle Harrison (re-nomination)
 - Tim Newton (re-nomination)
- Small Suppliers
 - Andy Knowles (re-nomination)
 - Kirk Hawksworth – Utiligroup
- Gas Networks
 - Leigh Page (re-nomination)
- Other SEC Party
 - Tim Boyle (re-nomination)
 - Elias Hanna – Landis + Gyr
 - Philip Doyle – Reerve Energy

SECAS further informed the TABASC of the resignations of Colin Rowland (Large Suppliers), Stephanie Shepherd (Large Suppliers) and Andrew Campbell (Other SEC Party). Following these resignations, a call for nominations will be issued for two Large Supplier seats and a call for elections will be issued for two of the three candidates to be elected to the two Other SEC Party seats available.

The TABASC **NOTED** the presentation.

ACTION TABASC11/08: SECAS to issue a call for nominations for two Large Supplier seats and a call for elections for two Other SEC Party seats.

10. TABASC Activity Planner

SECAS provided the TABASC with an updated activity planner outlining the activities anticipated until March 2017. Due to time constraints, the paper was not discussed at the meeting, and thus any comments to the paper should be provided offline.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the Activity Planner.

11. TABASC Risk Register

The TABASC were provided with an update on the TABASC risk register along with the SEC Panel Risk Register. These are provided as a monthly agenda item for the TABASC to review and consider any updates or further risks to be included. Due to time constraints, the paper was not discussed at the meeting, and thus any comments to the paper should be provided offline.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the Risk Register.

12. Expected Boundary between DCC Internal System Changes and SEC Modifications

The DCC informed the TABASC they are looking into releases, working through impact assessments, and developing a better understanding of the SEC and Subsidiary Documents as part of the Modification and Release Processes. The TABASC were queried whether there would be scenarios in which the DCC should raise SEC Modification Proposals or whether these should always be supported by and thus proposed by Users via the SEC Modifications Process.

The DCC offered an example relating to service management automation interface – the DCC believe they could implement a new interface as an internal change, however this could be a change that users could like to see progressing via a governance route. The TABASC noted that as this would introduce a new interface and therefore would have an impact on Users and as such it should be raised through the SEC Modifications Process.

The DCC noted that there is a level of sensitivity regarding raising/withdrawing Modification Proposals as well as price control, and stated that they would prefer if users raise the Modifications themselves, and that they would not be comfortable pursuing a Modification Proposal that does not have user support.

A TABASC member noted that if the DCC proposes a change that does not impact service users in any way, then the change could be DCC internal; and added that anything else should be implemented via the SEC Modification Process.

The DCC informed the TABASC they are planning to set up a DCC User forum and suggest they will include this topic in the discussions.

The TABASC **DISCUSSED** the agenda item.

13. SECMP0013 – Smart meter device diagnostics and triage – Potential Options for TABASC consideration

The TABASC were provided with a paper outlining three solution options for SECMP0013 'Smart meter device diagnostics and triage' and discussed what solution would be preferable from a technical and business architecture point of view.

SECAS provided an overview of the issue SECMP0013 aims to address. It was explained that meters get paired with a CH and that there is no mechanism to un-pair them. As such, it can be difficult to know whether a returned device is broken or not, which means there is no way to know if it can be redeployed or whether it holds data that can be used to fix the problem.

A TABASC member queried what fault conditions could create this situation and under what circumstances this solution would make sense. It was noted there is no way to know at this stage.

It was noted the cost-effectiveness of the proposed solutions is difficult to gauge as currently there is no way to know the number of devices that could be reused – because they cannot be read – and the devices would only be able to be read and such numbers identified if this Modification would go ahead.

The TABASC showed preference for the third option outlined in the paper – using the existing ZigBee HAN interface in a way not currently specified, however TABASC members are to further consider the elements within that proposed solution and provide feedback by the 4th November.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

ACTION TABASC11/09: TABASC members to further consider potential options and provide feedback by the 4th November 2016.

14. Modifications and Release Process Update

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the Release Management activities and discussions that are ongoing in order to provide clarity on content of the first few enduring releases. Following the Panel discussions at their October meeting, the Panel included their agreed potential way forward in a letter to the DCC asking them to confirm whether the proposed release content was achievable.

SECAS informed the TABASC work is being done to map how changes are captured across the industry codes. This would include key industry wide changes like Project Nexus and Enrolment and Adoption.

The DCC queried what the approach to release Technical Specification changes will be and noted the DCC needs to be able to quantify the changes in order to put them in the release. The nature/ content of releases was discussed and whether all of the first three releases could include Technical Specification changes.

The DCC queried whether, for service users implementing system changes, would it be easier to have releases once or twice a year rather than three times as currently expected. TABASC members noted that service users should expect to have to cope with implementing changes to their systems three times a year and it should be considered whether this is preferable.

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the Modification Proposals currently going through the SEC Section D Modification Process, including three new Modification Proposals: SECMP0020, SECMP0021 and SECMP0022, which are all self-governance and out for consultation.

TABASC members noted the new modifications have no technical or business impact and therefore set their interest to low.

The TABASC also discussed the proposed solution for SECMP005 'Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices'. Initial WG discussions were on whether tariff and price register should be updated via new use-cases. Not all suppliers wanted to adhere to this, so the WG decided that old use cases would have to keep being supported on Devices alongside with new use cases which is contrary to the principle that Devices should not be burdened with additional use-cases unless absolutely necessary.

Reliability issues were also discussed as the proposed solution will require two messages to update tariffs where the alternative would require only one if labels were not being updated. The TABASC noted that sending two separate messages may raise reliability issues however tariffs will not be erroneously updated if only one message is received.

The TABASC noted that carrying old and new use cases is a more complex solution, however, it was also noted that although more complex, it is feasible.

Members queried whether there was an alternative proposed solution. SECAS are to feedback TABASC discussions on Modification Proposals to the relevant WGs, noting that the TABASC do not agree with the current proposed solution for SECMP005 that requires Devices to support both old and new use-cases.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of this update.

15. Modification Development Update

The TABASC were provided with an update on the Modification Proposals currently going through the SEC Modification Process. The table in Appendix A includes the updates provided.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

16. Modification Status Report

The monthly Modification Status Report was provided to the TABASC to update them of the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the SEC Modification Process.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

17. Any Other Business

The TABASC Chair noted the TABASC does not have a direct approval responsibility in the development of modifications and queried whether the TABASC thought they could be allowed to veto any technical and/or business impacting Modification Proposal they objected to. A TABASC member noted that the Change Board is the body that has the final word regarding this matter. Another TABASC member added that it can be costly to process a Modification Proposal through refinement to the Change Board. SECAS noted that Ofgem regulation currently does not allow the TABASC to veto Modification Proposals, as there are rules in place regarding proposer ownership and transparency.

The TABASC agreed that their ability to feedback that Modification Proposals create inefficient architectures should be dissuasive enough and makes more sense in relation to the TABASC's duties than the ability to veto proposals.

The TABASC Chair informed the TABASC that BEIS are considering the role of sub groups to the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG) in the enduring world. The TABASC discussed what would be an appropriate forum to replicate Technical Specification Issue Resolution (TSIRS) under enduring governance.

It was noted that TSIRS, as a forum for technical issues to be discussed, will not currently exist in enduring governance. A member noted that Modification Proposals are likely to start ramping up in an enduring world and there is the need for forum like TSIRS – which could potentially be a sub-group of TABASC. A TABASC member suggested it could make sense for TSIRS to sit under TABASC as TABASC is counterpart to the TBDG in the enduring arrangements.

It was agreed the TABASC Chair would discuss this with BEIS and update at the next meeting.

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

APPENDIX A: TABASC Modification Tracker

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
SECMP0002 Add New Command to Reset Debt Registers	Yes – DUIS / GBCS / SMETS		Yes		Watching Brief
SECMP0003 Deficiencies in the Service Request for setting Maximum Demand Configurable Time	Yes	Yes – Limited to DNOs	Yes	<p>It was noted at the September TABASC meeting that the scope of the modification had been expanded to enable networks to choose between sending the existing SR or the proposed new SR to add in flexibility. The solution design document was circulated to TABASC members for feedback.</p> <p>The TABASC noted that the WG had decided not to take forward the option for the DCC to determine the correct SR to be routed to the meter to reduce the burden on the User. The TABASC noted that this had been considered prior to the delivery of the DCC PA and requested details of the justification from the WG.</p>	Medium interest – due to the solution going against one of the modification principles
SECMP0004 Inclusion of Meter Serial Number data	Yes	Yes	No		Medium

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
item in the Smart Metering Inventory					
SECMP0005 Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices	Yes	Yes	Yes	The TABASC do not agree with the current proposed solution that requires Devices to support both old and new use cases	High
SECMP0006 Specifying the number of digits for device display			Yes	TABASC did not express interest in inputting towards this solution, as the change is simply about the display on a meter.	Watching brief
SECMP0007 Firmware updates to mandated HAN devices	Yes	Yes	Yes It was noted that this Modification Proposal had a slightly higher risk of notification - as there could be the potential for the same output to be achieved using a different methodology, so the proposed method	TABASC noted that future developments that may impact the long term benefits of the modification should be considered. The following concerns were raised: Are there going to be more suitable solutions available in a short period of time, affecting the cost vs. benefit of the change? By the time the modification is implemented (if approved), would it still be needed? It was also suggested that the WG could consider a broader “Type 2 device” solution to factor in CADs, rather than constraining it to IHD or PPMIDs.	High

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
			would require justification.	<p>The TABASC noted the discussions that were still needed in relation to liabilities around the application of firmware updates on IHDs and PPMIDs, where there is more than one associated supplier, in the event that a firmware update stops functionality.</p> <p>The TABASC discussed whether the solution could be locked down in advance of decision on the modification to allow manufacturers to build at risk to the solution for assets to be delivered prior to the implementation of the regulation for the solution. This would allow assets to include the required functionality for the solution if approved.</p> <p>It was noted that this would pre-empt a decision that might not be approved and this would be at the manufacturers' risk. The solution design is not final but is unlikely to go through further design work subject to the DCC's Impact Assessments.</p> <p>It was also noted that there is further work to look at the security aspects of the modification and there may be benefit to the SSC and the TABASC discussing the modification together due to the security and technical implications being intertwined.</p>	
SECMP0008	Yes	Yes	No	In line with TABASC's Principle 2, the TABASC would like to see this change grouped together with other modifications for	Medium

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
Provision of a DCC Alert (formerly Service Request Error Response) for Quarantined Service Requests				implementation efficiency and noted that the WG is looking into the implementation approach for the individual modification. The solution now includes three new alerts rather than one. This was discussed at the SSC, and again it was determined that the benefits of the change outweighed the risk.	
SECMP0009 Centralised Firmware Library		Yes		The TABASC were informed contractual issues between manufacturers and suppliers have been identified. The TABASC expressed their desire to see any associated business architecture for the modification once developed by the WG. The TABASC also emphasised a simple business architecture outcome would be preferable.	Medium
SECMP0010 Introduction of triage arrangements for Communication Hubs	Yes	Yes			Watching Brief
SECMP0011 Including the MAP ID in the Smart Metering Inventory	Yes	Yes		The implementation of this Modification Proposal would be similar to SECMP0004.	Medium

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
SECMP0012 Channel selection to support Shared HAN solutions	Yes	Yes		TABASC raised a concern that this change relates to Alternative HAN (Alt HAN) solutions being developed under separate processes and activities. The TABASC were informed that a Request For Information (RFI) for products and services for the Alt HAN solution is being developed by the project team and shortly to be released. TABASC is interested to understand whether this modification is in-line with the RFI. The TABASC are interested in keeping a watching brief on developments, in order to understand whether there are wider benefits or issues to this Modification Proposal.	Watching Brief
SECMP0013 Smart meter device diagnostics and triage	Yes	Yes		This Modification Proposal is of high interest to the SSC and a more substantial update will be provided to the TABASC in October for more specific feedback.	Watching Brief
SECMP0015 GPF timestamp for reading instantaneous Gas values	Yes			The TABASC support the modification and are interested in keeping a watching brief on its progression.	Watching Brief
SECMP0018					Watching Brief

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
Standard Electricity Distributor Configuration Settings					
SECMP0019 ALCS Description Labels					Watching Brief
SECMP0020 Removal of the confidential classification of the unique identifiers listed in SEC Schedule 5					No interest
SECMP0021 Increase the representation of the “Other SEC Party” category on the SSC and the TABASC				People with relevant expertise could get involved in TABASC activities via the TBEC	No interest
SECMP0022					No interest



Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
Expanding SMKI PMA membership and removing Alternate restrictions					

Administered by

