

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.

Meeting TABASC_12_1711, 17th November 2016

10:00 – 16:00, Gemserv, 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
	Stephen Lovell (Alternate to Stephanie Shepherd)
	Rochelle Harrison
Small Suppliers	Andy Knowles
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton
Gas Networks	Leigh Page

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Seamus Gallagher
DCC	Sylvia Ovie
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	Joana Esgalhado (Meeting Secretary)
	Gordon Hextall (part)

Apologies	
Other SEC Parties	Andrew Campbell
Other SEC Parties	Tim Boyle

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	<p>SECAS informed the TABASC that the Panel are liaising with the DCC in relation to future Releases.</p> <p>For this reason, a formal proposal for an enduring Testing Advisory Group (TAG) function will be provided at the next TABASC meeting, after Panel discuss to inform the matter.</p>

2. BEIS Update

BEIS informed the TABASC that the first part of the response to the SEC consultation that closed on 17th October 2016 was expected in the days following the meeting. The first part of the response will relate to the Initial Enrolment Project Feasibility Report (IEPFR); and the second part, relating to the rest of the SEC consultation as well as local Consumer Access Device (CAD) pairing, is expected to be published in the first week of December 2016.

BEIS noted they are expecting the Panel to confirm the content for Release 2 and that they will liaise with the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG) regarding its delivery in February 2018. SECAS advised that BEIS had accepted the Panel conclusion as confirmation of content for Release 2.

BEIS informed the TABASC that a consultation letter on the removal of the Early Rollout Obligation had been published on the 17th November, and that it would run until the 23rd November 2016.

BEIS added that a Smart Energy consultation had been published, and would close on January 2017. BEIS noted that it may be beneficial for a representative from BEIS to present the relevant considerations for TABASC at the next meeting. The TABASC Chair suggested that members prepare questions in advance and advise SECAS of topic areas they would like to discuss.

BEIS also informed the TABASC that an updated impact assessment including a cost/benefit analysis had been issued for information.

The TABASC **NOTED** the verbal update.

3. DCC Update

The DCC informed the TABASC that two Large Suppliers had completed User Entry Process Testing (UEPT) for the Northern region and that the DCC are ready to support the necessary governance processes.

Following the feedback received at the last TABASC meeting, the DCC informed the group they had arranged an engagement workshop for the 29th November 2016 to discuss future releases with interested parties.

The DCC representative agreed to forward the invite to TABASC members, and it was noted that the SECAS Modifications Team should also be in attendance.

Administered by



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

ACTION TABASC12/01: DCC to circulate workshop invite to TABASC members.

4. Sub-Committee Update

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

- Security Sub-Committee (SSC) – nothing of significance to be noted by the TABASC; and
- SMKI Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) – nothing of significance to be noted by the TABASC.

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

5. Business Architecture Document Project Update – October 2016

SECAS provided the TABASC with the monthly Business Architecture Document (BAD) project update, focussing on activities undertaken in October 2016, which is leading up to the next drop of content in December 2016. SECAS also informed the group that an updated and revised version of this project update would be circulated before the next meeting.

SECAS advised that it is expected that access to the portal should be granted before December 2016. SECAS further added that TABASC members will be able to initially access the models developed to date, with the new models being dropped to the portal some time in December 2016. It was noted that, initially, this portal will only be available to TABASC and Technical and Business Expert Community (TBEC) members until the models are baselined. SECAS agreed to circulate an email in the coming weeks explaining how to access to the portal.

The TABASC noted that the tracker provided in the paper does not include dates for delivery, and SECAS agreed to add these before the updated project update is circulated. SECAS also agreed to split out the December 2016 drop from the rest of the upcoming content, in order for TABASC to clearly see what is due to come out.

The TABASC Chair proposed there could be a presentation of the BAD models at the next meeting in December 2016 as part of the project update, and SECAS agreed to arrange this.

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

ACTION TABASC12/02: SECAS to circulate an email to TABASC member explaining how to access the portal where the BAD models are saved.

6. Business Architecture Document Project Lessons Learnt Report

Following TABASC's request, SECAS undertook a lessons learnt exercise in relation to the initial stage of the BAD Project, detailing the areas that could be improved, such as: the initial budget setting, reporting, and process efficiencies.

BEIS queried whether the Panel had been presented with a high level work package which did not include details at a project level. BEIS noted that if that was the case, the Panel would not have been able to properly oversee the level of resource allocated to the project. SECAS clarified that they are

looking into providing a greater level of granularity to Panel and SECCo Board reports, so that levels of resource and expenditure can be identified and decided upon.

The productivity of resources was raised by the TABASC and it was queried whether a learning curve should be included in the project as it had been allocated to SECAS' 'technical experts'. SECAS noted that they had looked at lessons learnt from a cost-only perspective, and had not looked at the human resource aspect in detail. The TABASC noted that this was still related to cost, and linked with efficient delivery. SECAS noted the suggestion, and advised it would include human resources in the report, and the relevant skills of the people allocated to the project, with TABASC further requesting that this information be disclosed for all TABASC projects going forward.

A TABASC member queried what the role of TABASC in this project was, noting that it was unclear as to whether TABASC should act as project board. The Chair confirmed that TABASC is responsible for the quality and content of the BAD on behalf of the Panel.

Other TABASC members requested that there is more openness about who the project team is, including the project manager, and about who is doing what within the team. It was suggested that the project manager should be present at one of the meetings for TABASC members to directly ask questions on the progress of the project.

It was further suggested that the project update should include a project status against the key delivery areas and/or milestones.

TABASC noted that the size and complexity of the project should have been clear from the beginning so that the group could be confident that it was more effective to keep it within SECAS than to go out for competitive tender.

The TABASC Chair replied that the group had decided not to outsource the project, as it had seemed more cost-effective to keep it in within SECAS due to relevant resource and tools existing within the SECAS Technical Experts Resource. The Chair further noted that it was not expected that Casewise would accumulate a large portion of the resource at the time and the group considered that they should have scrutinised the project plan, methods and activities of the project from the start.

The TABASC requested clarity in relation to TABASC's and the Panel's responsibility in regards to managing projects generally and including clarification of what part of the Panel budget TABASC is responsible for. Discussion followed around accountability, and the group added they would also benefit from more clarity regarding the split between Panel's and TABASC's accountability in relation to the project oversight and deliverables.

TABASC members agree that the lessons learnt report should be shared with Panel for it to be aware.

SECAS agreed to circulate an updated lessons learnt report to TABASC for further feedback in advance of sending it to Panel for consideration.

ACTION TABASC12/03: SECAS to circulate an updated lessons learnt report, including further detail on human resources, to TABASC members for feedback prior to sharing it with Panel.

ACTION TABASC12/04: SECAS to confirm with the Panel whether it expects TABASC to manage budget and deliverables for TABASC activities such as the BAD development.

7. Risk-Based Approach to TABASC Reviews

Following up on the discussions from the last meeting, Gordon Hextall (GH) presented the TABASC with a proposal for a risk-based approach, reflecting the obligations set out in the SEC, for the TABASC to review the following three aspects:

- the Effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture;
- the Effectiveness of the Business Architecture; and
- the Effectiveness of the Home Area Network (HAN) Requirements.

It was noted that although TABASC accepted BEIS' suggestion for a risk-based approach, the ownership of this review lies with TABASC and not BEIS. SECAS further noted that the steer from TABASC was for the review to be a strategic, risk based, approach, and to focus on whether existing arrangements were working in live operations to deliver the goals of the Smart Metering Implementation Programme (SMIP).

It was agreed that the approach should be all-encompassing, with all three reviews to be carried out as one exercise, and that such exercise could be undertaken by a single external organisation.

GH proposed that there could be four stages to the review. The first stage could be addressed by a questionnaire issued widely to identify areas of interest for follow-up by a deeper, external review. TABASC noted that the questionnaire could be issued to other parties such as DCC and meter manufacturers as well as Users. TABASC also noted that the phrasing of the questionnaire was of great importance and it would be advisable to seek input from organisations with expertise in constructing surveys and in other energy code regulation. It was also noted that timing was important to receive relevant answers regarding the transition as well as the live phases.

It was noted that by June 2017, the rollout should be starting to pick up, with users having piloted R1.3, which is planned for implementation in March / April 2017. BEIS noted that it would be useful to capture the effectiveness of End-to-End (E2E) testing in an initial phase of the questionnaire, and emphasised that the questions would have to be well written to identify exactly what TABASC wish it to capture.

A TABASC member noted that a questionnaire exercise is inexpensive, especially if carried out on-line, and could be done multiple times before a more costly external review. The group noted and agreed that there could be several phased questionnaires as the rollout advances, possibly based on milestones, in order to provide what one member described as a 'weathervane' providing further detail and information as the programme progresses. BEIS undertook to check whether any other surveys were planned during 2017/18.

It was proposed that the end of 2017 is likely to be the earliest for users to frame meaningful responses about live operations. A TABASC member noted that there is unlikely to be 10,000 active pre-payment meters by then, which would diminish the usefulness of an external review.

GH agreed to look into options for the questionnaire phase of the exercise. TABASC Members made suggestions to inform the questionnaire phase of the review, which are captured below:

- questions should comprise a heading and details;

- questions should guide respondents into specific areas e.g.: DUIS¹ to GBCS² or GBCS to Device issue;
- the questionnaire should require that it is to be filled in by the solutions architect within the organisation (or other relevant role);
- there could be specific questions for different recipients e.g. DCC Users and the DCC;
- questions should be specific and architecture related, as opposed to open questions; and
- the questionnaire could provide an opportunity for suggestions for improvement rather than just identifying issues.

It was agreed that TABASC should review and agree the content of the questionnaire before it goes out to respondents. TABASC also noted that a significant analysis piece will need to be carried out post-questionnaire to identify what the issues for further investigation are – noting that there may be issues that are in fact DCC User-related, rather than architecture related.

It was further noted that the Smart Metering Issue Resolution Forum (SMIRF) risks are being allocated to appropriate governance groups, and that these have been used as a starting point for the TABASC risk based approach to the review. SECAS agreed to provide the TABASC allocated risks from SMIRF by the next meeting.

The group reviewed the proposed strategic risks that will inform the questionnaire and the later stages of the reviews, and the comments are captured below.

Risk review:

- 1) Risks to be grouped into themes where possible.
- 2) This risk should reference Smart Metering Systems rather than meters.

A question relating to this risk should aim to identify architecture issues rather than design issues, and, as such, should be worded carefully.

Risk 19 relating to HAN issues to be merged under Risk 2 relating to Smart Metering Systems which will include the HAN.

- 3) Risk 3 relating to Communication Hubs to be merged with Risk 2 relating to Smart Metering Systems.

Referring to SEC terminology, this risk should refer to an Incident rather than a fault for consistency with the SEC.

- 4) Remove the wording 'Time to market' from the description of Risk 4.

It was noted that in identifying inconsistencies, these can arise either from ambiguity in specifications or from different interpretations of a clear specification.

- 5) Focus of Risk 5 to be directed to Network Operators not getting the information they need from the system.

¹ DCC User Interface Specification

² Great Britain Companion Specification

To be merged as a theme under Risk 6, making sure that the same question is directed to all service users.

- 6) Remove the wording 'DCC' from Risk 6 and refer to 'system performance during normal operations' only.

It was decided not to include WAN coverage in the question, as it would make it hard to distinguish if problems are architectural or rather stemming from the right business models not being in place.

- 7) Noted that Risk 7 is more of a compliance issue rather than architecture related.

Focus should be on incidents and problems relating to architecture that cannot be fixed quickly enough and are adversely affecting DCC Users in undertaking business processes.

The questions should include whether use of the Self-Service Interface (SSI) and other tools are impeding smooth operations.

- 8) Relate Risk 8 to enduring and enhanced services. Theme: scalability.
- 9) It should be considered whether Risk 9 should relate to both interoperability and interchangeability.

Risk is that technical problems require Devices to be replaced. Make sure the question is phrased in a way that refers to architecture, as it could also be a design issue.

- 10) Noted that, as currently worded, Risk 10 is a process/ commercial risk rather than technical.

Focus should be on whether the architecture is so complex that it does not support prompt or agile improvements as well as on the cost / difficulty of change.

- 11) Risk 11 should not focus on the Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) process but should be related to whether the DCC's BCDR design, infrastructure and management adequately support business operations.

- 12) Split Risk 12 between installation and enduring business and operational processes.

Risk should be related to business operation processes resulting from Technical Architecture causing time / resource related issues and it should be made clear that this risk and associated questions does not relate to processes to connect to the WAN (e.g. via MESH).

- 13) To be included as a theme and question under Risk 12.

- 14) Rather than 'interoperability', reference should be made in Risk 14 to 'adequate controls in processes and infrastructure'.

Risk relates to whether a meter can get into a state that does not work e.g. during CoS (Change of Supply) and are the technical controls in place inadequate?

- 15) Remove the wording 'leading to consumer resistance' from Risk 15 and clarify that the risk relates to higher than expected volumes of the examples about readings, billings and changes of circumstances.

- 16) Risk 16 to be removed as not relevant to the SEC obligations on TABASC.

- 17) Add wording to Risk 17 to include consumer impact (e.g. via IHD performance) as well as business operations. This risk should also include whether the 2.4GHz HAN can deliver the expected 70% of coverage.

Two different question areas should be addressed: HAN performance and coverage.

18) Risk 18 agreed as is.

19) Risk 19 relating to the HAN to be included under Risk 2 relating to Smart Metering Systems.

20) Risk 20 relating to the performance of the HAN to be included under Risk 17.

21) Remove 'rollout timescales' from the wording of Risk 21 noting that 868, and Alt HAN: all have architectural risks, however, any change introduces additional risk.

Further aspects to take into consideration:

- a) Question of whether smart metering is fit for delivering smart home services?
- b) Are the current protocols a restraint on the architecture that prevents the adoption of more modern technology?
- c) Are the current Service Requests sufficient to meet supply licence obligations?

GH is to refine the risks, taking into account the input received at the meeting, and develop draft questions to be included in questionnaires.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the presentation provided by GH; and
- **AGREED** wording of the strategic risks that will inform the reviews to be carried out by the TABASC.

ACTION TABASC12/05: GH to refine the agreed risks, taking into account the input received from the TABASC, and to develop draft questions for a questionnaire.

8. Release Management and Thought Piece Update

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the Panel's ongoing activities and discussions in relation to enduring releases.

The group were informed that the Panel had sent a letter to the DCC querying what content the DCC expect to be included in coming releases. The DCC's response indicates they can deliver the structure as proposed, subject to modifications going through the process within expected timeframes.

SECAS also informed the TABASC that Technical Specifications Group (TSG) 2 content is to be aligned with what was previously expected to be TSG3 content.

The group were informed that the Panel envisage a group should be established covering two areas: a Technical Specifications Issue Resolution Subgroup (TSIRS)-like function and pre-modifications function. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for such group are to be presented at the December 2016 Panel, and it was noted that this group could either fall under TABASC or stand as a Sub-Committee in its own right.

SECAS informed the TABASC that three options were discussed by the Panel in relation to release management:

- a) Maintain the current structure of three releases a year;

Administered by



- b) Reduce the number of technical releases (including system/device changes) to two per year;
or
- c) Alter current Release Management Policy to include less than three releases per year.

SECAS noted that the Panel had expressed preference for b), however, this must be consulted upon with industry. This option would also make sure there is flexibility for urgent Device / system changes to be included in the February release if needed.

SECAS informed the group that discussions are underway regarding mechanisms for signing off enduring releases, and as to what groups will be needed to support releases, such as an enduring TAG-like group. SECAS added that a lessons learnt exercise on R1.2 is underway, and that the Panel wished to make sure DCC User impacts were considered in release sign off.

SECAS further informed the TABASC that an approach for an enduring TAG function would come out of the December 2016 Panel discussions and that, as a result, a paper including said approach will be brought to the December 2016 TABASC meeting.

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

9. TABASC Members Election Update

Following the conclusion of the election process, the TABASC were informed of the final list of TABASC members taking effect from the 30th November 2016 when new members take office. The TABASC members list is as follows:

- Large Suppliers
 - Rochelle Harrison
 - Tim Newton
 - Ashley Pocock
 - Grahame Weir
 - Emslie Law
 - Stephen Lovell
- Small Suppliers
 - Andy Knowles
 - Kirk Hawksworth
- Electricity Networks
 - Alan Creighton
- Gas Networks
 - Leigh Page
- Other SEC Parties
 - Tim Boyle
 - Elias Hanna

SECAS agreed the above list will be published on the SEC Website.

ACTION TABASC12/06: SECAS to publish the new TABASC members list on the SEC Website.

10. 2017 TABASC Meeting Schedule

SECAS proposed a TABASC meeting schedule for 2017. The TABASC agreed the proposed meeting dates, keeping the current arrangement in which it meets on the third Thursday of each month.

SECAS agreed to send out meeting invitations for the agreed dates to TABASC members, as appropriate.

The TABASC **NOTED** the presentation.

ACTION TABASC12/07: SECAS to send 2017 meeting invites to TABASC members.

11. TABASC Activity Planner

SECAS provided the TABASC with an updated activity planner outlining the activities anticipated until March 2017.

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

12. 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.

The group discussed the wording of risk 19 of the Panel risk register. This risk relates to User Entry Process Testing (UEPT) and connectivity issues with DCC.

It was noted that UEPT is time based and not intended to raise conflicts in relation to End-to-End testing and, for this reason, the TABASC asked SECAS to feed back to Panel that it suggested that the wording is changed to 'testing', rather than 'UEPT'.

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

ACTION TABASC12/08: SECAS to feed back to Panel TABASC's suggestion to revise the wording in risk 19 to read 'testing' rather than 'UEPT'.

13. Modification Development Update

The TABASC were provided with an update on the Modification Proposals currently going through the SEC Modification Process. In addition, SECAS informed the TABASC of new Modification Proposals going through the Refinement Process:

- SECMP0023 – 'Correct Units of Measure for Uncontrolled Gas Flow Rate'; and
- SECMP0024 – 'Enduring Approach to Communication Hub Firmware Management'.

SECAS noted that further updates on these modifications would be provided in December 2016. SECAS further noted that TABASC's feedback on SECMP0005³ was being taken into consideration, and that it would be discussed by the Working Group at their next meeting, scheduled for December 2016.

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

14. 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.

15. Any Other Business

Following the latest Implementation Manager's Forum (IMF) meeting, a TABASC member noted that the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) includes milestones for the review of both the Technical Architecture Document (TAD) and the BAD, and queried whether there should also be one for a HAN Document. It was concluded that TABASC's obligation in relation to the HAN solution is only to oversee its requirements and solutions, not to produce a HAN Document. However, it was noted that this could be considered further in future.

³ SECMP0005 – Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices

Administered by