

Meeting TABASC_10_1509, 15th September 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	Martin Bell (alternate to Ashley Pocock)
	Grahame Weir
	Tim Newton
	Stephanie Shepherd (via teleconference)
	Rochelle Harrison
Small Suppliers	Andy Knowles (part)
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton
Gas Networks	Leigh Page
Other SEC Parties	Tim Boyle
Other SEC Parties	Andrew Campbell

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Seamus Gallagher
DCC	Sylvia Ovie
SECAS	Mike Bennett (part)
	Alys Garrett
	David Barber (part)

Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Large Suppliers	Colin Rowland
Ofgem	Nigel Nash

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The draft minutes from the August 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
TABASC08/01	<p>Prior to the meeting, the DCC provided the following update on the action: Active conversation is being held between the DCC's Enterprise Architect lead and Chief Information Security Officer and at the appropriate time, once the approach has been finalised with detailed options, the DCC will be happy to discuss the risk assessment carried out with TABASC or SSC as determined appropriate and take comments. In order to ensure that the correct response is provided by the DCC, the recommendation would be for the TABASC chair (or administrator) to request of the SSC Chair that the issue be tabled for comment with a clear statement of the concern and a clear objective for SSC to fulfil. The DCC can then respond directly against this and ensure that nay response accurately reflects the full ask of TABASC / SCC.</p> <p>The TABASC agreed that they are satisfied that the DCC are undertaking their own internal risk assessment and that no further action would be required.</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>
TABASC09/05	<p>SECAS noted that the upcoming BEIS consultation on SEC content had yet to be published and an update would be provided at a future meeting. BEIS noted that the consultation is expected to be published in 1 – 2 weeks.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>

2. BEIS Update

BEIS provided the TABASC with an update on the decision to accept the DCC's replan for R1.3 with a live date of 12th December 2016. It was noted that the decision included a fallback in February 2017 if required. The Secretary of State letter confirming the position also included the dates relating to the DNO User Mandate plus the SMETS1 end date. It was noted that the letter would be followed up with the legal provisions in due course.

It was questioned whether there would be a further consultation if the fallback date in February 2017 were to be used. The BEIS representative noted that there are control points in place to review whether the fallback date would be required, and an action was taken to check whether there would be a further consultation.

The TABASC questioned where the SMETS1 end date was documented in regulation. The BEIS representative clarified that the end dates were not in the legal framework and the process for managing validity periods would be consulted on in the upcoming SEC consultation.

The following updates were also provided:

- The RFCs relating to the TSG1 set for DCC Live and TSG2 would be presented to the TBDG meeting on 21st September 2016 for approval; and
- Work was ongoing in relation to the 868 MHz changes, including finalising the GBCS drafting for review and approval at the TBDG meeting. It was also noted that a further RFC to the Joint Industry Plan would be released for comment in relation to the delay of approximately 2 months due to the Zigbee slippage. It was noted that the DCC are currently working with BEIS to understand the impact on the delivery of devices and are hoping to absorb some of the slippage.

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

ACTION TABASC15/01: BEIS to clarify whether a further consultation will be undertaken with regard to the R1.3 fallback date.

3. DCC Update

The DCC updated the TABASC on their ongoing activities, noting that they were progressing well with testing and they were working hard to achieve the DCC Live date at the end of September. It was also highlighted that CPA certification had been achieved for two Communications Hubs.

The DCC representative also provided an update on the development of their Enterprise Architecture, that they are working to publish at the end of September subject to the outcome of the security risk assessment. Once published communication would be sent out to industry and on the DCC website on how to access the model.

A TABASC Member noted the delay to delivery of Communications Hubs and asked whether they would have the latest firmware version when delivered or whether they would have the earlier version of firmware that they achieved CPA certification with. The DCC representative took an action to confirm the version of firmware that would be on the Communications Hubs. It was noted that the firmware update had been undertaken through the assurance maintenance plan and due to there being no material change CPA re-certification would not be required.

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

4. Sub-Committee Update

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

- SMKI PMA – The SMKI PMA are currently focussing on the governance aspects of the SMKI Service. It was also noted that consideration is being given to the distance between primary and backup data centres for the SMKI service.
- SSC – It was noted that the SSC were currently meeting twice a month in order to carry out their normal items of business alongside the reviews of the User Security Assessments. It was noted that they are also developing a Joint Industry Cyber Security Incident Management Plan. It was also highlighted that a potential modification was considered to the SSC member nomination process to ensure appropriate expertise is on the Sub-Committee. Further detail of the proposal will be considered at a future meeting and it was noted that the TABASC will be kept up to date in order to take any potential changes forward for the TABASC as well.

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

5. BAD Development Review

SECAS presented the TABASC with an update on the development of the Business Architecture Document (BAD) and the draft initial content for review. SECAS highlighted that the BAD included a number of explanatory sections, descriptive sections of the lifecycle functional areas supported by a Business Process Model that is being developed alongside the main document. The functional areas developed include an overview of the process area, including relevant regulation references and sequence diagrams where possible.

It was noted that the TABASC were being asked to review the main document, with a workshop set up with members of the Technical and Business Expert Community (TBEC) to review the initial outputs from the development of the Business Process Model. The model is being developed using Casewise with model suites for each functional area. The TABASC questioned whether the model would be publically available. SECAS noted that discussions were taking place on the best method of publishing the model to ensure it is publically available, however during its development, access would be restricted to those reviewing and inputting into it. It was noted that smaller suppliers are keen to see the outputs of the model development as soon as possible.

The TABASC noted that the content developed so far is at the level of detail expected. A Large Supplier requested that links to licence obligations were referenced where possible to provide context to the obligations and processes. SECAS highlighted that this link could potentially be made in the Target Operating Model section.

Versioning of the BAD was discussed and it was noted that the development of the document is based on the current version of the SEC. The document will need to evolve as the SEC content is modified. It was noted that the document will identify areas of change in the future however, the process descriptions and process model must cover the obligations as provided in the designated SEC content. It was noted that where variations of SRs are introduced, the document would recognise this as the amendments are made to the SEC content.

It was also discussed that the main document is likely to be a fairly stable document with the model providing the detail and the dynamic changes as SEC content evolves.

SECAS requested that the TABASC provide feedback on the initial content of the document, specifically in relation to the format and structure of the document and to check that it meets the requirements.

The TABASC discussed the accessibility to users of the document and whether this was being considered through the development. SECAS noted that the top level of the document included the descriptive components outlining how the business architecture is constructed and organised. The functional areas then included process descriptions using accessible language. The model itself will refer to legal and regulatory documents with much more precise use of language so that the document and the model together encompass business and technical user needs.

It was noted that the intended audience and the purpose of the document should be defined in the introductory sections. For example, Proposers of Modification Proposals could use the document and model, with support by SECAS, to highlight any likely impact of the proposal on business processes.

An update on the status of the project was provided and it was noted that prioritisation of functional areas to be developed would be discussed at the TBEC workshop. The TABASC requested that an update be provided following this session to allow oversight of the prioritisation and development of the BAD.

An update on the resource effort was also provided, with a projected increase in the amount required for the development of the Business Process Model. It was noted that this was due to the initial work to develop the Casewise environment and data models had required more effort than originally forecast. The TABASC raised concern that this should have been raised sooner and requested a project update on a monthly basis.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the update;
- **AGREED** to provide feedback on the initial content of the BAD by 14th October 2016; and
- **REQUESTED** SECAS provide a monthly update on the project status.

ACTION TABASC10/01: TABASC Members to provide feedback on the initial content of the BAD by 14th October 2016.

ACTION TABASC10/02: SECAS to provide a monthly update on the status of the BAD project.

ACTION TABASC10/03: SECAS to provide an update following the TBEC workshop on the BAD.

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

Gordon Hextall (GH) provided the TABASC with a paper setting out a number of considerations for the TABASC with regard to their duty to review the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture as set out in SEC Section F1.4 (e).

The paper considered:

1. The interpretation of the scope of the review;
2. The method of review by an independent organisation; and
3. The likely timing of the review.

Scope of the review

The paper proposed that the review is more than a review of the documentation, covering how the architecture has been designed and built, as well as testing and how it works in the live environment. It was noted that this could potentially include looking at:

- Service performance;
- Reuse of system components;
- Ease of implementing new functionality; and
- Scalability.

The TABASC discussed the proposed scope of the review and noted that any review should focus on the high level objectives and the set of services that the technical architecture is set out to deliver. It should also focus on giving confidence to industry that the solution is fit for purpose. This would include looking at the wider objectives of the programme, as a solution may perform against SLAs/obligations, however, it may not meet the wider objectives. The review would also have to recognise that systems might need improvements; however, this might not be due to the overarching architecture.

The TABASC also discussed whether the review would encompass:

Administered by

- A review of the effectiveness of the HAN requirements as per their Section F1.4 duties. It was noted that a lot of information was available in relation to SMETS1 however this had not been collated. BEIS noted that there was a SEC requirement for Parties to provide information in relation to requests on HAN requirements. It was noted that this could be a distinct layer of a more detailed review; and
- Testing environments and whether they are set up to deliver three releases a year. It was determined that the proposed scope covers testing aspects and therefore, environments would be expected to be included within the review.

The TABASC determined that they were content with the scope of the review as proposed within the paper, however further work would need to be undertaken in relation to the depth of the review, to define boundaries.

TABASC also suggested discussing with Ofgem, the review that they undertake against the DCC Licence in relation to operational performance, to avoid duplication.

Method of Review

The TABASC discussed the proposal for the review to be undertaken by an independent organisation that is credible and has the necessary skill set. The TABASC agreed with the proposal in the paper, noting that the scope and depth of the review would have to be further defined prior to undertaking a procurement for the review.

GH noted that it was the intention that the scope of the review would form part of the Invitation to Tender (ITT) that would be issued as part of the procurement.

Timing of the Review

The TABASC discussed the potential timing of the review, noting the proposal in the paper for it to be undertaken following the R1.x releases and when a significant volume of meters have been installed to prove the system e.g. 10,000 meters in operation.

The TABASC discussed the potential for a staged review e.g. a light touch review following the R1.x releases with a further in depth review when the system is fully implemented with a larger volume of meters in operation. An initial lighter review could also potentially identify areas to be included within a more detailed review.

The TABASC also determined that the review should be undertaken when there is an appropriate volume of meters within the system across credit and prepayment. It was determined that the TABASC could look at the rollout profile and determine an appropriate point for the review to take place.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper;
- **APPROVED** the interpretation of the scope of the review;
- **AGREED** for further work to be undertaken on the depth of the review;
- **APPROVED** the review should be undertaken by an external independent organisation; and
- **CONSIDERED** the timing of the review, noting that further consideration would need to be made following the development of the depth of the review.

ACTION TABASC10/04: GH to further define the depth of a review to provide a more detailed approach at a future meeting.

7. Draft TABASC Work Package October – December 2016

The TABASC were presented with a paper providing an overview of the estimated SECAS activities and resource requirements relating to the TSC from a core and project perspective for October – December 2016. A verbal update was provided on the projected out-turn for the activities undertaken in the July – September period.

The TABASC noted that in order to provide a recommendation to the Board on the appropriateness of the levels of resource and effort required, further information would be required on the specific activities to be undertaken and the level of resource involved. SECAS noted that more detailed information was provided to the Panel and Board on a monthly basis through the Operations and Management Reports as they have oversight of the budget. It was also highlighted that the Work Package set out a forecast rather than budgeted levels to provide the Board with more information on a quarterly basis.

SECAS noted that they would look into further information that could be provided to the TABASC for transparency in the costs associated with the running of the Sub-Committee. It was also noted that an out-turn report would be provided at the October meeting following the end of the current quarter.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **CONSIDERED** the TABASC Draft Work Package to be recommended to the SECCo Board.

ACTION TABASC15/05: SECAS to look into further information that could be provided to the TABASC for transparency in the costs associated with the running of the Sub-Committee.

8. TABASC Activity Planner

SECAS provided the TABASC with an updated activity planner outlining the activities anticipated until March 2017. The TABASC requested that change control was used within the document so changes from the previous month could easily be identified. It was also highlighted that the updates across a number of the items should be consistent e.g. a number of the duties could be joined together regarding inputting into the Modifications Process.

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

9. 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 TABASC noted that they were currently not capturing operational risks and it was noted that they should ask the Panel whether the level of risks being captured was satisfactory. It was noted that the SSC are currently developing an operational risk register to sit outside of the Panel risk register with any risks to the management of the SSC or to their duties to be captured in the Panel risk register. It was noted that this approach could be adopted by the TABASC.

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

ACTION TABASC15/06: SECAS to request from the Panel whether the level of risks being captured by the TABASC is satisfactory.

10. Modifications and Release Process Update

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the Modification and Release Process Thought Piece that had been discussed by the Panel at their August and September meetings. The update at the September meeting provided detail on the actions to be taken forward and set the priorities for undertaking actions and the timescales. SECAS noted that they had actioned many of the quick wins with an action plan provided on delivering the longer term items.

The Panel, SECAS and BEIS also discussed the scope and cut off times for the first enduring releases following DCC Live and R1.x. Discussions included the management of the releases and the scope to include any approved Modification Proposals, removal of Secretary of State variations or Secretary of State amendments via their Section 88 powers and any DCC internal change.

Through discussions on cut off times for releases, it is increasingly unlikely that there will be any modifications for the June 2017 release unless there are any governance type modifications. Following the discussions at the Panel meeting, the Panel Chair has written a letter to BEIS regarding the approach to removing the variation in relation to the EUI-64 ID obligations by June 2017.

A follow up meeting will take place between SECAS, BEIS and the DCC to expand on the content of the June, November and February 2017 releases in order to provide clarity to Parties. An initial model to use for release planning was presented to the Panel and this will be developed to include further detail on types of change and provide reference numbers.

SECAS noted that regarding Modification Proposals, Impact Assessments (IAs) from the DCC will provide an indication on the potential Release that each modification could be targeted for implementation. However, due to the DCC's focus on R1.2 and R1.3, the delivery of the Preliminary Assessments (PAs) and IAs has been further delayed. SECAS noted that the Panel Chair is aware of the further delays and SECAS would be reviewing any impacts on progression timescales of the Modification Proposals.

However, there will still be decisions required following approval for a Modification Proposal on the release it should be implemented in. There is discussion continuing on the decision process for which Release a Modification may go into. For example, consideration may need to be given to whether a Modification Proposal would introduce a new mandatory version of DUIS. The TABASC raised concern at the potential impact these delays would have on implementation timescales for the Modification Proposals currently in the process. It was noted that for a number of the Modification Proposals they have been raised by industry to rectify issues that could arise following DCC Live, the longer the delay to implementation, the greater the volume of meters that will be out there for the issues to arise. SECAS noted that the TABASC concern would be highlighted to the Panel at their next meeting.

SECAS also noted that options are being considered for industry input into the scope of a release e.g. through Sub-Committees, industry wide consultation. It was noted that there may be a potential role for the TABASC in determining the scope of releases, however a formal process has yet to be worked up.

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

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. Any Other Business

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	Update 15/09: The delivery of the Preliminary Assessment (PA) has been delayed by the DCC to 7 th October 2016, an interim PA is expected on 22 nd September 2016. The drafting has remained unchanged since last TABASC review. The Working Group is awaiting the PA to help inform when it could be implemented.	Watching Brief
SECMP0003 Deficiencies in the Service Request for setting Maximum Demand Configurable Time	Yes	Yes – Limited to DNOs	Yes	Update 15/09: The delivery of the Preliminary Assessment (PA) has been delayed by the DCC to 7 th October 2016. It was noted that the scope of the modification has 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. The TABASC noted that the WG had decided not to take forward the option for the	Medium interest – due to the solution going against one of the modification principles

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				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.	
SECMP0004 Inclusion of Meter Serial Number data item in the Smart Metering Inventory	Yes	Yes	No	<p>Will be considered together with SECMP0011 regarding MAP ID, for efficiency of implementation.</p> <p>Update 15/09: The WG are awaiting the Full Impact Assessment which has been delayed until 22nd October 2016.</p> <p>The WG are now focussing on the benefits of the change and are discussing solutions for the field to be backfilled for installations between DCC Live and implementation.</p> <p>Discussion is also taking place on the implementation into DUIS and how it would be mandated to ensure benefits are realised.</p>	Medium
SECMP0005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Update 15/09: The delivery of the Preliminary Assessment (PA) has been delayed by the DCC to 7 th October 2016.	High

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices				The solution design document was provided to the TABASC and the WG are waiting on the PA to inform the timing and approach for implementation.	
SECMP0006 Specifying the number of digits for device display			Yes	TSC did not express interest in inputting towards this solution, as the change is simply about the display on a meter. Update 15/09: The Modification Proposal doesn't impact the DCC but discussion is ongoing on the policy behind device digit display requirements in the technical specifications. The requirements will be discussed at TSIRS to help inform what should go ahead in the solution.	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	TSC 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	High

Administered by

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
			methodology, so the proposed method would require justification.	<p>time the modification is implemented (if approved), would it still be needed?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The TSC 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>Update 15/09: The WG are awaiting delivery of the PA expected 28th October 2016. It was noted that the solution design document had been updated with where things are going with the solution.</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</p>	

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				<p>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 locked 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>	
<p>SECMP0008</p> <p>Provision of a DCC Alert (formerly Service Request Error Response) for Quarantined Service Requests</p>	Yes	Yes	No	<p>Proposed change so that an Alert is sent to DCC Users following a breach of the DCC's Anomaly Detection Threshold and/or the individual DCC Service User's Anomaly Detection Threshold. The modification impacts the DUIS schema.</p> <p>DCC Only supports the current Schema and current minus one so if changes keep being introduced, Users would have to adapt their</p>	Medium

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				<p>systems fast enough, so implementing DUIS impacting changes together in a single DCC Release could minimise impact on the User.</p> <p>Following principle 2, the TSC would like to see this change grouped together with other modifications for implementation efficiency and noted that the WG is looking into the implementation approach for the individual modification, but would note if similar DUIS affecting modifications could be implemented concurrently for efficiency.</p> <p>Update 15/09: The delivery of the IA has been delayed until 7th October 2016.</p> <p>The solution now includes three new alerts rather than one. This was discussed at the SSC, again it was determined that the benefits of the change outweighed the risk.</p>	
SECMP0009 Centralised Firmware Library		Yes		<p>Proposed change to establish a repository where SEC Parties can access Firmware Images. Questions around security were raised in regards to: access control, maintenance (DCC/ SECAS), and responsibility (Suppliers/ Manufacturers/</p>	Medium

Administered by



Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				<p>both). The TSC were informed contractual issues between manufacturers and suppliers have been identified.</p> <p>The TSC expressed their desire to see any associated business architecture for the modification once developed, and requested sight of it following WG development. The TSC also emphasised a simple Business Architecture outcome would be preferable.</p> <p>Update 15/09: The WG are looking to work up a strawman on how a solution could potentially work taking into account various options. This will help to inform the impacts on the technical documents.</p> <p>It was highlighted that any solution would be dependent on commercial changes taking place and the modification would recognise these dependencies.</p>	
<p>SECMP0010</p> <p>Introduction of triage arrangements for Communication Hubs</p>	Yes	Yes		<p>Update 15/09: The WG are currently awaiting the DCC's PA.</p> <p>Suppliers and the DCC are going to meet to discuss scenarios and business cases in</p>	Watching Brief

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				which this triage would need to take place to help build the Use Cases to inform the solution. This work would be fed back to the Working Group.	
SECMP0011 Including the MAP ID in the Smart Metering Inventory	Yes	Yes		Similar to SECMP0004. Update 15/09: The WG are awaiting the PA expected on 16 th September 2016.	Medium
SECMP0012 Channel selection to support Shared HAN solutions	Yes	Yes		TSC raised a concern that this change relates to alternative HAN solutions being developed under separate processes and activities. The TSC were informed that an RFI for products and services for the alternative HAN solution is being developed by the project team and shortly to be released. TSC is interested to understand whether this modification is in-line with the RFI. The TSC are interested to keep a watching brief on developments in order to understand whether there are wider benefits or issues to this Modification Proposal.	Watching Brief

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				<p>Update 15/09: SECAS noted that WG discussions had focussed on realising the benefits from the modification and wider benefits beyond Alt HAN had been identified.</p> <p>However, there is still further work being undertaken to ensure that the modification does not constrain other solutions from being taken forward. The WG are also working with E.UK to ensure they are clear on the Alt HAN work currently being undertaken.</p> <p>SECAS also noted that there is the potential for this Modification Proposal to go through two Refinement consultations.</p>	
SECMP0013 Smart meter device diagnostics and triage	Yes	Yes		Update 15/09: This modification 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
SECMP0014 Standardise Formatting of Device ID	Yes	Yes		Modification Proposal withdrawn by Proposer	High
SECMP0015	Yes			This change seeks to provide certainty/accuracy in regards to when the reading was	Watching Brief

Administered by



Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
GPF timestamp for reading instantaneous Gas values				taken on GSME by providing a timestamp on the information held in the GPF. The TSC support the modification and are interested in keeping a watching brief on its progression. Update 15/09: The solution design document has been provided to the WG for feedback before taking things forward.	
SECMP0016 Consideration of “Maximum Credit” value in credit cover calculation				Changes to the SEC Credit Cover calculation.	No interest
SECMP0017 CGR Phase 3 outcomes: Code Administrator to chair modification Working Groups				Changes to Modification Proposal Working Group chairing provisions in SEC Section D. No technical aspects to the change; with the change mirroring what has been operating in practice since February.	No interest
SECMP0018 Standard Electricity Distributor Configuration Settings				Update 15/09: The WG is working up formal requirements prior to going to the DCC PA stage.	Watching Brief

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement – based on initial BEIS assessment (subject to change)	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				A further update will be provided at a future meeting.	
SECMP0019 ALCS Description Labels				Update 15/09: The WG is working up formal requirements prior to going to the DCC PA stage. A further update will be provided at a future meeting.	Watching Brief