

Meeting TSC_05_2104, 21st April 2016

10:00 – 13:00, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	TSC Members
TSC Chair	Julian Hughes
Large Suppliers	Rochelle Harrison
	Ashley Pocock
	Grahame Weir
	Stephanie Shepherd (via teleconference)
	Colin Rowland
Small Suppliers	Andy Knowles
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton
Other SEC Parties	Andrew Campbell
	Tim Boyle

Representing	Other Participants
DECC (Secretary of State)	Seamus Gallagher (part)
	Mike Bennett
DCC	Stuart Scott (alternate to Matt Roderick)
SECAS (Meeting Secretary)	Joana Esgalhado
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	David Barber (part)
Ofgem	Nigel Nash

Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Gas Networks	Leigh Page
Large Suppliers	Tim Newton

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

There were no comments or suggested amendments to the draft minutes from the March 2016 TSC meeting and the TSC agreed the minutes as written. All actions were marked as completed or on target for completion.

2. Business Architecture document Project Initiation

A draft Project Initiation Document (PID) regarding the hand-over of the Business Architecture Document (BAD) from the End-to-End Design Sub-Group (EEDIS)¹ into the TSC's remit, was provided for review by the TSC.

Once the TSC's remit is expanded² to include the Business Architecture, the group will become the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), and will have the duty to maintain and develop the BAD. The PID highlights key areas, scope, objectives, key resource, and initial timelines for the development of the BAD. It also includes a draft list of functional areas that are to be handed over once finalised by EEDIS. SECAS noted that the paper was in a draft form, to allow the incorporation of TSC feedback prior to it being submitted to the Panel for approval.

The proposed cost and timeframes were questioned by TSC members, and discussion was held on the purpose and benefits received from producing the BAD.

Further discussion was held on the scope of the BAD and the depth that the architecture would be mapped to. It was clarified that the EEDIS had put together a high level scope which would include an overarching Target Operating Model (TOM), with a number of functional areas detailed beneath. Each Functional Area would include a description and high level commentary with an overview of the governance areas and related documents (SEC Section / Subsidiary Document), underpinning each detailed process. TSC members noted that linking the processes to the SEC obligations is a key benefit from developing the BAD.

Discussions followed on scheduling and prioritisation of areas to be developed. It was suggested a phased approach would allow for early benefit realisation. This could start out with a functional model, which would allow for further development via detailed process steps and maps. At this stage, DECC informed the group that prioritisation discussion at EEDIS had been focused on the specific functional areas.

SECAS agreed to review the PID and amend it to include ways of working, prioritisation, and scheduling. It was noted this document aims to schedule and prioritise activities rather than actually setting out activity processes.

The TSC **AGREED** the PID should be further developed following the next EEDIS meeting.

ACTION TSC05/01: SECAS to further develop the PID following the next EEDIS meeting.
--

¹ Sub-group of the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG)

² By DECC Consultation on aspects of the implementation of Home Area Network solutions (868MHz legal drafting and approach to pairing devices locally) and on the operation and remit of the Technical Sub-Committee

3. TSC Risk Register

The TSC were provided with a paper including a Risk Register to document the risks associated with the TSC and their duties.

Due to time constraints at the meeting the TSC were not able to review the proposed risks and agreed they would provide any comments offline by Friday 29th April 2016.

The TSC **AGREED** to provide feedback on the proposed risks and propose any alternative risks by 29th April 2016.

ACTION TSC05/02: TSC members to provide feedback on the proposed risks and propose any alternative risks by the end of next week.

4. Ways of Working Between the TBEC and the TSC

The TSC were provided with a paper clarifying the relationship between the TSC and Technical and Business Expert Community (TBEC), and the ways in which the latter could support the TSC in their duty to support the Modification Process.

SECAS clarified how the TSC could offer input into Modification Proposals, through opportunities to feed into Working Groups (WGs) and the Panel. From a formal point of view, it is the TSC who provide input, which is not to say they cannot make use of the TBEC for expert support before they do so. It was emphasized that the TBEC was established to support the TSC on a breadth of technical and business matters, not just during the Modification Process and that there is no direct link between the TBEC and the Modification WGs.

Discussion followed on whether the TSC wished to provide input on Modification Proposals before or after the initial WG discussions and the identification of high level business requirements. The group agreed they would like to be asked to state whether they wish to offer input before WGs start working on Modification Proposals. It was suggested there should also be some checkpoints for the offering of input, and SECAS noted this would not be necessarily at the same stage for all Modification Proposals. The TSC further noted that the way they would offer their input would also vary depending on the level of interest of the Modification Proposal to the TSC, and it could range from keeping a watching brief or offering detailed input.

The TSC agreed they must be proactive with their support to the Modification Process as they want to avoid the need to unwind solution development that has progressed through the Refinement Process. It was further noted that they should act in a way that will not block or extend the process more than necessary.

The TSC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **DISCUSSED** the contents of the paper, including thoughts on pro-actively inputting into the Modifications Process.

5. Modification Development Update

SECAS presented a paper providing an update on the development of Modification Proposals currently going through the SEC Modification Refinement Process.

The group discussed each Modification Proposal at a high level and whether TSC input should be provided, noting whether there seemed to be a high, medium or low TSC level of interest at this stage in the process. It was also noted that since the publication of paper further development of some of the Modifications had occurred through further WG sessions.

Working Group 1:

- SECMP0002 Add New Command to Reset Debt Registers – Low interest from a TSC perspective; TSC to keep a watching brief on progression;
- SECMP0003 Deficiencies in the Service Request for setting Maximum Demand Configurable Time – Low interest from a TSC perspective; TSC to keep a watching brief on progression;
- SECMP0005 Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices – Medium interest from a TSC perspective due to the potential impact on demand and traffic through the DCC; TSC requested a further detailed update following the next Working Group meeting;
- SECMP0006 Specifying the number of digits for device display – Low interest from a TSC perspective; TSC to keep a watching brief on progression. It was noted that options are being considered, as well as the need for European Commission Notification since competition law is likely to be impacted; and
- SECMP0007 Firmware updates to mandated HAN devices – High interest from a TSC perspective, noting that a more detailed update on progression would be provided at the next TSC meeting.

Working Group 2:

- SECMP0004 Inclusion of Meter Serial Number data item in the Smart Metering Inventory – Medium interest from a TSC perspective, with the potential TSC activity to understand the business process impacts of this proposal; and
- SECMP0008 Provision of a DCC Alert (formerly Service Request Error Response) for Quarantined Service Requests – Medium interest from a TSC perspective, especially in regards to operational impacts. TSC to watch for updates in order to better understand scope. It was further noted that the Security Sub-Committee will be consulted on any security impacts of this proposal.

The TSC noted that the report provided on the outputs from the initial Working Group meetings was useful and feedback was offered on additional information that could be included in updates going forward, for example a summary of the rationale for the Modification Proposal including an outline of the potential benefits. The Chair questioned whether similar papers would go to other Sub-Committees. SECAS clarified that this would be the case, once clarity on the business requirements and consequential questions were known. It was noted the format may differ slightly in light of the more specific questions that would be raised, as the remit of the other Sub-Committees is more focused.

It was noted that the WGs set up to take the modifications through the Refinement Process may not necessarily deal with the broader business and operational use of some of the changes e.g. SECMP0004 and SECMP0008. The group discussed that it might be appropriate to establish expert groups using the TBEC, to consider the operational impacts of the Modification Proposals highlighted above and agreed to wait for the next TSC meeting after the WGs have undertaken further work on the Modification Proposals before taking that decision. However, it was agreed that consideration could be given to the scope of the expert group in relation to SECMP0004.

SECAS noted that any identified impacts on the Technical and/or Business Architecture Documents, would be flagged in the Modification Reports produced. Any updates to the two documents, could be actioned during any necessary implementation activities times, prior to the changes taking effect on the respective implementation date.

Discussion followed on the requirement to notify the European Commission (EC) of technical specification changes, and when in the process the WGs should consider whether this will be required as it could add an additional 3 month idle period to the progression timetable. It was discussed that the final decision on whether notification was required would sit with the Authority or Secretary of State during the period that they carry out the Authority decision activities; but the WGs will consider notification requirements, and considerations would be included in the Modification Report and would inform implementation dates and approaches if required. It was agreed SECAS should update the existing Modification Proposal Form guidance to highlight the matter to Modification Proposers to help inform target implementation dates.

It was noted that if TSC have concerns about the scope of any of the Modification Proposals going through the Refinement Process they should articulate them as soon as possible. It was noted that any feedback or concerns from the TSC, and any other Sub-Committee would be captured in the Modification Reports produced, including any actions taken by the Proposer and Working Group. It was also noted that the Proposer has the final say on how the solution develops under the Proposer ownership provisions within SEC Section D.

TSC agreed that further consideration of modifications was necessary and this would be factored into the next meeting.

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

ACTION TSC05/03: SECAS to update current Modification Proposal form guidance to highlight the need to consider whether EC notification may be required.

ACTION TSC05/04: SECAS to consider the scope of a TBEC expert group to discuss the operational and business impacts of SECMP0004.

6. Modification Status Report

The monthly Modification Status Report was provided to the TSC to keep them informed of the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the SEC Section D 'Modification Process'.

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

7. TSC Roadmap

The TSC were provided with the five-year roadmap articulating all known industry changes that may affect Smart Metering and the TSC's duties in particular. This aimed to aid the TSC to put together a documentation and architecture review timeline necessary to meet their duties.

It was proposed the roadmap could be a Panel owned document rather than TSC owned and it was also noted that a Joint Industry Plan (JIP) covering the period until 2020 is underway, which could potentially supersede the roadmap provided.

The TSC:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and

- **AGREED** that the question of ownership should be raised at the next Panel meeting

ACTION TSC05/05: SECAS to raise the question of the development and maintenance of an industry roadmap at the next Panel meeting.

8. TSC Activity Planner

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

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

9. DCC Update

Due to time constraints, the DCC informed the group there was nothing of significance to report in regards to the TSC remit.

10. DECC Update

DECC informed the TSC the Government's response on the Consultation on aspects of the implementation of Home Area Network solutions (868MHz legal drafting and approach to pairing devices locally) and on the operation and remit of the Technical Sub-Committee should be published in the last week of April. The outcomes of this consultation are expected to come into force in late July 2016.

The TSC **NOTED** the contents of the verbal update.

11. Sub-Committee Update

The TSC Chair provided the TSC with an update on the Security Sub-Committee and SMKI PMA's recent activities, highlighting areas of specific relevance to the TSC, including:

SMKI PMA's ongoing work on recovery processes and SSC's ongoing incident management activities.

The TSC **NOTED** the contents of the verbal update.

12. Any Other Business

A TSC member raised a concern arising from the Testing Design Execution Group (TDEG) regarding DCC's intent not to make production-level test environments available to its Service Users at all times. The group expressed concern Users' would not be able to test their solution against the current DCC live code, as for a period of time, the sole test environment would contain code from the forthcoming release of DCC Systems rather than the production code.

It was noted that this would be of interest to the TSC from an enduring point of view, however, release 1.2 and 1.3 would fall under TAG's remit; and the group agreed they wish to be updated on this matter at their next meeting.

Due to the fact that in the two last consecutive meetings the TSC were unable to go through all agenda items, the TSC Chair proposed the forthcoming TSC meetings should be extended through the afternoon. Members agreed meetings should be extended until 4pm.

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

ACTION TSC05/06: SECAS to provide an update on test environment availability at the May meeting.

ACTION TSC05/07: SECAS to extend the meeting invites until 4pm.