

Meeting TABASC_08_2107, 21st July 2016

10:00 – 15:00, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

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

Attendees:

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

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Seamus Gallagher
	Samuel Balch (part)
DCC	Stuart Scott
	Sylvia Ovie (part)
SECAS (Meeting Secretary)	Joe Davenport
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	David Barber

Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Other SEC Parties	Andrew Campbell
Ofgem	Nigel Nash

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The draft minutes from the June 2016 TSC meeting were updated to include minor amendments proposed by a TABASC member and were agreed as final. All actions were marked as complete or on target for completion.

2. BEIS (Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy) Update

Samuel Balch (SB) from the Smart Energy Team at BEIS (formerly DECC) presented TABASC with an update on the work being undertaken on Smart Energy Policies in the UK. DECC published an initial policy paper "Toward a Smart Energy System" on 17th December 2015 setting out some of the key challenges that the energy system faces and how smart energy can support improvements. The TABASC were advised that a Call for Evidence would be published shortly outlining policy options, with the intention of publishing a ~~route map~~Routemap by the end of the year. The TABASC were advised that the smart energy work is being carried out in conjunction with Ofgem's flexibility team.

SB provided the TABASC with the areas that are currently being looked into by the team in relation to ~~removing barriers to storage and enabling~~ demand side response (DSR). ~~In relation to enabling DSR~~ The team, working closely with Ofgem, are looking at a number of areas including investigating the half hourly settlement options available to consumers for smaller energy users and are aiming to remove barriers in relation to elective settlement by Q1 2017, and taking a decision on paving the way for mandatory settlement by H1 2018.

BEIS advised that technologies currently exist that would support the move to a smarter energy system and the ability to respond quickly and dynamically will be key for future policies. TABASC members highlighted the significant existing potential already afforded by electric storage heating to manage network constraints (in North of Scotland) and provide ancillary services.

A TABASC member advised that links with the work undertaken within the Smarter Markets Forums should be part of the evidence gathering. It was noted that there is a collective benefit to society, however, the work needs to consider intervention measures ~~for to encourage uptake from~~ consumers. There is a need to understand how consumers would react to this by comparing it with research being undertaken within UK and internationally. BEIS advised they ~~want to use~~ are considering using a portion of the innovation budget to run further DSR pilots to determine what the uptake will be. A TABASC member highlighted ~~that the European Network Codes (ENC) for generators does impose requirements on smaller generators for frequency response. If the the potential for frequency response from appliances through the Demand Connection Code (DCC) and there was subsequent discussion around managing consumer concerns in a smart energy system, is seen to benefit networks rather than consumers or smaller generators, then this would need to be investigated as part of the research.~~

BEIS advised that they want to ~~limit avoid~~ closing down options prematurely and would prefer there to be as many avenues for progression as possible and noted that in future this may involve ~~the changing of broader evolution of the electricity systems~~ to ensure progress is upheld. There was some discussion about the different roles that smart meters could play in a future smart energy system, either through sending signals directly to appliances, or simply recording demand response actions following signals sent via other means (e.g. via internet).

The TABASC thanked SB for providing the update to the group and it was noted that further updates could be provided following the publication of the Call for Evidence. The TABASC said they would

consider a joint response to the Call for Evidence, focusing in particular on how the smart meter system can enable these developments.

The TABASC were provided with the regular BEIS update and informed the TABASC that the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) has been merged with what was formerly the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). The Secretary of State for the new Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), Greg Clark, was appointed on 14th July 2016. BEIS advised there was no immediate change to the smart work being undertaken.

It was also advised that a call was being held by SMDG on 21st July 2016 to confer on DCC proposed changes to the planned release dates for DCC Live R1.2.

BEIS confirmed that the TBDG meeting had been held on 20th July 2016 and informed the group:

- The designation of the Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS), Communications Hub Technical Specification (CHTS) and Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS) will now be delayed in line with the DCC proposals to amend the DCC R1.2 Live date.
- TBDG members approved Request for Change (RFC)49 and accepted RFC50 for impact, both including minor textural updates to the technical specifications.
- The ZigBee specification to support sub-GHz is likely to be approved in August 2016.
- Discussions were held around the modification process and how the enduring process will work between the SEC Party community and SEC Panel.

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

3. DCC Update

The DCC provided the TABASC with an update on the DCC Enterprise Architecture that is undergoing development. The TABASC were informed that following the presentation in March 2016 the DCC have aligned their architecture with The Open Group Architecture Framework (TOGAF) and were presented with a view of the DCC Enterprise Architecture model created in Abacus. The DCC also confirmed that they are using the eTOM framework for the classification of the process, although it was noted that this framework is mainly used by the telecommunications industry and although DCC uses telecommunications, it is not a telecommunications company.

The DCC informed the TABASC that they have attempted to capture the properties of each application and whether it is an IT, dedicated Smart or management system. Work remains ongoing and the DCC are investigating the deployment results utilising a logical model rather than a physical model. The model itself shows how modules integrate across systems and one will be available for each key interface. The TABASC Chair enquired as to whether there would be a level of information that demonstrates which module interacts with which. The DCC informed the group that a catalogue will be made available which means it can be used as a high level map. The DCC will investigate the possibility of incorporating data entities at a later stage however the DCC reminded TABASC members that it is an enterprise architecture.

The DCC informed the TABASC that the model will be published online and made available to Parties in September. Further information would follow as soon as it is available. The DCC advised that SEC Parties will be able to view all elements of the model but Communication Service Providers (CSP) would only be able to view those aspects associated with their own operations. Concerns were raised on the availability of data however the Chair advised that this data can also be obtained from other

sources, however, it may be advisable to ask the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) first to determine whether there were any concerns with making this data available to Parties through an online portal.

ACTION TABASC08/01: The DCC to refer the publication of the Enterprise Architecture documentation and models to SSC to determine any security risk of this being made publicly available.

The DCC advised that they are currently undertaking a review of the Release 1.3 (R1.3) plan and a delay request is currently out for consultation. The DCC also informed the group of the introduction of the concept of the deferral of some R1.3 functionalities to an internal release (R1.3.1) in February 2017.

A TABASC member questioned whether the DCC had considered at what point the risk of delay would become significant, taking into account current roll-out plans. The DCC noted that they are considering the impact of their date changes on the wider plan and suppliers were keen to understand how they were engaging with industry to ensure parties are made aware.

The DCC advised TABASC of the Enhanced Service Support (ESS) where Users who have completed Entry Process Testing would be invited to take part in calls regarding platform performance and fix priorities. The DCC noted that this would be running in parallel with the Smart Metering Issue Resolution Forum (SMIRF). TABASC members queried whether they would need to be involved in the ESS process and how quickly they would need to react if issues were found that required a SEC change. TABASC members requested further information on the ESS.

ACTION TABASC08/02: The DCC to provide further information on the ESS Best Practice and Support arrangement in place and ensure it is an effective process for dealing with issues.

ACTION TABASC08/03: BEIS to update the TABASC on the SMIRF process and determine any TABASC involvement at the August TABASC meeting.

Suppliers noted concerns relating to the delay in Communication Hubs being accessible for conducting any E2E testing as a result of testing issues currently being encountered by the DCC. The DCC advised suppliers that they have made software such as GBCS for Industry (GFI) and emulators available to encourage and support testing where possible. Suppliers advised they still had concerns that issues will be pushed into the live environment due to testing environments not being able to properly replicate real world scenarios. Until real world testing can be undertaken this will remain an issue for Suppliers and the DCC noted this concern.

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

4. Sub-Committee Update

The TABASC were informed of the readiness and usage of SMKI Services and that the SMKI PMA had now begun its enduring role. The SEC Panel are currently considering a response to R1.3 and have asked the SMKI PMA to consider the risks associated with recovery being pushed out further. TABASC were also advised that the SMKI PMA now have an idea on the cost of running a Recovery Event and as a result could now consider using recovery for a lower volume of meters than originally thought.

The TABASC were advised that the SSC had two meetings since the last TABASC and are currently focussed on the review of the User Security Assessment Reports as organisations go through the User CIO assessments.

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

5. TABASC Terms of Reference (ToR) Update

SECAS advised the group that following the designation of SEC 4.14, the changes to the TSC had now taken effect, including the change of name to the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC). It was noted that the Terms of Reference had been updated to reflect the SEC changes and that the definition of Business Architecture had also been incorporated into the ToR.

There was discussion on the use of the defined term 'Services' within the SEC definition of Business Architecture. SECAS confirmed that the definition was as follows:

"Services - means the services provided, or to be provided, by the DCC pursuant to Sections F5 (Communications Hub Forecasts and Orders) to F10 (Test Communications Hubs), Section H (DCC Services), or Section L (Smart Metering Key Infrastructure and DCC Key Infrastructure), including pursuant to Bilateral Agreements"

The TABASC noted that if Modification Proposals expanded the services within the sections set out in the definition then the scope of the TABASC and the Business Architecture Document would be amended.

BEIS provided clarification on the use of the term 'may' within SEC Section F1.5 and included within the ToR which means the TABASC will not provide oversight over other forums but where changes or modifications have an impact on any of the architecture TABASC would become involved.

SECAS noted that following TABASC approval, the amended ToR would be provided to the BEIS SA16 group for comment prior to seeking Panel approval. It was noted that there were some duties within SEC Section F1 that provided Panel direction. It was agreed that when seeking Panel approval of the ToR that Panel direction would also be sought so that the TABASC could undertake the duties as required.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the Terms of Reference; and
- **AGREED** the ToR should be referred to SA16 subject to the requested changes being applied.

ACTION TABASC08/04: SECAS to provide the amended Terms of Reference to SA16 for comment prior to submission to the SEC Panel for approval.

6. TABASC Principles for Assessing Modification Proposals

SECAS provided the TABASC with an amended set of principles for use when assessing Modification Proposals. Amendments had been made to the Principles as per the action raised from the previous meeting for approval with updated detail. A further principle had also been proposed by a TABASC member for potential inclusion. The following discussion took place on each of the principles:

Principle 1

The TABASC agreed with the User Simplicity principle, however agreed to update the statement to read "Any solution should minimise operational complexity for Service Users with consideration of viability". It was discussed that viability could include economic viability as well as technical viability, depending on the Modification Proposal that was being discussed.

Principle 2

The TABASC did not propose any changes to the Efficiency of Implementation principle. Prioritisation of change was discussed; however, it was noted that this is currently being considered as part of a wider Modifications Thought Piece that would be discussed by the Panel at their August meeting.

Principle 3

The TABASC agreed to update the name of this principle to Design Integrity rather than stability.

Principle 4

It was agreed to amend the name of this principle to Change Relevance rather than Originality. It was clarified that this principle would look at the appropriateness and relevance of a specific change including looking at whether the SEC is the right regulation to include the change.

Principle 5

The TABASC discussed a proposed new principle on proximity of change and change should only be assessed against the current baseline architecture. TABASC members raised that although the change should be assessed against current architecture, the ideal assessment would be against a balance of both the current and the future architecture. It was agreed to defer the approval of this principle and this could be looked at again if need arises through the assessment of Modification Proposals.

SECAS agreed to send out the updated set of principles to the TABASC for comment prior to the next meeting.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **DEFERRED** the inclusion of the additional principle to a later TABASC meeting.

ACTION TABASC08/05: SECAS to update the TABASC Principles and provide to the TABASC for comment prior to the next meeting.

7. Modifications Development Update

Prior to the July Panel meeting, the DCC sent a notice to advise that Modification Impact Assessments have been paused due to resource constraints and the current focus on the delivery of R1.2 and R1.3. It was noted that the SEC Panel wish to be informed when these are expected to resume and a response is likely to be received prior to the August SEC Panel meeting. The Panel also noted that it would be for Ofgem to determine any licence compliance issues.

The DCC provided clarification that it was not a suspension of all modification impact assessments but those that were putting strain on Service Provider resources. SECMP 0004 and SECMP 0008 are still continuing through the impact assessment process. TABASC members voiced concerns that the delay caused to the modifications process may result in key changes and requirements not being implemented in a reasonable timescale. Discussions were held on the prioritisation of modifications. BEIS advised that the process is not clear and work is undergoing to resolve this in the quickest possible timescale. SECAS advised that there are abilities to expedite the progression of a modification that is not considered urgent, however the correct process must be followed in order to ensure that when it comes to Change Board vote it is not rejected. A full cycle of the modification process has not yet been completed in order to fulfil a learning exercise.

SECAS provided the TABASC with an update on the current status of Modification Proposals going through the process, particularly in relation to the modifications that the TABASC had a high level of interest in. The table is included as Appendix A: TABASC Modification Tracker.

The TABASC were advised that Working Group 4 is due to be held on Monday 25th July. High level information was also provided on the progress of modifications and this is captured in the TABASC Modification Tracker.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper;
- **CONSIDERED** the TABASC's degree of interest in the new Modification Proposals; and
- **AGREED** that no feedback needed to be provided to Working Groups on the Modification Proposals.

8. TABASC Activity Planner

SECAS provided the TABASC with an updated activity planner outlining the activities anticipated until March 2017. It was noted that the updates included additional review points for the Business Architecture Document.

SECAS advised TABASC that a number of duties are reliant on being requested or directed to undertake the activity by the SEC Panel with other duties being dependent on other activities e.g. Modifications.

A TABASC member suggested that it would be worth considering when they should look at their duty to review and report on the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture. SECAS advised that through previous discussions on this the TABASC agreed that this would not need to be looked at until at least DCC Live. Due to DCC Live being near, it was agreed that SECAS would look into the activities that may be required to undertake this activity.

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

ACTION TABASC08/04: SECAS to consider the activities required for the TABASC under their duty to review the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture.

9. TABASC Risk Register

The TABASC were provided with the risk register along with the SEC Panel Risk Register that outlined the three risks currently raised by the TABASC. It was noted that this would be provided as a monthly agenda item for the TABASC to review and consider any updates or further risks to be included.

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

10. Any Other Business

Discussions were held on three sub-groups that were initially considered for establishment prior to the change in approach to form the TBEC. It was noted that the groups had not been established as regular standing groups but they could be formed when expert knowledge was required in a specific area. A TABASC member noted that it would be useful to inform those who had been nominated into

the positions of the process and SECAS advised this had recently taken place through email communications and SECAS agreed to circulate the email.

ACTION TABASC08/05: SECAS to circulate the email distributed to TBEC Members.

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

APPENDIX A: TABASC Modification Tracker

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
SECMP0002 Add New Command to Reset Debt Registers	Yes – DUIS / GBCS / SMETS		Potential	Has been submitted for DCC Preliminary Assessment (PA).	Watching Brief
SECMP0003 Deficiencies in the Service Request for setting Maximum Demand Configurable Time	Yes	Yes – Limited to DNOs		Old service requests are likely to remain to support existing installed equipment.	Watching Brief
SECMP0004 Inclusion of Meter Serial Number data item in the Smart Metering Inventory	Yes	Yes		DCC PA to be discussed by Working Group 2 on 20 th June 2016. Will be considered together with SECMP0011 regarding MAP ID, for efficiency of implementation.	Medium
SECMP0005 Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices	Yes	Yes	Potential	This Modification Proposal was not discussed further at this meeting.	High
SECMP0006 Specifying the number of digits for device display			Potential	TSC did not express interest in inputting towards this solution, as the change is simply about the display on a meter.	Watching brief

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
SECMP0007 Firmware updates to mandated HAN devices	Yes	Yes	Potential	<p>TSC noted that future developments that may impact the long term benefits of the modification should be considered.</p> <p>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?</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>	High
SECMP0008 Provision of a DCC Alert (formerly Service Request Error Response) for	Yes	Yes		<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>	Medium

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
Quarantined Service Requests				<p>DCC Only supports the current Schema and current minus one so if changes keep being introduced, Users would have to adapt their 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>	
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/ 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</p>	Medium

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				sight of it following WG development. The TSC also emphasised a simple Business Architecture outcome would be preferable.	
SECMP0010 Introduction of triage arrangements for Communication Hubs	Yes	Yes		This Modification Proposal was not discussed at the meeting.	Watching Brief
SECMP0011 Including the MAP ID in the Smart Metering Inventory	Yes	Yes		Similar to SECMP0004.	Medium
SECMP0012 Channel selection to support Shared HAN solutions	Yes	Yes		<p>TSC raised a concern that this change relates to alternative HAN solutions being developed under separate processes and activities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The TSC are interested to keep a watching brief on developments in order to understand</p>	Watching Brief

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				whether there are wider benefits or issues to this Modification Proposal.	
SECMP0013 Smart meter device diagnostics and triage	Yes	Yes		This Modification Proposal was not discussed at the meeting.	Watching Brief
SECMP0014 Standardise Formatting of Device ID	Yes	Yes		<p>This change seeks to standardise the formatting of Device ID by adding the device type to the GUID. Modification to undergo initial consideration by the Panel on 17th June 2016.</p> <p>It was noted this change had been discussed previously at SDAG a number of years ago and also at TBDG and that it had been agreed that product specific information should not be included in the Device ID.</p> <p>The TSC expressed a number of concerns, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This change could result in inefficient use of the EUI64 space and deterred by the EUI administrators; • application of this change to non-mandated products such as CADs may prove challenging; 	High

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As this change will be implemented after DCC Live there will be many Devices that do not follow this change and therefore benefits will be limited; and The operative reading the barcode could also read the meter type information on the meter, which would render this change unnecessary. <p>The TSC stated this Modification Proposal does not align with Principles 1, 3, and 4.</p>	
SECMP0015 GPF timestamp for reading instantaneous Gas values	Yes			This change seeks to provide certainty/accuracy in regards to when the reading was 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.	Watching Brief
SECMP0016 Consideration of "Maximum Credit" value in credit cover calculation				Changes to the SEC Credit Cover calculation.	No interest

Modification Proposal	Impact		EC Notification requirement	Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business			
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