

Meeting TSC_06_1905, 19th May 2016

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

Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) Final Minutes

Attendees:

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

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

Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Small Suppliers	Andy Knowles
Ofgem	Nigel Nash

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

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

As part of the one of the outstanding actions, DECC provided the group with an overview of the requirement and the process to notify the European Commission (EC) of any changes to the technical specification or associated requirements that affect a product that may arise from the Modification Process.

The TSC were informed that the EC Technical Standards and Regulations Directive (TSRD) (2015/1535/EU) requires Member States to notify the EC of new technical regulations that impose restrictions on the features and characteristics of products. This notification aims to prevent the emergence of obstacles to trade in the European single market. Changes proposed via a Modification Proposal may need to be notified to the EC, which would entail a standstill period of the draft changes and impact the Modification progression timescales.

In the enduring change process, the Authority are responsible for undertaking the notification process, however during transition DECC have undertaken this function.

DECC informed the group that the TSC may be asked to assist the Authority during the notification process including providing an explanatory document to support the notification process.

It was noted that SECAS will also help in assessing the need for notification when assisting Parties through the Modification Process as part of their Critical Friend role. EC notification was also discussed in regards to the Release Management Policy, as the EC may ask to bundle all change notifications that impact one release at once.

2. Business Architecture document Project Description

At the TSC meeting in April 2016, discussion was held on an initial Project Initiation Document (PID) provided for the development of the Business Architecture Document (BAD). The initial purpose of providing the PID was to outline the scope and content of the BAD rather than to provide the detail of the project itself. Therefore, SECAS highlighted to the TSC that the further development of the PID had been put on hold until scoping work has been completed and the detailed project planning stage can take place.

SECAS provided the TSC with a draft Product Description of the Business Architecture Document (BAD), including the Functional Areas as agreed by the End-to-End Design Issues Sub-group (EEDIS) and an outline development plan.

The TSC discussed the layering of functional areas. It was proposed there should be a clear distinction between functions and capabilities, in order to create a layer of abstraction separate from that of implementation. It was noted sections 9 – 10 as currently drafted may include too much detail to be at a function level together with sections 1 – 8. They could either be lifted to a high level function level or be included at a business process level.

DECC noted sections 1 to 8 aim to set a high level scoping and sections 9 – 10 aim to identify areas of specific interest. Nevertheless, DECC agreed to review the current high level functional structure and the TSC approved the initial Product Description, subject to the amendment to the layering of the functional areas. After that layer is completed, each functional area should then be broken down into business processes.

SECAS informed the group that the Panel had approved the continued development and handover of the BAD in advance of the designation of it the SEC content in relation to this activity.

The size, output configurability, editing, and updating of the BAD were mentioned as elements to be kept in mind. It was also confirmed that the BAD is to be developed by SECAS and reviewed by the TSC at their September meeting, without prejudice of interim offline reviews.

The TSC:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **APPROVED** the Product Description subject to DECC amending the layering of functions and capabilities.

ACTION TSC06/01: DECC to review BAD Product Description with respect to the layering of functions and capabilities

ACTION TSC06/02: SECAS to develop the BAD and present it to the TSC for review in September

3. Tools for Modelling

The TSC were provided with a paper outlining the tools currently available to the TSC to aid them in their way forward in regards to their duties, particularly with regard to the development of the BAD.

The group were informed that the Panel have established a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with MRASCo to share a Casewise platform in order to achieve cost efficiencies and set a standard of work. It would be available to SECCo for 2 years, and it is likely to be renewed after that. The TSC were informed the platform is currently being used in Smarter Markets work and it was envisioned it would also be made available as a modelling tool to facilitate TSC's operations.

The TSC discussed their duties that require modelling, what their requirements would be and whether Casewise could be used to fulfil those requirements. It was noted they are not certain of what their duties require to be modelled at this stage. However, the group agreed Casewise is adequate for business process modelling, and would be adequate for the developing and maintenance of the BAD.

It was further noted that utilising the Casewise shared to develop the BAD would be without prejudice of procuring other modelling tools at a later date, if necessary.

The TSC:

- **NOTED** the content of this paper; and
- **AGREED** Casewise is to be utilised in the developing of the BAD.

4. TSC Risk Register

The TSC were provided with a Risk Register paper to document the risks associated with the TSC and their duties, including risks and mitigation actions proposed by TSC members following the the April meeting, for review.

The group discussed the risks proposed in Appendix A, in particular risk #4, and agreed this does not seem to be a TSC risk. It was noted it is more a service requirement related risk and that it does not directly relate to the TSC's operation.

SECAS' capacity to deal with a high volume of Modification Proposals was also discussed as a potential risk and SECAS clarified the Panel already own this risk and have mitigating actions in place.

The TSC:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **AGREED** to escalate risks #1 - #3 to the Panel risk register.

ACTION TSC06/03: SECAS to escalate risks #1 - #3 set out in Appendix A for Panel approval

5. 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.

6. 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 (MP) at a high level and whether TSC input should be provided, generally following the below questions in regards to each Proposal:

- 1) Does the Modification Proposal impact the Technical and/or Business Architecture?
- 2) Are there any issues / concerns with the current solution proposal?
- 3) Are there any alternative solutions that should be considered by the Working Group (WG)?
- 4) Are there any wider implications to be considered outside of the Modification Proposal progression?
- 5) Is there the need for EC notification?

Modification Proposal	Impact		Notes/Concerns	Interest Level
	Technical	Business		
SECMP0002	Yes – DUIS / GBCS / SMETS		Introduces three new Service Requests (SRs). No specific concerns were raised by the TSC.	Watching Brief
SECMP0003	Yes	Yes – Limited to DNOs	This MP may set a precedent for future change leading to managing differential behaviours on different sets of meters. It was noted that the potential solutions could end up on the User having to make a decision on a service response and the TSC	Watching Brief

Administered by

			agreed that a principle that should be aimed for is not burdening Users where possible.	
SECMP0004	Yes	Yes	<p>There was discussion regarding the potential to merge this MP with SECMP0011 to achieve implementation efficiencies however it was noted that this would be need to be agreed by the Proposers of the MPs and even if they have the same solution the MPs themselves may have different drivers, benefits, and achieve different SEC Objectives and therefore should be considered in their own right.</p> <p>The TSC raised that a principle should be worked to that considers each Modification in its own right but that ensures efficiencies in implementation where possible.</p>	Medium
SECMP0005	Yes	Yes	The TSC raised concerns regarding the risks and costs of this change specifically with regard to the change to Communications Hub functionality and the potential to introduce incompatibility and strand devices.	High
SECMP0006	Yes		The status of this Modification Proposal was not reviewed at the meeting.	Watching Brief
SECMP0007	Yes	Yes	TSC raised concerns regarding conflicts of interest and Supplier liabilities as one Supplier on the HAN could introduce an upgrade that would be detrimental to another Supplier on the HAN. The current proposal to notify the other Supplier that the upgrade had taken place would not deter this event.	High
SECMP0008			The status of this Modification Proposal was not reviewed at this meeting.	Medium
SECMP0009			The status of this Modification Proposal was not reviewed at the meeting.	Watching Brief

SECMP0010	Yes	Yes	The TSC noted that the Modification Proposal would soon undergo Preliminary Assessment by the DCC and outputs from that should be considered at a future meeting.	Watching Brief
SECMP0011			As well as the discussions regarding ensuring efficiencies in implementing with SECMP0004, the TSC also noted that there may be some cross-code work required on the validation mechanism in any proposed solution.	Watching Brief
SECMP0012			TSC members noted the current draft of this change focuses in supporting an Alternative HAN solution, however, the Alternative HAN solution has not been baselined yet and is not currently part of the technical specification landscape. The TSC would like to keep a watching brief on the progression of this Modification Proposal. It was agreed its wider benefits need to be identified, otherwise this proposal should be considered under Alternative HAN work currently underway.	Watching Brief
SECMP0013	Yes	Yes	The TSC raised concerns over the potential design change to testing devices in the live environment and that the Working Group should consider whether the requirements could be met using the current technical solution.	Watching Brief

Throughout the discussions on the above Modification Proposals, the TSC agreed that a set of principles could be developed that would aid them in assessing change and provide the Working Group to aid them in the solution development. For example:

- Principle 1 – Any technical solution should not burden Users.
- Principle 2 – Efficiencies in implementation should be ensured where possible.

The DCC noted that they also have a set of design principles that could aid the TSC in the development of these principles and agreed to provide these to SECAS. SECAS agreed to undertake some work on the development of these design principles.

SECAS agreed to include TSC's interest in each Modification Proposal in this paper going forward.

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

ACTION TSC06/04: SECAS to put together a straw man of principles the TSC should check are being followed in the Modification

ACTION TSC06/05: DCC to provide their set of design principles to the TSC at a future meeting

ACTION TSC06/06: SECAS to include TSC's level of interest in this paper going forward

7. 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.

8. DCC Update

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

9. DECC Update

DECC noted that proposals for trialling alternatives to IHDs are to be submitted by the end of September 2016 with reports on the trials required by September 2017. DECC also noted that there may be some mid-point reporting.

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

10. Sub-Committee Update

The TSC chair had nothing of significance to report to the TSC from the SSC and SMKI PMA meetings.

11. Any Other Business

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