This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

Meeting TABASC_18_1805, 18th May 2017

10:00 – 15:40, 8 Eastcheap, London, EC3M IAE

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

Attendees:

Category	TABASC Members
TABASC Chair	Julian Hughes
Large Suppliers	Emslie Law
	Stephen Lovell
	Rochelle Harrison
	Ashley Pocock
	Tim Newton
Small Supplier	Andy Knowles
Other SEC Parties	Tim Boyle
	Elias Hanna
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton
Gas Networks	Leigh Page

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Sylvia Ovie
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	Kayla Reinhart
	Gordon Hextall (part)
	David Barber (part)

Apologies	
Large Suppliers	Grahame Weir

Absent	
Small Suppliers	Kirk Hawksworth

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The draft minutes from the April 2017 TABASC meeting were agreed as final. All actions were marked as completed or on target for completion with a number of verbal updates provided, with relevant amendments to updates and action statuses recorded. The following updates were provided:

Action Reference	Update
TABASC09/06 SECAS to produce a proposal for an enduring TAG function for TABASC to review.	The Panel are continuing work on the approach for enduring Release Management. The Panel are to consider an approach to Testing Principles for modifications, which will include consideration of the governance group that will have oversight. A joint workshop with TAG and TABASC was held on 21st March 2017. The Panel will be provided with the approach at their June 2017 meeting. Outcomes will be provided to the TABASC following Panel discussions. Action **ONGOING**.
TABASC15/05 SECAS to assess the configuration management of the SEC and tools that could be used to support that function.	SECAS noted that techniques were currently being trialled to provide links to either specific pages or specified locations e.g. at clause level to determine the method, process and effort required to implement the solution. It was noted that SECAS would provide the TABASC with the outcome of the trial as soon as possible. Action **ONGOING**.
TABASC16/11 SECAS agreed to liaise with BEIS regarding the handing over of the Design Notes and to bring further information to a future meeting.	SECAS noted that the Panel agreed for the TABASC to formally take ownership of the Design Notes, which requires an update to the TABASC Terms of Reference. SECAS informed the TABASC that a disclaimer has been applied to each Design Note stating that the document may be out of date and content should be non-binding and where there is any discrepancy, the SEC takes precedence. SECAS noted that a paper setting out the status of the Design Notes will be presented to the TABASC at the June 2017 meeting. Action **ONGOING**.
TABASC17/01 The DCC to feedback their intended approach to make upgrades more acceptable.	The DCC noted that this was currently being looked at internally and an approach will be provided at a future TABASC meeting. Action **ONGOING**.

TABASC17/02 The DCC to provide the TABASC with a list of defects and change requests currently being progressed.	The DCC noted that they will provide the TABASC with a list of defects and change requests currently being progressed prior to the next TABASC meeting. Action **CLOSED**.
TABASC17/03 SECAS agreed to further develop a view of the interactions and dependencies that the TABASC should have with other industry groups.	SECAS provided an updated list of industry forums to further develop a view of the interactions and dependencies that the TABASC should have under agenda item 5. Action **CLOSED**.
TABASC17/04 SECAS to provide an update on the outcomes from the service management in enduring governance discussion at the April 2017 SEC Panel meeting.	SECAS provided an update on the outcomes from the service management in enduring governance discussion at the May 2017 SEC Panel meeting under agenda item 13. Action **CLOSED**.
TABASC17/05 SECAS agreed to allocate relevant areas of the BAD model for review by the specific parties (i.e. the TABASC, SCC and SMKI PMA).	SECAS will allocate relevant areas of the BAD model for review by the specific parties (i.e. the TABASC, SCC and SMKI PMA) as part of the overall review process. Action **ONGOING**.
TABASC17/06 The TABASC Members to provide SECAS with feedback on the proposed approach for development of User Testing Principles for Modification Proposals prior to it being raised at the SEC Panel in May 2017.	The TABASC were requested to provide feedback by 3rd May 2017. This feedback will be incorporated into the approach that will be raised at the SEC Panel meeting in June 2017. Action **CLOSED**.

2. BEIS Update

No update from BEIS was provided at this month's meeting.

3. DCC Update

The DCC highlighted a number of elements of the monthly performance reporting including:

- An issue that had been identified in Remedy, was resolved in April 2017; and
- Due to outages in the UIT environment, it was noted that maintenance windows would be extended. The TABASC questioned the reason for the failure and whether the outage had been logged as an incident. The DCC agreed to confirm.

The DCC informed the TABASC that a strategic approach is being developed for managing environments to support Releases. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued and the DCC are currently finalising the contract for an organisation to commence a four-week period of work to produce a conceptual design to improve environment capability. This will look at a cloud-based strategy which should allow for a more flexible approach to standing up environments. The TABASC noted the need for improving test environments and suggested that the DCC utilise SEC Party input in developing an approach to strategic delivery. The TABASC requested to see the output from the work being undertaken to develop the conceptual design and the DCC noted that this will be brought to the July 2017 TABASC meeting for review. It was noted that whilst this new approach is being developed, the DCC are also looking to provide additional environments for R1.4 and R2.0 to reduce the dependencies on the current environments. The DCC agreed to provide more information on the environments that would be available for these Releases at the June 2017 TABASC meeting.

The DCC also noted that this piece of work should support the intent to minimise disruption from outage periods. The TABASC reiterated their concern in relation to the 60-hour service outage for upgrades to the system, noting the outage period is unacceptable to Service Users and an alternate solution is required. The DCC informed the TABASC that there was no further update to provide this month; however, noted they are investigating options to enhance the service but have identified several constraints. The DCC will action TABASC17/01 to feedback their intended approach to make upgrades more acceptable at the June 2017 TABASC meeting.

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

ACTION TABASC18/01: The DCC to provide details on the outputs from the work being undertaken to develop the conceptual design for cloud-based environments.

ACTION TABASC18/02: The DCC to provide more information on the additional environments that would be available for R1.4 and R2.0 at the June 2017 TABASC meeting.

4. Sub-Committee Update

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

- Security Sub-Committee (SSC) –organisations are continuing to proceed through the User Competent Independent Organisation (CIO) audits.
- SMKI Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) – the TABASC were informed that discussions were held on the testing requirements for the SMKI Recovery functionality. It was noted that the Recovery functionality would not be available for Users to test in the User

Interface Testing Environment until Release 1.4; however, the functionality would be available in the production environment from Release 1.3. The SMKI PMA have identified this as a risk and will continue to monitor. TABASC need to consider the challenges of testing in the progression of any modifications.

The TABASC Chair highlighted the ongoing discussions at both the SSC and SMKI PMA meetings in relation to User IDs and Parties using Shared Services Providers. Issues have been identified when one company has two legal entities where each hold either a Gas or Electricity Licence; however, wish to operate as one DCC User, sharing a single User ID to combine their gas and electricity supplier roles. Following the May 2017 SEC Panel discussion and further discussions with Ofgem and BEIS, there is no intent to change the policy as the requirements are fit-for-purpose and organisations must continue to meet their SEC requirements.

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

5. Transitional and Enduring Industry Forum List

Following the April 2017 TABASC meeting, the TABASC were provided with an updated list of industry forums which now includes the Alt HAN Forum and the Smart Metering Issues Resolution Forum (SMIRF). The paper provides insight into SECAS' interactions with the forums. The TABASC discussed the interactions and dependencies to further identify where their presence is required.

SECAS noted that a 'Transitional Governance Update' paper is provided to the Panel and SEC Parties each month which highlights the activities occurring in the Smart Metering Implementation Programme (SMIP). It was noted that this paper provides high-level updates from the Transitional Governance meetings attended by SECAS. The TABASC requested SECAS to provide a summary update on the outputs of each forum to inform the TABASC of relevant topics from a Technical and Business Architecture point of view. The TABASC noted the importance of being able to influence these forums to improve enduring arrangements rather than only receiving information. SECAS will provide further development of the TABASC's role in each forum. For example, it was noted that SECAS does not attend the Smart Metering Operations Group (SMOG) although some members do attend and could provide a verbal update at TABASC.

The TABASC **DISCUSSED** the content of the paper and how the TABASC could keep informed of updates from each of the groups.

ACTION TABASC18/03: The TABASC Members who attend the SMOG were requested to provide updates following each meeting.

ACTION TABASC18/04: SECAS to provide a cross forum update to the TABASC on a regular basis.

6. TABASC International Standards Approach Update

The TABASC discussed the membership options available for the ZigBee Alliance and Device Language Message Specification (DLMS) User Association in order to support the TABASC in keeping up to date with the standards to ensure they are aware of any amendments or issues being discussed through the User Associations to assess impacts and take any relevant action.

The TABASC assessed the different options for membership and discussed their intent for recommending SECAS to become a member. The TABASC discussed their level of involvement in the changing and development of the protocol. The TABASC agreed that the intent is not to influence the documents as they develop but rather just to leverage existing and new functionality that is coming through once the standards are formalised. The TABASC explored whether the group can

utilise organisations who are currently members of the User Associations to gain access to documentation; however, it was noted that this would breach the confidentiality requirements of membership.

The TABASC's role in assessing modifications and accessing the specifications to inform the Modification Proposals was discussed. It was noted that the Working Groups, including SECAS technical experts, would be relied upon to provide the expertise and knowledge for developing the solutions for modifications and would require access to the ZigBee and DLMS specifications to ensure they are fully informed.

In addition, it was noted that BEIS have an established bespoke liaison agreement with ZigBee Alliance, including obtaining access to documents. The TABASC requested SECAS to further discuss with the ZigBee Alliance to ascertain whether it would be possible to establish a bespoke liaison agreement equivalent to that used by BEIS prior to recommending the 'Adopter' membership for ZigBee Alliance to the Panel.

The TABASC **AGREED** that membership was required to provide the TABASC (including SECAS technical experts) access to the finalised specifications to inform on Modification Proposals, however it was agreed at this stage that full membership would not be required to raise and influence amendments to those standards. It was noted that this could be reviewed at a later date. However, it was agreed that further discussion should take place with the ZigBee Alliance to ascertain whether it would be possible to establish a bespoke liaison agreement equivalent to that used by BEIS.

The TABASC **AGREED** the finalised wording for Principle 5 to be included within the TABASC Principles to assess Modification Proposals on the SEC Website.

ACTION TABASC18/05: SECAS to further discuss with the ZigBee Alliance to ascertain whether it would be possible to establish a bespoke liaison agreement equivalent to that used by BEIS.

ACTION TABASC18/06: SECAS to recommend the 'Adopter' membership to the DLMS User Association and the equivalent for ZigBee, for Panel approval.

7. Business Architecture Document Project Update – April 2017

SECAS provided the TABASC with the monthly update on the Business Architecture Document (BAD) Project, focussing on the activities undertaken in April 2017. A high-level dashboard was included in this paper setting out project status and high level risks.

It was noted that the last drop of content for the Business Architecture Document would be provided in June 2017. A workshop will be held in May 2017 to go through the final drop of the Business Process Model content and to discuss further development of the portal. It was noted that Drop 4 content and the model will be available in June 2017. The consultation document, with a grid setting out particular areas of interest to focus on based on User Role, will be issued on the week commencing 19th June 2017.

The BAD project and BPM to date have delivered to time and budget, with future planned activities set at Green status for the overall project out-turn. It was noted that the BPM is currently set at Amber as it is awaiting the Technical and Business Expert Community (TBEC) approval. The TABASC recommended the status to be amended to Green following TBEC approval of content, given it has been delivered to time and quality.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the Business Architecture Document Project Update – April 2017.

8. Business Architecture Document Communication and Review Approach

Following the final drop of content for the Business Architecture Document in June 2017, the TABASC discussed the recommended review approach leading to final approval by the Panel and a communication approach following final approval.

The Business Process Model (BPM) aspect of the BAD has also been completed and will be going through a review workshop by the TBEC as part of the final review cycle. It was noted that any outputs from the workshop will either be incorporated into the version for consultation or the consultation will be issued subjects to the amendments identified.

Areas of interest to each of the Sub-Committees (SSC and SMKI PMA) have also been provided and will be included when the BAD is presented at the respective upcoming meetings to introduce the consultation.

A formal consultation with all SEC Parties will also be published on the SEC Website, including access to the portal, on the week commencing 19th June 2017. This will be communicated to the SEC Parties via direct emails and the SECAS Newsletter. Due to the size of the document and the potential effort required for an end-to-end review, as part of the consultation document, a grid will be provided setting out particular areas of interest to focus a review on based on User Role. Specific questions will form part of the consultation document and a comments form will be provided for respondents to submit feedback. The deadline for feedback responses will be 13th July 2017.

Following the consultation deadline, comments will be collated and any amendments required will be incorporated. The consultation response will consist of a log of the comments with commentary provided for each comment. The TABASC will complete a final Sign-Off to recommend Panel approval in September 2017.

Due to the likelihood of ongoing feedback as Parties start to use the BAD, an issues log will be uploaded on to the SEC Website on the relevant page with a feedback form to allow users to submit ongoing feedback.

The TABASC is requested to **NOTE** the contents of this paper.

9. TABASC Effectiveness Review

Following discussion at the March 2017 TABASC meeting, the TABASC were presented with an updated questionnaire, that will form the initial fact-finding element of the End-to-End review of the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture, Business Architecture and HAN requirements review (the 'effectiveness review').

Questionnaire Issue Date

The TABASC were requested to provide a steer on the timeline for issuing the questionnaire based on the delays of the Release 1.3 Live date. The TABASC agreed to move the questionnaire issue date from September 2017, as initially agreed, to November 2017, although they noted that this could be amended at a later date if required.

Questionnaire Feedback

The TABASC provided the following feedback on the questionnaire:

- Include a higher range box option for 'Number of Commissioned Devices Connected'. For example, >5000 range;

- Provide a defined classification for 'level of Impact' rather than satisfaction level in relation to the Section 1: DCC systems and processes;
- Re-order the questions under Section 3: Firmware Upgrades to be sequential; and
- Use 'SMKI, DCCKI, IKI' instead of 'cryptography' for question 24 of Section 6: Cryptography.

SECAS re-confirmed the following information from the previous meeting:

- The questionnaire will be conducted by SECAS using 'Survey Monkey';
- The nominated SEC Party representative contact will be requested to nominate a representative from their organisation to complete the questionnaire.
- The questionnaire will be provided to all Users, including Network Operators, who have completed UEPT and who are live at the time of the questionnaire.
- The proposed approach will use the questionnaire to identify any fundamental emerging problems associated with the Technical and / or Business Architectures and / or the HAN requirements and so to not be too onerous on organisations completing the questionnaire voluntarily.

Communications Plan

The TABASC discussed the proposed communication plan for the questionnaire to ensure awareness across all stakeholders and co-ordination with any other communication initiatives in the same timeframes. The TABASC agreed to conduct the questionnaire in November 2017 with a follow up questionnaire commencing April 2018, subject to TABASC confirmation.

Next Steps

The TABASC were informed that the updated questionnaire will be provided at the June 2017 TABASC meeting for approval including the amended communications plan. Subject to the TABASC's approval, the questionnaire and communication plan will be brought to the July 2017 Panel meeting for final feedback and approval. The Panel will also be requested to recommend an approach for communicating the outcomes of the questionnaire to industry, if necessary. It was noted that the outcomes will at least be provided to the DCC, and other SEC Sub-Committees for information; however, further distribution is not required.

The TABASC **AGREED** further feedback to be incorporated into the questionnaire and **AGREED** an alternative timescale to take account of the delays to Release 1.3 Live. It was noted that communications would be issued to those stakeholders set out in the Communications Plan.

ACTION TABASC18/07: SECAS to further develop the questionnaire to be provided to the TABASC for final approval.

ACTION TABASC18/08: SECAS to provide the updated questionnaire to the July 2017 Panel meeting for final feedback and approval.

10. TABASC Risk Register

The TABASC was provided with a paper documenting the TABASC risks and those included in the SEC Panel Risk Register. The TABASC also noted the operational risks, relating to the End-to-End Technical and Business Architecture, that had been included following initial discussion at the April 2017 TABASC meeting. The TABASC expressed concern in relation to several risk mitigations pointing to the Technical, Business and HAN Architecture Effectiveness Review to identify areas of

concern. Due to the severity of a number of the risks, the TABASC discussed that action should be taken on any mitigations prior to the effectiveness review. The TABASC noted that the TABASC Operational Risks are public which further confirmed that the risks' mitigations should be managed prior to any risks potentially materialising and becoming issues. The TABASC agreed that it is in their remit to develop risks including each likelihood, impact and severity rating.

The TABASC discussed the fact that these risks would have been identified and accepted when the Technical and Business Architecture was designed. It was clarified that the Technical and Business Architecture is not necessarily considered 'wrong'; however, parts of the architecture may be able to be improved and mitigations should be in place should the risk materialise.

The TABASC agreed that further development of the operational risks should take place, and consideration should be given to using a formal risk management methodology. The Chair requested members provide an indication of which methodology is used in their organisations to allow standardisation on a common platform. It was agreed a separate workshop on risk management was required.

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

ACTION TABASC18/09: SECAS to further develop the operational risks, including identifying appropriate mitigations in conjunction with TABASC.

ACTION TABASC18/10: TABASC Members to declare which formal methods they use to allow standardisation on a common platform for risk management.

11. TABASC Activity Planner

The TABASC was provided with an updated activity planner outlining the activities anticipated up to and including December 2017. The planner was presented in a new format with TABASC Members noting that it was easier to navigate.

The TABASC provided the following feedback to further develop the activity planner for next month:

- Include the Working Group timescales as part of the TABASC duty to support the Modification Process;
- Feature the DCC development Release plan including Release 2 and Enrolment and Adoption milestones to inform when TABASC work is required to assess Release compatibility with the Technical and Business Architecture; and
- Provide further detail on the timeline colour classification.

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

ACTION TABASC18/11: SECAS to provide an updated TABASC Activity Planner to address the TABASC feedback received.

12. Specification Defect Resolution Update

The TABASC were presented with an update on progress with the specification defect resolution work, following discussions with Ofgem on the potential new Modification Proposal Path (Path 5). TABASC Chair and SECAS considered a number of specification defect scenarios, including

timescales, to determine whether the existing Modification Proposal Paths and routes can be utilised to resolve them or whether the new Path 5 is required at this time.

The paper outlined five scenarios with different assumptions applied. Having considered different defect scenarios, it was identified that by managing change through the existing Modification Process in a more agile way the existing processes could provide the rapidity of resolution required. However, it was noted that the matter will be kept under review and if it becomes apparent that such specification defects cannot be progressed through these existing avenues in a timely manner, Path 5 can be revisited.

The TABASC Members noted that the group had spent a lot of effort on developing the potential Path 5 and while it was recognised as a learning experience, it was recommended that consideration be given to existing procedures prior to spending time on developing new procedures. It was noted that development work was required to inform the discussion with Ofgem and that if the path was required in the future, then the work was not nugatory.

The TABASC **AGREED** to utilise the existing modifications routes for specification defect management in the first instance, until such time it becomes apparent that a new/additional Path is required.

13. Service Management and Reporting

At the April 2017 TABASC meeting, an action was taken to raise to the Panel the discussions in relation to Service Management and Reporting and the potential gap in the governance and oversight of such services.

The Panel recommended that the TABASC consider their potential role in monitoring Service Management performance and issues raised. The TABASC should also consider any support that would be required in order to aid them in this role e.g. SECAS analysis of Service Management reporting, attendance at Service Management Design Forums. The TABASC noted that monitoring these reports would be beneficial to understand any trends in issues and to analyse any potential issues arising from the Technical and Business Architecture. The Panel requested the TABASC to continue to review the DCC Performance Measurement Report and escalate any concerns to the Panel as required. The following other reports that the DCC provide to the Panel on a regular basis should also be monitored and correlated against each other to identify trends or any Technical and Business Architecture problems:

- Certificate Signing Requests (CSR) Variance Reports;
- DCC Performance Measurement Report;
- Service Request Variance Reporting;
- Deployed Products List;
- Responsible Communications Hubs Returns Report;
- Network Enhancement Plan Report; and
- Post Commissioning Information Report.

SECAS will produce analysis on the reports, including trends and a summary of issues identified for the TABASC to consider prior to reporting to the Panel.

The DCC noted that there is no requirement to report the details on an issue and how they are fixed. The TABASC noted the need to investigate beyond the report to surface information from the DCC to

resolve the issues; however, the DCC mentioned concern around confidentiality. The TABASC noted that the need to know the controls in place will aid to mitigate future problems.

SECAS informed the TABASC that the TABASC Terms of Reference will be updated to formalise this duty.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the paper and **DISCUSSED** the TABASC role in monitoring Service Management and Reporting as set out above.

ACTION TABASC18/12: SECAS to provide analysis on the DCC Service Management reports provided to allow the TABASC to discuss trends and recurring issues.

Any Other Business (A.O.B.)

A TABASC Member raised an A.O.B. item in relation to PPMIDs and whether the TABASC should consider the likely deployment of PPMIDs in lieu of IHD's. The TABASC noted that the DCC should receive information of the number of PPMIDs to be installed via the demand forecasting. The TABASC also questioned whether the DCC has considered the change in volumes between IHD's and PPMIDs. DCC agreed to confirm whether the DCC System is impacted by the Supplier change to using PPMIDs from IHDs.

The TABASC member questioned whether the TABASC need to action this item or keep a watching brief.

ACTION TABASC18/13: DCC to confirm whether the DCC System is impacted by the change to PPMIDs from IHDs.

The TABASC Chair noted the joint Smart Metering Type 2 Device Risk & Opportunity Workshop between the SSC and the TABASC will be held on 23rd May 2017.

There were no further items and the TABASC Chair closed the meeting.

Items for Information

14. Modification Status Report – May 2017

The monthly Modification Status Report was provided to the TABASC for information to update them of the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the SEC Modification Process.