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_20x_0108, 1st August 2017

15:00 – 16:00, Teleconference

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

Attendees:

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

Representing	Other Participants
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	David Barber
	Kayla Reinhart

Absent	
DCC	Sylvia Ovie
Large Suppliers	Grahame Weir
Large Suppliers	Tim Newton
Small Suppliers	Kirk Hawksworth

1. DCC Release 2.0 Consultations – TABASC Response

Following the Release 2.0 Consultation being issued on 25th July 2017, the TABASC agreed to hold the ex-committee teleconference meeting to consider any areas that impact the Technical and Business Architecture and therefore, should be included as part of the SEC Panel's response or a specific TABASC response.

The TABASC Chair requested that the TABASC provide any observations or responses to the Release 2.0 Consultation from a Technical Architecture and/or Business Architecture point of view. The following matters were discussed by the TABASC:

Variants

A TABASC Member raised a concern over the number of planned Communications Hub variants within the consultation that will be introduced as part of Release 2.0, and observed that this will create management challenges and as yet an approach on how these will be handled has not yet been determined. This includes details on the timing of when devices will go into production and when updated single band Communications Hubs will be available. The TABASC Chair questioned whether this was in the TABASC's remit or if it was more of an operational challenge. It was noted that although the number of Communications Hub variants maybe a challenge from an operational point of view, it is outside of the TABASC scope. While it was a valid observation that there would be an increase in the number of device variants in operation, it was noted that the TABASC should not limit the number of variants so as to provide freedom for Suppliers to roll out smart metering and meet licence conditions as they wish.

Specific Communications Hub variant for Fylingdales

A TABASC Member queried the decision to develop a specific Communications Hub solution for the Fylingdales area. They believed it was not a major issue if it was the only way in which to ensure coverage in that area could be achieved. There was a discussion around whether single band Communications Hub would be deployed in this area, with views being expressed that this would not be the case, as noted in the consultation. There was also discussion around the costs of the specific solution, in the form of shared DCC charges. It was agreed though that cost impacts of the Release 2.0 plan and the Fylingdales solution was something to be raised with individual organisation responses rather than a TABASC response.

Battery life

The TABASC discussed its concern around battery life in relation to Devices operating Dual Band. The concern was that the 868 MHz frequency is slower, meaning that a Gas Meter operating on this frequency will need to be 'awake' for a longer period of time to process the Service Requests. This could potentially lead to the battery in the Gas Meter draining more quickly.

It was noted that the choice of what Gas Meter to use sits with the Supplier and it is up to them to ensure that it has sufficient battery capacity to enable it to meet the expected meter life-time, whichever frequency the Communications Hub is operating at. It was observed though that the matter may have consequential impacts or influence each Supplier's choice. The TABASC Chair informed the group that the matter was one for the purchasers of Devices (as battery capacity is not specified anywhere in the specifications) and as such was not in the remit of the TABASC. It was also agreed that as the scope of Release 2.0 sits under transitional governance that anything relating to Dual Band Communications Hubs should be raised at the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG). Therefore, the TABASC requested SECAS raise this risk at the next TBDG via the monthly SECAS update.

Testing

The TABASC also raised concerns around Release 2.0 testing and that the Release 2.0 Testing Approach Document Consultation did not provide sufficient detail around when and how it will be undertaken. SECAS noted that the Testing Advisory Group (TAG) will hold a meeting to discuss a response to the Release 2.0 Testing Approach Document Consultation on 9th August 2017 and any output from that meeting may feed into the SEC Panel consultation response. SECAS agreed to highlight the TABASC observation on the detail during the TAG meeting.

The TABASC Response

The TABASC concluded that there were no specific observations or concerns that would require a TABASC response to the Release 2.0 Consultation. Nor was there anything that needed to be fed back to the SEC Panel as part of its consideration of a response.

The TABASC **DISCUSSED** the Release 2.0 Consultation.

ACTION TABASC20x/01: SECAS to raise a risk to the TBDG based on TABASC discussions in relation to battery life and Dual Band Communications Hubs.

2. Operations Group Terms of Reference – Feedback

Following the July 2017 TABASC meeting, the TABASC were requested to provide feedback on the draft Terms of Reference for the Operations Group. SECAS informed the TABASC that two queries were raised in relation to Section 2 - Operations Group Duties and are outlined below.

It was questioned whether the TABASC's approach to undertaking a survey as part of the Effectiveness Review will conflict/duplicate the proposed duty for the Operations Group in relation to a DCC Customer Satisfaction Survey. SECAS noted that the proposed duty will not duplicate work as the purpose and outcomes will be focussed on different areas. However, both groups should be kept informed of the work going on for each of the duties. It was confirmed that no updates are required to the Terms of Reference for this matter.

Secondly, a TABASC Member noted that the duty in relation to acting as a sounding board for the DCC in assessing operational priorities for DCC Services should be in relation to future operational priorities. SECAS noted that this amendment had been included in the final draft of the Terms of Reference, which would be presented for approval at the August 2017 Panel meeting.

In addition, a TABASC Member questioned the frequency of the Operations Group and the need for the group to be dynamic with the ongoing activities. For example, it was noted that the timeframe around DCC implementing Releases is crucial and should be covered by an intensive period by the Operations group coming into each Release as well as immediately following a release. SECAS confirmed that the Operations Group will be an active group and, in addition to monthly meetings, the Terms of Reference enables the group to meet more frequently depending on the activities (such as, issues, Releases, etc.).

The TABASC **NOTED** and **DISCUSSED** feedback on the draft Terms of Reference for the Operations Group to be provided to the August 2017 SEC Panel for consideration.

3. TABASC_21_1708 Agenda – Modification Proposals confirmed for Discussion and Feedback

SECAS informed the TABASC that there will be no Modification Proposals brought to the August 2017 TABASC meeting for their feedback due to Working Group discussions and Preliminary

Assessment timeframes. It was noted that several Modification Proposals will be brought for the TABASC feedback at the September 2017 TABASC meeting. SECAS noted that further analysis on these modifications will be conducted to only request the TABASC feedback on the modifications that the TABASC have a particular interest in and/or where the Technical and Business Architecture are impacted.

In addition, SECAS highlighted the below main agenda items that will be brought to the August 2017 TABASC meeting.

- The final Business Architecture Document and Business Architecture Model, which was updated following feedback requested in August 2017;
- A update from the DCC to provide further information on each Change Requests going through; and
- A potential agenda item from BEIS to provide an overview of the 'Upgrading Our Energy System: Smart Systems and Flexibility Plan – Call for Evidence Question Summaries and Response from the Government and Ofgem'. SECAS noted that a request for a presentation was sent to BEIS; however, this agenda item has not been confirmed yet.

The TABASC **NOTED** the agenda items for August 2017 TABASC meeting.

4. Operational Risk Register Development Workshop – Proposed Date

SECAS proposed the date of 12th September 2017 from 10:00 – 16:00 to hold the workshop to further develop the Operational Risk Register. The majority of TABASC Members stated their availability on this day; however, it was noted that TABASC Members who are unavailable are invited to send an alternate to attend the workshop.

The TABASC **AGREED** the proposed date to hold the Operational Risk Register Development Workshop.

5. Any Other Business (A.O.B.)

A TABASC Member informed the group that the DCC are starting to communicate their approach to a development plan, which will be published later this year. It was noted that this plan may have impacts on the Technical and Business Architecture. Because of the potential implications, the TABASC requested for SECAS to invite the relevant representative from the DCC to present on the plan to the TABASC at the August 2017 TABASC meeting.

ACTION TABASC20x/02: SECAS to invite the relevant representative from the DCC to present on the development plan to the TABASC at the August 2017 TABASC meeting.

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