

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_31_2106, 21st June 2018

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

Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC)

Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	TABASC Members
TABASC Chair	Julian Hughes
Large Suppliers	Stephen Lovell
	Martin Bell (Alternate)
	Rochelle Harrison
	Emslie Law
	Stacey Brentnall
	Graham Weir
Small Suppliers	Andy Knowles
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton
Gas Networks	Leigh Page
Other SEC Parties	Tim Boyle
	Elias Hanna
Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Amanda Rooney
	Paul Cook (Part)
	Sylvia Ovie (Part)
BEIS	John Eager
SECAS	David Barber
	Kayla Reinhart
	Linda Martiri
	Rainer Lischetzki (Part)
	David Kemp (Part)

Apologies	
Large Supplier	Ashley Pocock
Absent	
Ofgem	Michael Walls

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Update
<p>TABASC23/01</p> <p>The TABASC Chair noted that further work is required between the Operations Group and the TABASC to ensure duties are not duplicated across the Sub-Committees.</p>	<p>A meeting took place between the Panel Chair and Sub-Committee Chairs on 23rd January 2018, to discuss the roles and responsibilities across Sub-Committees. A RASCI matrix has been undergoing further development to clarify and trace the duties and responsibilities of each Sub-Committee. Completion of the RASCI has been delayed due to SECAS resource focusing on the Business Architecture Document (BAD), Technical Architecture Document (TAD) review, the Effectiveness review questionnaire and recent issues with the DCC processing of Certified Products List (CPL) submissions. Specific resource has been set aside during the next quarter to discharge this activity, with forthcoming activities (such as Release test phase, go live and incentive scheme activities) being utilised as working examples to ensure the RASCI and associated information is complete and robust.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC24/08</p> <p>The DCC to provide further information on its approach to publishing the CR spreadsheet to industry.</p>	<p>The DCC provided a high-level update on the Change Management System under agenda item 2. The DCC noted that it would provide a more User focused overview of the Change Management Systems at the July 2018 TABASC meeting.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC27/03</p> <p>SECAS to inform the Panel of TABASC's discussions on what to expect as part of the set of handover information to be provided from BEIS following the go-live of transitional releases.</p>	<p>SECAS noted that BEIS had provided an update on the post Release go-live handover materials at the June Panel meeting. It was noted that the list of materials is currently very similar to those previously identified by TABASC. It was also noted that a process for identifying and seeking feedback on the handover materials was discussed. Further information on the process can be found in the June Panel minutes on 29th of June 2018 on the lead up to a transitional release going live. The timescales should enable Sub-Committee input on the specific handover material in advance of formal handover. The handover materials once confirmed would then be passed to the Panel to then action as appropriate.</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>

Administered by

<p>TABASC28/03</p> <p>The TABASC Chair to continue discussions with the Panel to determine the responsibility of the Release Implementation Document (RID).</p>	<p>Discussions are taking place, with the Panel Chair on the roles and responsibilities associated with enduring Release Management. These discussions include which elements from the BEIS stewardship function need to become enduring activities. A more detailed update will be provided at the July TABASC meeting.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC29/02</p> <p>SECAS to provide information on the November 2019 Release approach in relation to Technical Specification changes, including a clear rationale for the TABASC's consideration prior to the approach being brought to the SEC Panel for approval.</p>	<p>A verbal update was provided on the approach for the November 2019 Release following updates given at the June Panel meeting. The main matter to note being the agreement of the potential scope, subject to the subsequent approvals of the associated Modification Proposals, which is expected over the next couple of months. Engagement with relevant Sub-Committees, including TAG and the Ops Group, will also commence in August. There were questions regarding the likely costs of the Release and how they will be accepted.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC29/07</p> <p>SECAS to provide a plan at the July 2018 TABASC meeting for the capture of the BAD and TAD changes being required by the SMETS1 Service release.</p>	<p>The proposed initial plan for capturing the BAD and TAD changes required by the SMETS1 Service Release will be provided at the July TABASC meeting for consideration.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC29/08</p> <p>SECAS to provide further feedback to the DCC on the Unplanned Maintenance notification to enable action to be taken to improve the usefulness (in accordance with SEC Section H8.6) of the notifications to all recipients.</p>	<p>SECAS provided feedback to the DCC, on the Unplanned Maintenance notification to enable action to be taken to improve the usefulness (in accordance with Section H8.6) of the notifications to all recipients. The DCC received the TABASC feedback and have accepted the suggestions for future notifications.</p> <p>This action is superseded by TABASC30/06 below</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>

<p>TABASC30/01</p> <p>The DCC to provide a demonstration on the Change Management System at the June 2018 TABASC meeting.</p>	<p>DCC provided a high-level demonstration on the Change Management System under agenda item 2. The DCC noted that it would provide a more User focus overview of the change Management Systems at the July 2018 TABASC meeting.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC30/02</p> <p>The DCC to provide a demonstration on the Traffic Management system at the June 2018 TABASC meeting.</p>	<p>DCC provided an update on the Traffic Management system under agenda item 2.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC30/03</p> <p>The TABASC to escalate the Modification Proposal risk 10 to the SEC Panel for consideration.</p>	<p>The TABASC escalated TABASC 10¹ risk and its associated sub-risk to the June 2018 SEC Panel meeting as an issue as it was viewed as being a current issue.</p> <p>An update on the Panel discussions was covered under agenda item 6.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC30/04</p> <p>SECAS to provide the Effectiveness Review Questionnaire responses to the TABASC for analysis with feedback due by 4th June 2018 to inform whether subsequent actions are required.</p>	<p>SECAS provided the Effectiveness Review Questionnaire responses to the TABASC for analysis. No further TABASC feedback was received. An update on the Effectiveness Review Questionnaire was covered under agenda item 10.</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>
<p>TABASC30/05</p> <p>SECAS to scope out more detailed guidance on how specific disputes would be managed, and the outcome to be published on the SEC website.</p>	<p>A verbal update, including an overview of the steps taken, was provided at the June 2018 TABASC meeting in relation to guidance on how disputes will be managed.</p> <p>It was noted that a guidance document is being prepared to explain the process and will be published on the SEC Website in the future.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>

¹ TABASC 10 'DCC System is circumvented as making changes to it is too complicated'

<p>TABASC30/06</p> <p>SECAS to request further clarity from the DCC on how it determines whether to issue the notifications as 'Planned' or 'Unplanned' Maintenance notifications.</p>	<p>SECAS requested further clarity on the Unplanned Maintenance notifications from the DCC. An update on the DCC rationale was provided under agenda item 12.</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>
<p>TABASC30/07</p> <p>The TABASC agreed to invite the BEIS representatives to provide an overview of the feedback received on the consultation(s)² in order to inform whether there are any impacts on the Technical and/or Business Architecture.</p>	<p>This action was amended for clarity to identify the two consultations underway.</p> <p>First, involves the joint Ofgem-BEIS Smart Flexibility call for evidence from an expert perspective and includes the impacts of increased demand and usage of the DCC capacity to process Service Requests. SECAS is seeking an update from a BEIS representative to be provided at a future meeting to inform whether there are any impacts on the Technical and/or Business Architecture.</p> <p>Second, involves Ofgem's Significant Code Review (SCR) in relation to Half-Hourly Settlement, which ELEXON is leading from a cross-code impact perspective. The TABASC will keep a watching brief on the project until SECAS have discussed the matter with ELEXON to inform an appropriate time for when TABASC involvement is required.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>

2. DCC Update

June 2019 Update

SECAS and DCC provided an update on the June 2019 Release and associated planning activities. It was noted that the draft Release Implementation Document (RID) and Testing Approach Document (TAD) had been presented to the Panel, which had been based on discussions on the testing approach for the Release at recent TAG meetings. It was noted by DCC that initial proposals presented high costs for Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) and System Integration Testing (SIT), based on the TAG's agreed approach of testing with Devices and all potential device/firmware combinations, which were indicated to total around 2,000. It was noted that the Panel had pushed back on the high testing costs and asked for consideration to be given to a risk-based approach for testing device combinations. DCC noted that it had informed the Panel that it was pushing back on these costs and was also considering alternative testing methodologies, and revised costs would be presented to the July Panel.

A TABASC Member noted that analysis had occurred, which showed that the actual device/firmware combinations were much lower from a core functionality change perspective, and the majority of firmware versions only fix device defects. Therefore, the amount of combinations that needed to be tested should be significantly lower. DCC indicated that they would be issuing a request for information on the types of devices and versions of firmware that are expected to need to be supported, similar to that being done for the SMETS1 Release, in order to see if the assumptions on combinations is correct.

It was noted that details on the June 2019 Release testing approach of device combinations would be considered by the TAG. It was suggested that undertaking the full set of device/firmware combination testing could be seen as not efficient or economical and unnecessary, based on the risks involved. A TABASC Member suggested that DCC must consider the whole life costs of testing rather than just the DCC component, when considering new ways of testing, as while it may simplify DCC activities if testing all Devices was left to Suppliers, it may make it very difficult and costly and take a long time.

More generally, DCC noted that consideration was being given to how modifications could be grouped together. Currently the costing of a change is done individually with PIT and SIT being assessed for that individual modification. Once Modification Proposals are grouped together into a Release, the cost-benefit case may be enhanced or reduced. It was noted that the Panel will consider the scope of Releases to maximise efficiency through similar modifications being implemented at the same time. However, it is difficult as the nature of modifications being raised and the urgency to progress are at the behest of the Proposer.

It was noted by SECAS that the June 2019 Release is the first enduring Release under SEC governance, and there will be lessons to be learned from utilising the Panel Release Management Policy for the first time. A review will be undertaken following the June and November 2019 Releases to identify if further improvements can be made.

The TABASC queried whether it was right for the Panel to decide upon the scope of a Release without the input from its Sub-Committees, including assessing whether modifications should be grouped. SECAS advised that the timing of Sub-Committee input was being considered to ensure it occurs at the right time, while noting that the architectural impact of individual changes would be considered as part of the progression of individual Modification Proposals. It was noted that the timing of such engagement on individual modifications and Panel decision making requires improvement. Further updates would be provided at future TABASC meetings.

Change Management System Update

The DCC provided an update on the new DCC Change Management System, and it was noted that it was not possible to give a full demonstration this month due to the relevant DCC lead being unavailable, and instead would be given at the July meeting.

A brief overview was given with the DCC noting that the view TABASC members would have will be different due to different user capabilities. It was noted that details of DCC Change Requests (CR) including those associated with Modification Proposals would be present. It was noted that the format of the system, would show more recent CRs first, and would include delivery information and the delivery date of the CR deployment. The system would also indicate who was project management lead for each CR and the originator (e.g. BEIS or a Modification Proposal).

There was confirmation given that the system has reporting functionality that enables reports specific to Sub-Committee needs. DCC mentioned that the new system was expected to help improve the DCC's role in Modification Proposal progression timescales as it would automate certain activities. TABASC Members suggested that the users should be involved regarding its requirements as it is developed further.

Traffic Management System Update

The DCC provided an update on the work it has undertaken on the traffic management of Service Requests and Alerts sent via the DCC, on the basis that the DCC does not have infinite capacity to process Service Requests and associated Alerts. The DCC presented on the progress being made with the two solutions that are being progressed, and it was noted that CR330 covering northbound traffic management was currently undergoing DCC Impact Assessment with Service Providers and the Southbound traffic management approach undergoing Preliminary Impact Assessment with the DCC Service Providers. It was noted that the DCC was aiming to have the Northbound solution ready for Release 2.0. TABASC Members queried why this was being prioritised when existing defects that require prompt resolution were being pushed back to later this year, with the existing Parallel Processing defect being highlighted. DCC were unable to confirm. The DCC will provide an update on the Technical solution for the DCC enduring Production Proving Update at the July 2018 meeting

The DCC questioned the TABASC on what they would want to happen with the response code that is issued in the event of traffic management being deployed. It was noted that the existing HTTP '503' code would be utilised however there is the option for additional information to be included, in the form of a status field, that could be used to indicate the reason for the rejection. It was noted that such additional information would result in a new version of DUIS being required to be deployed by Users however it would be optional whether that information was used or not. Questions were also put to the DCC on the costs associated with providing such status information where it was confirmed there would be little difference in the price of providing the solution either way.

A question was asked whether there was a 'Plan B' for traffic management, with the DCC noting that there were no provisions in the SEC currently for traffic management and that if the associated Modifications Proposals do not progress and get approved there is currently no alternative plan.

TABASC Members observed that they would expect to see cost savings if the solution was deployed as the original contract was for the required capacity.

It was agreed that there was a need for guidance on traffic management generally to limit the need for DCC to technically limit throughput, but recognition and agreement that the specific procedural controls on when and how it would be used needed to be captured within the SEC.

The TABASC sought clarity on whether the traffic management would throttle alerts from individual devices or across multiple devices, with the DCC confirming that the proposed approach would throttle individual alert codes from individual devices rather than throttling across all Devices.

It was noted by the TABASC that the traffic management solution being proposed would provide the ability to define certain Service Requests as not to be constrained by traffic management, and therefore would negate the requirement for SECMP0028 'Prioritising Service Requests'. As a result, it was noted that the Modification would continue to be on hold until such time as the functionality has been confirmed.

ACTION TABASC31/01: DCC to provide an update on the Technical solution for the DCC enduring Production Proving Update should be provided at the July 2018 meeting.

Release 2.0 Communications Hubs and CHTS version 1.0 compliance.

The DCC requested the TABASC to provide views on whether Release 1.2 Communications Hubs were compliant with the Communication Hub Technical Specification version 1.0, that was designated and in place at the time of Release 1.2.

The request for the TABASC view had been prompted by Operations Group discussions around the upgrading of early Communications Hubs. It was noted that the Operations Group had requested that the DCC raised the matter with TABASC.

It was observed that it was not appropriate for the TABASC to give a view on the matter without a prior request from the Panel and which would need to be prompted by a view and position provided by DCC to the Panel.

The TABASC did advise though that if and when the DCC undertakes activities to inform its view and position to the Panel, that the DCC double checks the test scope and evidence it holds on the matter.

A TABASC Member requested that the DCC provide an update to be given on T3 Aerials and the progress being made with them.

ACTION TABASC31/02: DCC update to be provided on T3 Aerials at a future meeting

The TABASC **NOTED** the DCC Update.

3. Sub-Committee Update

The TABASC chair provided an update on recent SSC meeting discussions. It was specifically noted that the SSC had requested views from the TABASC Members on the average load requirements of Non-Domestic Suppliers to ascertain the scale of impact if there was a sudden loss of consumption due to an attack on a Non-Domestic Supplier system. An assumption of an average of 10kW load is being used at the moment.

TABASC concluded that the load value does not get recorded anywhere, with the information only being used for billing purposes. What a supplier records is based around what the customer says they need, subject to demand changes increasing or decreasing over time.

It was noted that the reason for the question was relating to how Non-Domestic Suppliers are treated with respect to CIO assessments. As Non-Domestic consumers may have more ambient load than Domestic consumers, if a large number of sites were to go off supply it has the potential to destabilise the grid. Therefore, the SSC are considering whether the trigger to become a Large Supplier should be lowered.

The TABASC Chair noted that there were no items of SMKI PMA business to highlight to the TABASC.

TABASC was updated on Operations Group discussions, highlighting that the DCC had indicated that there was a need to dispose and recycle a certain amount of Communications Hubs with the Operations Group pushing back on the costs for doing this as they considered the matter to be a defect with the Communications Hubs. Further details on this are covered under the DCC Update.

It was also noted that the Operations Group had discussed data quality issues and misalignment of DCC held data versus what Suppliers hold. With the misalignment being attributed to the processing of Registered Data Provider (RDP) data by the DCC Service Providers. It was also observed that certain data used by the Communication Service Providers for Wide Area Network (WAN) coverage was based on Ordinance Survey information rather than the information used by registration data, resulting in discrepancies in the information provided on the Self-Service Interface (SSI).

The TABASC **NOTED** the Sub-Committee Update.

4. BEIS Update

BEIS noted the recent publications below:

- Government response to consultation on regulatory changes to enable SMETS1 enrolment issued 4th June 2018;
- R2.0 Testing Approach Documents, consultation issued on 5th June 2018 on the re-designation and approval of the updated Device Integration testing and User Interface Testing Approach Documents;
- Technical Specification designations of GBCS v2.1, v3.1 and re-designation of GBCS v3.0, DUIS v2.0 and the Technical Specification Applicability Tables on 5th June 2018;
- Re-designation of ETAD and CTSD for Release 2.0 on 8th June 2018;
- Direction letter for the re-designation of SEC Appendices B and M to permit Production Proving on 8th June 2018; and
- Consultation on the removal of the transitional variation preventing the ordering of Dual Band Communications Hubs was issued on 11th June 2018.

BEIS noted the following future consultation activity due to be published:

- A Direction letter on the re-designating of the SEC Variation Testing Approach Document (SVTAD) for Release 2.0 was expected to be issued on 26th June 2018;
- A consultation on the DCC Project Incentive Scheme for SMETS1 Enrolment & Adoption is expected to be issued by the end of June 2018;
- The Direction letter removing Transitional Variation which prevented ordering of DBCH is expected to be issued on the 3rd July 2018;
- The quarterly statistics report for April to June 2018, is expected to be published in August 2018; and
- Consultation(s) on final designations, covering the User Interface Services Schedule (UISS) and the Service Request Process Document (SRPD) and transitional variation removals for R2.0 is expected to be issued in August 2018.

The TABASC **NOTED** the BEIS Update.

5. SEC Issue Process – SEC0001 ‘Clarification of DLMS Fixed length fields’

SECAS provided an overview of the SEC Issues Process to the TABASC. It was noted that most of the issues raised with SECAS thus far were more questions than actual issues. The first issues to require discussion being (SEC0001) being the one brought to TABASC for discussion.

TABASC suggested that the Issues Log needs to be made available and visible to Parties so everyone can view the information contained within it. The TABASC also discussed capturing the list of Issue Resolution Proposal (IRPs) that had been passed to SECAS from transitional governance to be progressed via Modification Proposal for inclusion in future Releases. It was agreed and noted that the Issues Log would contain all issues raised with SECAS regardless of route and it would include indicating which Modification Proposal the IRP is or will form part of.

It was also agreed that the SECAS Issue Log should be extended to include the BEIS transitional issues in the future, once the BEIS run process is closed down. It was observed that the sensible point for the transitional issues process to be stopped would be following the implementation of the SMETS1 Service Release or possibly DCC Release 4.

SECAS noted that following feedback from the TABASC, revisions could be applied to the Issues Register, including changes to improve readability prior to publication.

The TABASC then discussed SEC issue 0001 (SEC0001) with SECAS talking through the issue and highlighting that there may be discrepancies in how:

- the device manufacturer had interpreted the requirements;
- what GCBS requires;
- what DUIS requires; and
- what the DCC Data Service Provider was doing with the requirements.

In relation to DLMS Field Lengths of data items in the Service Request used to set ‘season’.

The BEIS Representative noted that the matter had been previously considered on the transitional issue process and indicated the BEIS view was that the DLMS field length was not a set length but an ‘up limit’.

The TABASC concluded that the issue seemed to relate to the transitional releases and as such should be transferred for progression under the BEIS transitional issue process. The transfer of the issue would also enable the speedy progression with the involvement of the affected parties (e.g. Suppliers and Device manufacturers) through discussion of the matter at TSIRS.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **DISCUSSED** the Issue identified and agreed that it should be transferred to BEIS for progression via the transitional issues management process.

ACTION TABASC31/03: SECAS to transfer SEC Issue 1 (SEC0001) to BEIS to progress under transitional issue governance.

ACTION TABASC31/04: SECAS to show how the issue will be progressed in a timely fashion with TABASC in future.

ACTION TABASC31/05: SECAS to provide an update of all the other issues on the web site.

6. TABASC Risk Register

SECAS provided an update on the TABASC risks and associated risk management plans that the TABASC Risk Register have agreed to retain and monitor.

SECAS highlighted that the risk management plan for TABASC Risk 3, has been amended to recognise that some of the activities associated with the risk and sub risks would be achieved through the TABASC Effectiveness Review.

SECAS updated the TABASC on the newly proposed TABASC Risk 10, and the two Sub-Risks 10.1 and 10.2 relating to it being too difficult to make changes to the DCC System. The concern is that the DCC System will be too costly and take too long to implement change and as a result the DCC will stagnate and be circumvented. It was noted that the issue arising from the risk had been escalated to the Panel for consideration which was accepted by the Panel. However, TABASC raised concerns that the mitigations identified did not cover the whole issue, with it being observed that the Section D review of the Modification Process would only aid certain parts of the issue. It was observed that the issue would be revisited at the July Panel meeting, as the progress of the Section D review was being discussed and would enable further consideration of the issue mitigations. It was agreed that an update would be provided at the next TABASC meeting in July on the Panel discussions of the issue.

ACTION TABASC31/06: SECAS to provide an update on the Panel discussions around the escalated Panel Issue 2 at the next TABASC meeting.

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

7. Release 2.0 Business Architecture Document Project Update

This monthly update covers the activities undertaken in May 2018 in support of the Release 2.0 Business Architecture Document (BAD) update project. The report includes an update on resources used and expenditure to date.

It was noted that the remaining activity was the approval of the BAM changes, covered under the next agenda item.

The TABASC questioned the timing of the BAM publication, with it being noted that it would occur following the application of any final updates, including housekeeping changes actioned outside of the project to improve the end user experience of the BAM. The TABASC agreed that publication should occur as soon as possible once the updates are completed.

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

8. Approval of Release 2.0 BAM Updates

SECAS presented the Release 2.0 BAM changes for final approval, noting that no comments were received on the changes during the industry review period.

The TABASC questioned how the Release 2.0 specific processes would be differentiated from existing processes. SECAS noted that options were being explored and would be actioned in advance of final publication. TABASC Members suggested colour coding as an easy to understand option and suggested that if SECAS were unsure of what approach to go with, options could be put to TABASC for consideration.

The TABASC approved the BAM changes and noted that the updates will be finalised in the draft BAM. This will then be followed by the activities to uplift the content within the draft model to the live

model in advance of Release 2.0 going live. When updated, communications will be issued notifying Parties of the republished live model.

The TABASC:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **APPROVED** the Release 2.0 Business Architecture Model changes.

9. Release 2.0 Technical Architecture Document Project Update

This monthly update covers the activities undertaken in May 2018 in support of the Release 2.0 TAD (Technical Architecture Update) projects. The report includes an update on resources used and expenditure to date.

It was noted that the report should be the last TAD update report, as the Release 2.0 version of the TAD had been published on the SEC Website alongside the original versions. SECAS noted that supplementary communications would be issued highlighting the publication of the TAD.

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

10. Effectiveness Review Update

The TABASC were provided with an updated set of Effectiveness Review questionnaire, following the May TABASC meeting where it was agreed that revisions to the questions should be made to enable more focused responses. The TABASC also discussed whether action should be taken with the feedback received during the first round of the questionnaire.

The TABASC agreed the investigative actions as a result of responses received to the Effectiveness Review questionnaire should be paused until the questionnaire is re-issued in September 2018. The TABASC agreed with the proposed amendments to the Effectiveness Review Questionnaire, subject to minor additional amendments to merge questions that related to the Central and South Communication Service Provider (CSP) regions.

It was agreed that going forward that alongside the questionnaire and the pdf version of the questions, generated from Survey Monkey, that a word version of the questions would be made available to enable respondents to more easily formulate and collate feedback prior to completing the online questionnaire. The questionnaire would be reissued in mid-September for four weeks.

The TABASC

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper;
- **AGREED** that actions with responses received to the Effectiveness Review questionnaire should be paused until after the questionnaire is re-issued in September 2018; and
- **AGREED** amendments to the Effectiveness Review Questionnaire.

11. TABASC Activity Planner

The Activity Planner has been provided to the TABASC to manage its duties, time, and required expert support, highlighting up and coming activities.

The spreadsheet has been amended and the ongoing actions have been filtered out in order to show the current more precisely.

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

12. DCC Planned Unplanned Maintenance Information

SECAS highlighted that since the May 2018 TABASC meeting, no DCC Unplanned Maintenance notifications were issued, although one instance of unplanned maintenance was rescheduled and has consequently been re-classified as DCC Planned Maintenance.

SECAS also highlighted that from June 2018 and going forwards the paper has been expanded to include any DCC Planned Maintenance notifications issued since the last TABASC meetings.

The TABASC commented on the additional information on why recent instances of unplanned maintenance had been treated as such, with it being observed that the rationale lacked detail. A TABASC Member observed that the use of unplanned maintenance was due to the DCC running out of planned maintenance in a given month.

The DCC highlighted the recent request to the Panel around changes to the Planned maintenance approach over the next few months, which would involve approximately 1 full day of Planned Maintenance a week until October 2018. The rationale for this approach being to have the DCC Systems fully ready for Release 2.0 go-live and to ensure that users could commence rollout activities following Release 2.0 going live. It was noted that a consultation had been issued and the matter was still being considered by the Panel.

The TABASC provided feedback that the format for the DCC Planned Maintenance notifications should be aligned the same as the format for DCC Unplanned Maintenance notifications. The DCC agreed that they would action this feedback. It was also noted that changes were being put in place so that future notifications would be in plain English to aid user understanding, with the former approach of copying and pasting information provided by the DCC Service Providers coming to an end.

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

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

No items of A.O.B were raised.

14. Transitional Governance Update

The Transitional Governance Update is a compendium of activities occurring in the Smart Metering Implementation Programme (SMIP). The paper provides a high-level overview of any relevant publications, responses and consultations issued by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), the Data Communications Company (DCC), and Ofgem, in relation to smart metering, whilst highlighting areas which may be of interest to the SEC Panel and/or SEC Parties.

15. Change Status Report – June 2018

The monthly Modification Status Report, covering the period between the April 2018 and May 2018 SEC Panel meetings, was provided to the TABASC for information to update them of the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the SEC Modification Process.