Meeting 02_3103, 31st March 2014 at 10am

Gemserv, 10 Fenchurch Street, London, EC3M 3BE

FINAL Minutes

Attendees:

Participants	Representing
Ashley Pocock	EDF Energy
Dave Smith	Npower
Samantha Cannons	SSE
Steven Bradford	Flow Energy Ltd
Simon Yeo	Western Power Distribution
Helen Boothman	TMA Data Management Ltd
Simon Bevis	Utilita Energy Ltd

Other Participants	Representing
Amanda Rooney	Ofgem (the Authority)
Peter Dell'Osa	DECC
Matthew Roderick	DCC
Ken McRae (Chair)	SECAS (Gemserv)
Natalia Sandomierska (Meeting Secretary)	
Rebecca Mottram	

Apologies:

Change Board Member	Representing
Graham Wood	British Gas
Martin White	Northern Powergrid
Joanna Ferguson	Northern Gas Networks
Iain Matthews	Scottish Power
Alex Travell	E.ON
Dora Ianora	Ofgem (the Authority)

1. Minutes of Change Board Meeting 01_0302

The Chair invited the Change Board to provide any comments on the Draft Minutes from Meeting 01_0302.

DECC requested that the role of the Technical Business Design Group (TBDG) be clarified under agenda item two of the minutes. DECC highlighted that any design changes or issues raised to DECC's SMIP Helpdesk will only be considered by the TBDG at the discretion of DECC. Further noting, DECC will issue a sentence for inclusion in the minutes following this meeting.

One Change Board Member requested for more detail to be included on the Modification Process and the different Modification Paths that were discussed under agenda item two.

Subject to the agreed changes, the Change Board approved the minutes as written.

2. Actions Update

The Chair provided an update on all the actions outstanding from the previous meeting, highlighting that all actions apart from action SECCB01/04 had been closed off and some of the actions would be discussed in greater detail under the respective agenda items.

With regards to action SECCB01/04, SECAS highlighted that, following discussions with the website developers, an online discussion forum is not currently an available feature but explained that this function could be integrated into a subsequent release of the Website as part of a wider enhancement project. SECAS proposed to keep this action as ongoing and a paper will be brought to a future Panel meeting outlining this feature and other possible changes that could be considered in a future release. SECAS noted that an online discussion forum on the Website may also be of merit to the other Sub-Committees, once established.

SECAS welcomed Parties to contact the SECAS Helpdesk with any feedback or ideas for future enhancements and features to the Website.

3. Modification Process Guidance Material Feedback

SECAS introduced the agenda item, highlighting that the feedback received for action SECCB01/02 had been incorporated into the Modification Process guidance documents that were circulated to all Change Board Members following the last meeting.

SECAS thanked the eight Members for their time in submitting their comments and noted that redlined versions of these guidance documents had been attached as appended papers (SECCB_02_3103_03a-e) which were issued in advance of the meeting.

SECAS presented a high level overview of the main comments set out in the paper and the subsequent amendments that had been made to each of the five Modification Process guidance documents by SECAS.

3.1 Modification Proposal Form Template

SECAS introduced the Modification Proposal Form template, outlining a high level overview of the feedback received as set out in Table 1 in SECCB_02_3103_03 and the subsequent amendments that had been made to the template in line with the comments.

One Change Board Member asked whether the Proposer needs to provide justification for their choices of identified impacts, particularly in cases where the form includes a tick box answer. SECAS

clarified that a Proposer is required to provide reasons in the commentary section for each of the impact assessment statements, including those with tick boxes.

In reference to the Statement of Impact on Central Systems, the DCC recommended that a glossary for the common terminology is appended to the Modification Proposal Form in order to ensure the Proposer has a good understanding of the terms, particularly when referring to Central Systems when completing the form.

The Change Board agreed for SECAS to develop a glossary of the common terminology which will be appended to the Modification Proposal Form.

3.2 Stage Modification Report Templates (Initial, Draft and Final)

SECAS introduced the Modification Report templates, outlining the main feedback points received as set out in Table 2 in SECCB_02_3103_03 and the subsequent amendments that had been made to the templates in line with the comments.

SECAS highlighted comment number one in Table 2 from SSE on the Initial Modification Report that raised a suggestion whether it would be sufficient for SECAS to prepare a cover sheet with their written views for the Panel's Initial Assessment instead of a full report in the form of the Initial Modification Report. This cover sheet would be submitted together with the Modification Proposal to the Panel.

SECAS explained its reasons for keeping an Initial Modification Report, stating that an Initial Modification Report provides consistency and streamlines the reporting. SECAS also highlighted that there is merit in having one document rather than two, a cover sheet and Modification Proposal.

The Change Board agreed with the responses provided by SECAS and the Initial Modification Report will remain in its current report format.

One Change Board Member raised the question whether all sections of the Draft Modification Report will need to be completed. SECAS clarified that certain sections of the Draft Modification Report will only apply in the event of a Refinement Process, i.e. Working Group Assessment in section 8 of the Draft Modification Report. SECAS also noted that in these cases, guidance text is included under each of those sections.

The Change Board inquired about the possibility of SECAS adding further clarity on which sections of the Modification Report are mandatory and which are conditional.

Following this question, the Change Board discussed what the process should be in the event that sections of the Draft/Final Modification Reports are not completed. A question was raised on whether a section which has not been completed should be subject to SECAS's evaluation before being issued for Panel and/or Change Board for determination. Additionally, what would happen in a situation where the Change Board are not comfortable with the information presented to them in the Final Modification Report and believe more refinement is required or where the Modification Report Consultation has not generated responses instilling confidence to the Change Board. Concerns were also raised on the impact that these situations would have on the timetable.

SECAS highlighted their role as a Critical Friend in the Modification Process and explained that they have a duty of care in making sure all Modification Proposals are critically evaluated before being processed through to the next Modification Report stage. Furthermore, SECAS explained that in a situation where consultation responses are incomplete or insufficient responses are received, SECAS will seek to contact respondents directly to clarify the points that are unclear and in situations where it

is deemed necessary, will attempt to contact Parties that have not provided a Consultation Response, enquiring about their views.

The Chair highlighted to the Change Board the need to consider processes that facilitate a transparent Modification Process in terms of reporting and ensuring visibility of when Modifications are amended through the process. Additionally, working procedures need to be established for Working Groups to take into account how discussions from the meetings are recorded and incorporated into the Modification Reports.

Ofgem stated that under the experience of other Codes, the timescale from when a Modification Proposal is raised to when it is issued to the Authority for approval can sometimes take up to a year on complex changes. Therefore, it would be useful to incorporate change history into the Modification Reports to avoid having to review a number of reports from different points in the process. The Change Board discussed how it would be beneficial to include change history of the point in the process the Modification was changed, by whom this change has been made and the date of the change.

SECAS agreed to make the necessary changes in line with these discussions and to look into how the Change History could be made more visible in the templates. SECAS further highlighted that the Modification Register is also designed to show these changes, illustrating how the Modification Proposal has been modified over time and the dates these amendments were made.

One Change Board member queried whether information in the Modification Register would be available to everyone on the Website or only to the Change Board. SECAS clarified that the Modification Register is publicly available but further down the line, a detailed track history could be developed in a members' only area.

The Change Board discussed what would happen in the event Modification Proposals of similar nature were raised. One Change Board member suggested that both Proposers should be made aware of this type of event and asked whether they would consider raising one Modification Proposal together. SECAS highlighted that under such circumstances, it would be recommended that Panel send both Modification Proposals for discussion to the same Working Group.

3.3 Informal booklet Guide to the SEC Modification Process

SECAS introduced the informal guide, outlining the main feedback points received as set out in Table 3 in SECCB_02_3103_03 and the subsequent amendments that have been made to this document in line with the comments.

Ofgem noted that under section one, the Authority is listed as one of the other bodies which can raise Modifications. However, Ofgem noted that only on limited occasions may they raise Modifications and requested SECAS to provide further clarity in the guidance materials.

Ofgem also noted that on page four of the guide, the statement on the 12 Principles of the Code Administrator Code of Practice (CACoP) needs to be amended to reflect that these were established by the industry and not Ofgem.

DECC noted that as in the case of the draft minutes from the last Change Board meeting 01_0302, the statement of the Transition Work Groups needs to be amended to reflect that only at the discretion of DECC will the Transition Work Groups assess any design changes or issues raised for draft/baseline SEC text during the Transition phase of the programme.

One Change Board Member highlighted that on page four, the statement referring to the Smart Metering Delivery Group (SMDG) needed to be amended to illustrate that the SMDG resolves issues

escalated by the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG) and Implementation Managers Forum (IMF). SECAS noted the point and stated the amendment would be made to the document.

The Change Board discussed that the Transitional Security Expert Group (TSEG) should be listed as one of the transitional groups on page four of the guide, highlighting the security angle of the transitional arrangements. The Change Board also suggested that SECAS includes a view of all DECC's Transitional Work Groups and provides a view of which groups will fit into the Enduring Sub-Committees.

3.4 Formal Procedure on SEC Modification Process - Part 1

SECAS introduced the formal procedure, outlining the main feedback points received as presented in Table 4 of SECCB_02_3103_03 and the subsequent amendments that have been made to this document in line with the comments.

SECAS highlighted that more explanation on the Alternative Modification Process, and situations when Alternative Modification Proposals may be raised, including the source and preference for Alternative Proposals had been incorporated into a new section 3.5.8.1 in the Formal Procedure document.

One Change Board Member asked if Modification Proposals could be regarded as Alternative Proposals where there is one solution but three different implementation dates. SECAS clarified that this would not be regarded as an Alternative Proposal but as one with three different implementation dates. However, Change Board discussed that variations in the implementation date in a Modification Proposal should be captured and reviewed at the beginning of the Modification Process rather than at the end.

3.5 SEC Consultation Response Form

SECAS introduced the Consultation Response Form, highlighting that it had been developed following a comment raised by SSE which suggested that it would be beneficial to have the Change Board's feedback on the Response Form which Parties will use to submit their impact assessment during the Modification Report Consultation phase.

SECAS explained that the format of the SEC Consultation Response Form has been developed in keeping with the SEC branding and the Modification Proposal and Reports format.

SECAS noted that the respondents to the consultation will have to include commentary on their reasons behind their decisions. SECAS also highlighted that the Consultation Response Form will be issued to Parties together with a Draft Modification Report.

SECAS highlighted that the SEC Consultation Response Form is a Draft Template which will evolve with time as Modifications are processed.

The Change Board had no further comments and approved the Draft Templates, acknowledging that they will evolve with the staged delivery of the SEC.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** for some additional amendments to be incorporated into the SEC Modification Process guidance materials.

ACTION SECCB02/01: SECAS to incorporate the additional feedback that was raised in the meeting into the Modification guidance materials.

ACTION SECCB02/02: SECAS to provide more information and clarity on the current DECC Transition Work Groups and how they will be integrated into the SEC in the Enduring phase.

4. Testing the SEC Modification Process

4.1 Recap of the Modification Process

SECAS presented the next agenda item, highlighting the intent was to test the Modification Process under current arrangements for the Enduring phase of the Programme.

The first part of the presentation provided a recap of the enduring arrangements of the Modification Process; Modification Process Steps, Modification Paths and the role of the Change Board in the Process, available for download on the Website (SECCB_02_3103_04).

4.2 Testing the SEC Modification Process

In the second part of the presentation, SECAS introduced the Modification Proposal example which had been submitted by Northern Powergrid. The Modification Proposal suggested amendment to the Payment of Charges Timescales to the DCC (SEC J1.4).

One Change Board Member queried whether the statement of impact on likely Party Categories would only refer to negative impacts. SECAS clarified that the Proposer should evaluate both impacts and specify in the narrative section for each statement of impact, whether it refers to a positive or negative impact.

With reference to the Modification Proposal example, the Change Board discussed whether only the DCC would be negatively impacted by the implementation of the Proposed Modification. The Change Board concluded that any negative impact on the DCC would have subsequent effects on other Party Categories over time, for example which may be reflected in higher charges to Users.

One Change Board Member highlighted that the Modification Proposal example was a topic that has been widely consulted on in the industry in the past. Subsequently, this brought the Change Board to discuss the issue of new Proposals being raised which have been previously raised and rejected under the process or covered by industry consultations.

The Change Board concluded that it should be the role of SECAS acting as a Critical Friend to investigate whether a Modification Proposal has been previously raised or discussed through industry consultation. When preparing the Initial Modification Report, SECAS should make the Proposer aware of any similar Modifications raised in the past and ask the Proposer to provide sufficient grounds and reasons for wanting to raise a new Proposal.

The Change Board also said that when SECAS presents the Modification for Initial Panel Assessment, SECAS should provide the Panel with all the background information. If the Panel believe there is sufficient ground for the Modification to be processed then the Change Board cannot question this decision but will have to vote on it based on the information that is presented to them at the time. The Change Board noted they would assume SECAS would advise the Panel on any Modifications previously processed or discussed under industry consultations in the past.

Ofgem noted that there are provisions in other Codes for a “cooling-off” period during which Modification Proposals that have been previously rejected cannot be raised as new Modification Proposals.

One Change Board Member suggested that a statement in the guidance materials could be included advising potential Proposers to take into account that Modification Proposals that have previously been raised and issued for industry consultation will have to provide sufficient reasons for the Modification Proposal to be assessed again.

DECC advised that a potential Pre-Change stage could be developed and SECAS responded, stating that a Pre-Change Process had been briefly mentioned in the guidance materials as a future stage in the process that requires further discussion.

Ofgem highlighted that the term implementation timetable in the presentation of the Modification Proposal example could be misleading and presumes that all Modifications will be implemented. SECAS acknowledged this feedback and will make the necessary amendments to the slides and guidance materials before issuing to Parties. An alternative term suggested by the Change Board was Modification Timetable.

One Change Board Member suggested that SECAS provides more clarity on the definition of this timetable which refers to the time from when a Modification Proposal is received to when it is processed through to the Change Board and Authority for approval.

In addition, a Change Board Member highlighted that before a Modification Timetable is set, there needs to be some due diligence made around the timescales for the Modification Process for the specific Modification Proposal, taking into account any potential refinements.

A Change Board Member inquired whether the Change Board would receive any updates on the Modification Proposals in advance of voting. The Change Board discussed that it would be of merit for the Modification Process, for the Change Board to have an early involvement and oversight. Given that the Change Board has been in place in advance of the Enduring arrangements and been involved in developing the procedures, the Change Board agreed there was advantage in them having earlier involvement in Modification Proposals in the process and further discussions should be had at the next meeting in terms of developing a Pre-Change Process.

The Change Board discussed the timetables of Modification Proposals, highlighting that if a timetable is going to slip then this should be highlighted early on in the process so the timescales can be adjusted, and not just allowed to slip. SECAS should do pre-scrutiny of the Modification Proposal and pass on this information to the Panel in the Initial Modification Report. The Change Board agreed that having a pre-scrutiny element of the Modification Proposal should reduce the risk of variations to the timetable.

Ofgem highlighted that in other Codes, Modifications have extensive impact assessments and some also have pre-modification scrutiny before being issued for industry consultation. The Change Board discussed that in other Codes, Change Board equivalents have an early involvement in the Modification Process whilst in the SEC their involvement is set out in the later part of the Modification Process.

There was a general consensus amongst the Change Board Members present, that an early involvement in the Modification Process would be an advantage. It was agreed that having visibility of Modification Proposals prior to the Initial Modification Report being sent to the Panel would allow the Change Board to meet its obligations set out in section D8.2 (a) of the Code which states that the function of the Change Board is to facilitate the development, refinement and discussion of potential variations to the Code prior to their formal submission as Modification Proposal.

SECAS highlighted that the role of the Change Board's early involvement in the Modification Process, subject to the Panel's approval, would be to support the Panel by providing their view. The Panel

would still be the body deciding on whether a Modification should be progressed, the Path Type the Modification should follow, whether it was subject to the Refinement Process and so forth.

Following these discussions, the Change Board requested SECAS prepares a paper setting out the arrangements for a Pre-Change Process to be discussed further at the next Change Board meeting.

On slide 12 of the presentation, SECAS outlined a list of potential Working Group and Modification Report Consultation questions, in relation to the Modification Proposal example. The Change Board agreed that there would be case specific questions developed by the Working Groups but agreed these as sufficient core questions.

On slide 15 of the presentation, SECAS outlined a list of General SEC Objectives for the Change Board to discuss, highlighting that the Modification Proposer selected the seventh General SEC Objective in the Modification Proposal Form as the SEC Objective that the Modification Proposal would better facilitate the achieve of, if implemented.

The Change Board discussed whether the Proposed Modification better facilitates any of the other SEC objectives. A number of Change Board Members believed the fourth SEC Objective to facilitate effective competition between persons engaged in, or in Commercial Activities connected with, the Supply of Energy, would be a better alternative.

One Change Board member raised the question whether the Change Board may propose an alternative SEC Objective and what would be the process and implications on time, if this was to happen under the SEC.

Ofgem stated that they consider all of the Objectives when reviewing a Modification and noted that in some Codes, the objectives are set at the Final Modification Report stage of the Modification Process.

The Change Board discussed and questioned whether the reasons in the Modification Proposal example provided by the Proposer would be acceptable reasons. The Proposer outlined in the statement of how a proposed variation would be better facilitating the achievement of the SEC objective that the present timescales were inconvenient to all SEC Parties and not efficient for Parties in administration of the Code.

The Change Board agreed that inconvenient is not a suitable justification and should as an example, refer to factors such as cost, delay, inefficiency. SECAS highlighted their role as a Critical Friend, stating that they would review the Modification Proposals before compiling the Initial Modification Report. In this situation, SECAS would request the Modification Proposer review their statement on the basis of the above feedback.

The Chair raised the point of how adversely impacted SEC Objectives are recognised and facilitated in the SEC.

One Change Board Member inquired about the possibility of including flow charts of the timescales between the different stages of the Modification Process. SECAS responded saying that it would be difficult to provide a universal flow due to the varying nature and timescales of Modifications under the SEC.

One Change Board Member raised the question what would happen in the event the Change Board did not agree with the implementation timetable in the Final Modification Report and what the procedure would be if this occurred.

SECAS stated there will be a number of touch points in the Modification Process to review this and by the time a Modification Proposal is ready for the Change Board to vote on, the Modification Report should have captured the timescale necessary to implement the change.

With regards to the Change Board's consideration of the Final Modification Report, one Change Board Member raised the question what would the procedure be in the event the Change Board requires further clarity or analysis. SECAS responded that they will actively seek to explore any unclear responses prior to submitting the Final Modification Report to the Change Board. However, in the event the Change Board requires further clarity, the Change Board may request further information to be obtained by SECAS or make a recommendation to the Panel stating that Change Board considers returning the Modification Proposal to the Working Group for further clarification.

The Change Board discussed the process of voting and discussed the grounds for abstaining to vote. One Change Board member raised the question whether they can abstain in the case they believe there is no impact on their Party.

The Authority responded saying that it is very rare for Modifications to not have an instrumental impact on one Party only. All Parties would to some degree be affected by Modifications.

The importance of recording votes and providing reasons for the vote were also discussed by the Change Board. DECC explained that the reason for recording the reason is for the Authority (Ofgem) to be able to assess whether the voter has provided a viable reason, justification and is acting in the best interest of their Party Category or Voting Group.

4.3 Modifications to SEC Subsidiary Documents

The third part of the presentation on "Testing the SEC Modification Process" covered the topic of Modifications to SEC Subsidiary Documents. SECAS highlighted the need for building up the configuration picture of the Smart arrangements including the working arrangements with those bodies outside SEC Panel governance such as DCC, Communication Service Provider (CSP) and Data Service Provider (DSP), given that some of the SEC Subsidiary Documents will sit outside the governance of the SEC Panel.

SECAS also highlighted the need to understand the 'types' of changes that may be expected in the future so that their impacts on the SEC and SEC Subsidiary Documents can be identified.

The Change Board recognised the importance of understanding how the technical assessment of future Modification Proposals would be achieved and integrated into the Modification Process, such as developing strong working arrangements with SEC Sub-Committees such as the Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) and Security Sub-Committee (SSC).

The DCC requested that SECAS clarifies in slide 19, that the listed Technical Specification Documents are examples of some of the Technical Specification Documents.

The DCC inquired about the source of the finalised dates on slide 20, referring to a number of Technical Specification Documents. SECAS clarified that these are indicative dates taken from the Cross Sector Product Inventory (CSPI) version 1.2 as published by DECC. The DCC requested that SECAS clarifies that these are indicative dates prior to publishing these slides and highlighted the need for careful consideration of the use of terminology related to the status of these documents, whether these are finalised or baselined.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper;
- **AGREED** that SECAS incorporates the discussed amendments to the guidance materials; and

- **AGREED** that SECAS develops a straw man of how a Pre-Change Process can be introduced under the SEC in the Enduring phase, including the introduction of Change Board's early sight of a Modification Proposal.

ACTION SECCB02/03: SECAS to incorporate the suggested amendments to the guidance materials before uploading it on to the Website.

ACTION SECCB02/04: SECAS to develop a straw man of how a Pre-Change Process can be introduced under the SEC in the Enduring phase, including the introduction of Change Board's early sight of a Modification Proposal.

5. Establishing Working Arrangements in the Modification Process with the Technical Sub-Committee

SECAS introduced the agenda item, highlighting that this paper had been prepared at the request of the Panel at the February 2014 Panel meeting in order to obtain the Change Board's view on the establishment of enduring change control arrangements of the Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) and the Working Groups.

SECAS described the background, provided an update on the establishment of the TSC and outlined the possible options for the establishment of change control arrangements with the TSC which the Change Board could consider.

One Change Board member raised the question why in Option 1 (having the TSC's early technical assessment and assurance of the Modification Proposal), the presented working arrangements did not allow for the Initial Impact Assessment to be approved by the TSC and incorporated into the Initial Modification Report for the Panel's Initial Assessment. SECAS responded that the short lead times are not likely to provide enough time for any formal pre-approved assessment to be incorporated into the Initial Modification Report. However, there may still be merit in TSC having an early oversight of Modification Proposals prior to the Draft Modification Report stage.

Following these initial discussions, the Change Board agreed that clarity still needed to be obtained on the role of the TSC, the process it follows and what its main function is (e.g. as a design authority or technical group) before it can provide the Panel with a response on preferred working arrangements. However, the need for developing robust impact assessments and efficient working arrangements before the Enduring phase was raised.

Change Board Members also discussed the benefits of having representatives of the TSC and Security Sub-Committee (SSC) sitting on the Working Groups under the Refinement Process and recommended this should be factored in when establishing the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Working Groups.

It was noted that the decision making process for reviewing and inputting into the draft and final impact assessment in the DMR and FMR by the Sub-Committees will also need to be considered.

The Change Board agreed that in advance of the ToR of the TSC being agreed, it would be beneficial for a straw man to be developed to illustrate the TSC's early involvement in the Modification Process along with an outline representation of subsequent Sub-Committees' working arrangements in the Modification Process. This will be discussed at the next Change Board meeting and an update will be issued to the Panel in line with discussions.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** that SECAS prepares a straw man of the TSC's early involvement in the Modification Process along with an outline representation of subsequent Sub-Committees' working arrangements in the Modification Process.

ACTION SECCB02/05: SECAS to develop a straw man of the TSC's early involvement in the Modification Process along with an outline representation of subsequent Sub-Committees' working arrangements in the Modification Process.

6. SEC Modification Implementation Methods

SECAS introduced the agenda item, highlighting that the paper had been prepared following the question that a Change Board Member raised when submitting their feedback on the Modification Process guidance documents.

SECAS highlighted that the implementation method of Modification Proposals is a familiar term when raising and progressing Modifications under existing Codes, such as the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) and the Master Registration Agreement (MRA). However, under the SEC, such a term has yet not been defined but will need to be addressed.

SECAS highlighted a number of discussion points for the Change Board to explore, in relation to the implementation techniques of Modification Proposals under the SEC.

SECAS noted that the introduction of implementation methods may be beneficial when considering how to factor in considerations such as testing and implications on Release Schedules and also when SEC Parties do testing (e.g. System Integration Testing (SIT) and User Acceptance Testing (UAT)) following DCC System changes.

One Change Board member raised the question regarding how to govern the quality, cost and timescales in the implementation process of a Modification Proposal and whether it would be considered a role of the Change Board in administering this process.

The Change Board agreed that post implementation review in many other Codes is mainly the responsibility of a Change Board equivalent in these Codes. However, the Change Board advised that the current ToR would have to be changed in order for the Change Board to facilitate such discussions.

The Change Board also discussed the need for a wider Change Management role to manage the appeals process, post implementation reviews and to manage Parties internal testing and UIT when changes have been made to the DCC Systems. The Change Board again raised the question whether it would be a role of the Change Board to oversee this process, with SECAS as support.

Ofgem highlighted that some Codes do not begin to work on the implementation of a Modification until the appeal window has closed, which might be an approach to consider for the SEC.

The Change Board agreed they would be keen to take on the role of Change Management, in addition to their current duties set out in the SEC and in the ToR.

The Change Board agreed that a further piece of work is to be brought back to the next meeting in relation to this agenda item, which will look at best practices of other Codes in terms of assurance and post implementation reviews.

The Change Board:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** that SECAS prepares a study of industry best practices in terms of assurance and post implementation reviews, in other Codes.

ACTION SECCB02/06: SECAS to prepare a study of industry best practices in terms of assurance and post implementation reviews, in other Codes.

7. Next Meeting

SECAS proposed that the next Change Board Meeting to be held on Monday, 2nd June 2014, in line with previous discussion on Change Board Meetings to be held every two months.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** the next meeting to be held on the 2nd of June 2014.

8. Any Other Business

The Chair invited the Change Board to raise any matters of other business.

Following the discussions under agenda item 6, the Change Board requested that SECAS prepares a study of industry best practices in terms of assurance and post implementation reviews, in other Codes. Action has been included under agenda item 6.

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