Meeting 03_0206, 2nd June 2014 at 10am

Gemserv, 10 Fenchurch Street, London, EC3M 3BE

FINAL Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Large Suppliers	Ashley Pocock
	Dave Smith
	Samantha Cannons
Small Suppliers	Steven Bradford
Electricity Networks	Simon Yeo
Other SEC Parties	Helen Boothman
	Simon Bevis

Representing	Other Participants
Ofgem (the Authority)	Amanda Rooney
DCC	Matthew Roderick
SECAS	Jill Ashby (Chair)
	Natalia Sandomierska (Meeting Secretary)
	Rebecca Mottram

Apologies:

Category	Change Board Members
DECC (Secretary of State)	Peter Dell'Osa
Large Suppliers	Iain Matthews
	Alex Travell
Electricity Networks	Martin White
Gas Networks	Joanna Ferguson
Other SEC Parties	Richard St Clair

FINAL

1. Minutes of Change Board Meeting 02_3103

The Chair invited the Change Board to provide any comments on the draft minutes from the previous Change Board meeting (SECCB_02_3103) held on 31st March 2014.

Ofgem requested for some amendments to be made to the minutes and would submit their comments to SECAS following this meeting. There were no further comments and the Change Board approved the minutes subject to the aforementioned amendments.

2. Actions Update

SECAS reported that all actions outstanding from the previous meeting had been closed or formed agenda items, other than the following:

- Action SECCB01/04 - SECAS explained that the feature of an online discussion forum for Members would be considered as part of a wider project to enhance the SEC website and would be brought to a future Panel meeting for consideration. As this was not in the immediate pipeline, the Chair suggested a quarterly update on this action.

3. Transition Governance Work Groups and Enduring SEC Sub-Committees

SECAS introduced the agenda item, highlighting that the presentation sought to provide a view of how the current Transition Work Group (TWG) arrangements will emerge over time to the enduring governance model. The presentation covered four key areas, as set out in the following sub-sections.

3.1 DECC's Transition Governance Work Groups

SECAS presented an overview of DECC's TWGs, highlighting that a monthly update from these TWGs is provided to the SEC Panel in the Transition Governance Update Paper. SECAS also highlighted that a short summary of the role of these TWGs is provided in the informal Guide to the Modification Process which is available on the SEC website.

One Change Board Member highlighted that the Operational Delivery Group is missing from the presented list. SECAS welcomed the feedback and agreed to investigate the role of this Work Group in transition and how it will play out in the enduring governance model.

ACTION SECCB03/01: SECAS to investigate the Operational Delivery Group and bring back information to the next meeting and to update guidance material where relevant.

3.2 SEC Sub-Committees and their relationship to Transition Governance

SECAS presented a diagram illustrating how the current TWGs will transition to the enduring SEC governance model and the anticipated timeframe. SECAS underlined that the dates in the diagram are indicative and that the establishment of SEC Sub-Committees is subject to a number of factors;

- SEC Sub-Committees will be introduced at the designation of the different stages of the SEC. The SMKI Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) will be introduced in SEC Stage 3 (SEC3), designated in August 2014. In the case of the PMA, SECAS highlighted that the

inaugural meeting is scheduled for July 2014, in advance of SEC3 designation, in order for the Sub-Committee to be prepared for its duties and functions in the ensuing months.

- The provisions for the Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) and Security Sub-Committee (SSC) will be introduced in SEC3 and SEC4, respectively. SEC4 is anticipated to be designated towards the end of 2014 and establishment of the TSC and SSC has been tentatively planned for a similar time. SECAS also highlighted that although the provisions for the TSC will be introduced in SEC3, the TSC is not linked to the designation of the SEC content but the landing of the Technical Specifications.

- The timescale for the establishment of the TSC and SSC would also be subject to handover time from the respective TWGs in order to avoid a cold start.

The Change Board welcomed visibility of both the TWGs and the SEC Sub-Committees and requested updates at future meetings in order facilitate more informed discussions on managing interactions in the end-to-end SEC Modifications Process.

ACTION SECCB03/02: SECAS to provide progress updates on the Transition Work Groups and SEC Sub-Committees at subsequent meetings.

3.3 CSPI Documents under SEC Sub-Committee Responsibility

SECAS presented an overview of the different Cross Sector Product Inventory (CSPI) documents which will come under SEC governance, including a view of which documents will be assigned to the different SEC Sub-Committees.

The DCC inquired about the Business Processes document listed under the TSC's governance and SECAS clarified that this overview had been taken from the current version of the CSPI. SECAS was aware that there were ongoing discussions on the maintenance of a business process model and the expectation was that the CSPI would be updated in light of those.

One Change Board Member inquired about the role of the TAG (Testing Advisory Group) and its relationship with the TDEG (Test Design and Execution Group). SECAS clarified that TAG was established for the purpose of assisting the Panel in its duties defined in the SEC for the approving of the DCC's Test Approach Documents for the different testing phases. SECAS also explained that the Terms of Reference (ToR) is different to the TSC and that TAG's work is taken from a SEC Panel perspective whilst TDEG works from a programme perspective. In addition, TAG has no role in the SEC Modifications Process, and hence had not been included in the SEC Sub-Committee view for Change Board's discussions on end-to-end change control.

3.4 SEC Subsidiary Documents Transition

SECAS provided an overview of the Smart Metering Implementation Programme's (SMIP) transition checkpoints for SEC Subsidiary Documents, noting that a number of CSPI documents are still under development and that the governance arrangements of a number of these products have not yet been allocated. A number of the products listed under the current version of the CSPI will fall under SEC governance (e.g. as SEC Subsidiary Documents) from March 2015, which is when the DCC User Integration Testing (UIT) is due to commence.

The Chair advised the Change Board that the Implementation Managers Forum (IMF) had also commenced an exercise to revisit the Programme Tranche definitions, and SECAS would keep members informed.

4. Outline of Sub-Committees' Involvement in the Modification Process

As noted in the Change Board paper (SECCB_03_0206_04) the SEC does not set out in any detail the procedural interaction of other Sub-Committees in the Modifications Process, and broadly considers this in the Refinement stage. The SEC drafting also envisaged the relevant Sub-Committee determining the process for SECAS to determine whether a Modification Proposal may affect the SEC documents under the remit of that Sub-Committee. Thus, the purpose of this item was to canvas the Change Board's views on how the involvement of Sub-Committees in the Modification Process could be managed efficiently and effectively.

SECAS provided the Change Board with an outline of the Modification Process which mapped out potential areas for Sub-Committees' involvement in an expanded logical sequence and also noted that the timescales were intended as indicative only.

The Change Board discussed the regulatory and practical challenges of multiple Sub-Committees' involvement in the process. The following key points were raised:

- If a Proposer is aware of any impacted SEC Subsidiary Documents when raising a Modification Proposal, then the Proposer should highlight these in the Modification Proposal Form. However, the Change Board recognised that it is unlikely that a Proposer will have the necessary understanding at this stage of all the SEC documentation in order to make a comprehensive assessment. The Change Board considered there would be merit in guidance materials on SEC Subsidiary Documents for Parties to reference when raising a Modification.

- SECAS asked whether the development of a 'look-up' tool to indicate early impacts on SEC Subsidiary Documents may be of merit for expediting the process. It was considered this may be too prescriptive at this stage, noting that early flagging of Modifications to the relevant Sub-Committees and liaising through an informal process may be the best practice for now.

- Based on experience from other Codes, often, the understanding of a Modification's impact merges through the Refinement (Working Group) stage and thus it may not be possible to provide a view of the scale of impacted SEC Subsidiary Documents. A number of Change Board Members suggested that it may be sufficient enough to only include a list of artefacts in the Modification Proposal Form for the Proposal to tick off in terms of their impact assessment. To this end, a 'decision-tree' guide might be the right level of guidance to inform the initial raising of a Modification in terms of its impact across the suite of SEC documents.

- An informal approach to obtain expert advice from SEC Sub-Committees on Proposals prior to the Initial Modification Report (IMR) stage was suggested and discussed by the Change Board. One Change Board Member suggested that SECAS maintains a list of key contacts for each Sub-Committee whose initial view can be called upon if required. This approach may not unduly impact the current timetable for the IMR and equally could provide the relevant Sub-Committees with an early view and oversight of relevant Modifications.

FINAL

A Change Board Member raised the question of how WG Members would be identified. SECAS clarified that the Panel would specify the composition and ToR for these and then invitations would be sent to Parties. Interested Parties with the relevant expertise would put their name forward to SECAS. The Change Board noted that this process may be lengthy and SECAS observed that the process for setting up WGs may become better informed over time, for example a model ToR and a list of experts could be developed. However, it may be the case that a WG would need to be constituted on a case by case basis related to the Modification in question.

The Change Board discussed the role of Sub-Committees in the Refinement Process and believed the best approach would be to have Sub-Committee Representatives present on WGs. However, this would need to be checked against the SEC provisions which state that duplication of expertise should be avoided. The Change Board also noted that there may also be merit in model WG ToR which may invite the participation of Sub-Committee representatives.

The Change Board discussed the impact on the Modification timetable the hand-off procedures between the WGs and the Sub-Committees in the Refinement Process could have. A Change Board Member inquired about the role of Sub-Committees in the Refinement Process and SECAS clarified that their expertise differs from that of the WG Members in that they are responsible for managing the SEC Subsidiary Documents and to provide expert advice in terms of the wider technical and security aspects. However, a WG and the Change Board's role is to canvas the wider views from SEC Parties on the impacts and implications of a change. The Chair also highlighted that some Sub-Committees, such as the PMA, had the right to raise a Modification, although this would then process through the SEC Modification Process via the appropriate Modification Path.

The Change Board welcomed the approach to share updates between Sub-Committees and suggested having open and closed or restricted sessions in the event that confidential or sensitive issues are involved.

The consultations conducted at various Modification stages were also discussed, and the Change Board considered that the relevant Sub-Committee views and recommendations throughout the Refinement and Modification Report stages would be beneficial, as responses may raise issues and impacts that need Sub-Committee input to aid the WG or Change Board considerations.

SECAS highlighted that exploring the transition working arrangements between the different TWGs could provide guidelines on best operational procedures. SECAS suggested that a case study on the current HAN Key issue is reviewed in more detail as this was an issue raised from a security perspective but impacts technical specifications.

ACTION SECCB03/03: SECAS to provide a case study for the Change Board on the procedural progress of the HAN key issue between the Transitional Work Groups to highlight interactions and hand-offs.

ACTION SECCB03/04: SECAS to develop an initial outline decision tree and expanded process map drawing out the key steps of Sub-Committee involvement in the Modification Process.

5. Introducing a SEC Pre-Modification Process

SEC D8.2 sets out a function of the Change Board to facilitate a pre-change process which provides for the consideration of potential SEC variations prior to entering the formal Modification Process.

To set the scene, SECAS provided a brief overview of the provisions outlined in the SEC and the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP). The following key points were raised during the discussion of this agenda item:

- The Change Board considered that the current approach to issue management used in the transition governance arrangements might be a useful starting point. The Chair confirmed that SECAS would liaise with DECC to provide further insight into this process. The Change Board discussed that issues could also be evaluated from the dimensions of:
    - different categories for issues to be targeted to the relevant entities; and
    - future developments that may influence the direction of change.
- Notwithstanding that there may be multiple entities involved, there may be merit in having one centralised 'tracker'.
- Pre-change may in itself impact the Panel's risk register regarding SEC-operational concerns.
- The Change Board also discussed the process for capturing issues, i.e. whether it should be considered as general Code operation or a process facilitated by the Change Board or another oversight body. In particular, if a pre-change process would mirror the hand-offs to Sub-Committees for their views as envisaged in the SEC Modification Process, then this may be a Code administration matter for SECAS to facilitate. The need to develop a pro-forma for raising SEC issues was also discussed.
- Based on experience from other Codes, there are typically more issues raised in the early stage of a Code's lifecycle, although these may transpire as clarification and guidance steps rather than Modifications.
- The Change Board raised the concern over whether any unresolved issues would be passed on from TBDG (Technical and Business Design Group) and agreed that there would be merit in having an early view of TBDG's issues tracker in order to understand what may be coming down the way for the SEC.
- The Change Board considered that a range of techniques may have to be considered in order to ensure that issues and pre-change matters were capable of 'airing' in advance of a formal Modification Proposal being raised. Consequently, the implementation timetable for a pre-change process would need to be considered in light of the timetable for the enablement of Modification Paths.
- The Change Board noted that an early process for capturing issues under the SEC need to address the risk of issues being duplicated with those that have been raised and/or being considered by the different Transition delivery groups. It was noted that communication to Parties will need to be clear on this front.

FINAL

- The Change Board discussed the merits in capturing issues before all Modification Paths are switched on, recognising that issues do not need to be considered as problems but could be concerns or suggestions for improvement and thus having this process in place earlier could potentially mitigate some risks. The Change Board also discussed the benefits of an issues review process after Checkpoint 3 (July 2014) and before Checkpoint 4 (October 2014) of the SMIP.

ACTION SECCB03/05: SECAS to liaise with the SMIP on the transitional arrangements in place for managing issues and pre-Modifications.

ACTION SECCB03/06: SECAS to investigate the different issues that have been captured during Transition by the different Transition Working Groups.

6. Cross-Code Review of Post-Implementation Reviews

SECAS noted this agenda item (SECCB_03_0206_06) outlined a number of case studies intended to show how post-implementation techniques are managed under other Codes and the possible techniques which could be considered under the SEC.

The Change Board agreed that it is too early to discuss post-implementation techniques but recognised the merit in having a process under the SEC which provides an opportunity for evaluation as part of continuous improvement of the process.

The Change Board discussed whether complex Modifications which impact a range of SEC Subsidiary Documents would be the best cases for post-implementation feedback. It was noted that even in the event the implementation has been successful, this exercise may provide insight which could help inform better working arrangements. The Change Board discussed whether this process could be facilitated by the Change Board and noted that it may be beneficial to look at post-implementation after a period of time.

The Change Board also discussed that it may be advantageous to develop appropriate criteria for post-implementation reviews. One Change Board Member noted the need to look at post-implementation from a due-diligence point of view.

The Change Board agreed for this topic to be revisited at a future meeting.

ACTION SECCB03/08: SECAS to keep a log of any considerations or issues that merit further thought at a later date (e.g. once SEC provisions are introduced and designated at a later date).

7. Next Meeting

SECAS proposed for the next Change Board meeting to be held in September 2014 due to the summer period. The Change Board agreed and requested that SECAS come back with a provisional date for the meeting.

FINAL

8. Any Other Business

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

Fast-Track Modification

Following the opening of the meeting, one Change Board Member noted that some Parties were not aware of the recent Fast-Track Modification. Another Member inquired about the Change Board's role in the process for Fast-Track Modifications.

SECAS explained that Fast-Track Modifications are to correct typographical and minor inconsistencies within the SEC and that these Modifications are raised and decided upon by the Panel. SECAS also explained that they had also received the feedback that the details of this Fast-Track Modification had not in some organisations reached the relevant people which had been highlighted to the Panel at the May 2014 Panel meeting. The Panel agreed for a dedicated change administrator distribution list to be developed to supplement the current SEC Party distribution list.

SECAS added that a template will be sent out to all Parties requesting contact details for the relevant recipients of different information within each organisation, including recipients of Modification related information. A possible future enhancement to the website where Parties could register their details and sign up for email alerts notifying them of any updates or announcements was also discussed.

Customer Satisfaction Survey (CSS)

SECAS informed the Change Board of its bi-annual Customer Satisfaction Survey (CSS) which had recently been issued to all SEC Parties seeking their views on the performance of SECAS. SECAS invited the Change Board to provide their feedback, highlighting that the survey closes on the 13th June 2014.

Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) Annual Review

SECAS informed the Change Board of the upcoming Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) Annual Review, noting that a paper would be brought to the June Panel meeting and a subsequent consultation issued to all SEC Parties.

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

FINAL