

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.

SEC Change Board Meeting 21_2208

22nd August 2018 10:00 – 12:00

8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	David Kemp
Large Suppliers	Jonathan Hawkins (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Stacey Brentnall (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Andy Knowles (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Alex Hurcombe (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Samantha Cannons (<i>Teleconference</i>)
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (<i>Teleconference</i>)
Networks	Paul Fitzgerald (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Jeremy Meara (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Shanna Kay (<i>Teleconference</i>)
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Tim Boyle (<i>Teleconference</i>)
	Gerdjan Busker (<i>Teleconference</i>)
Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Amanda Rooney
Ofgem	Raymond Elliot
BEIS	Jamie Wasley
SECAS	Harry Jones
	Nikki Olomo
	James Hosen

Apologies	
Large Suppliers	Rachael Mottram
	Simon Trivella
SECAS	Talia Addy

1. SECCB_21_2208_01 – SECMP0018 ‘Standard Electricity Distributor Configuration Settings’.

SECAS provided the Change Board Members with the Final Modification Report and the Modification Report Consultation responses for [SECMP0018 ‘Standard Electricity Distributor Configuration Settings’](#).

The Change Board discussed the recommendation by the Panel that the modification should not be determined upon at this time as further clarification around the full implementation costs is required.

The DCC Representative clarified that the changes to the GB Companion Specification (GBCS) would incur costs for testing the new GBCS version if SECMP0018 was implemented as a standalone change, and at present this is very difficult to quantify.

One Member commented that the configuration settings are already being applied and therefore did not understand why additional costs should be incurred. The DCC Representative clarified that these were due to the testing that would be associated with implementing a new version of GBCS to include the changes sought by SECMP0018. This modification would require a version uplift even though the changes are document-only in nature.

One Member commented that they did not believe that SECMP0018 would require a large amount of testing from DCC to implement, and expressed their frustration at the situation.

Following discussions, Change Board Members voted to send the modification back to the Panel, citing that more clarification is needed on the full implementation costs.

Change Board Vote on SECMP0018:

The Change Board agreed to send this modification back to the Panel for further consideration, in order to clarify the issue stated surrounding costs.

The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Proceed to Vote	Return to Panel	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	0	5	0	Return to Panel
Small Suppliers	0	1	0	Return to Panel
Networks	1	1	1	Proceed to vote
Other	0	2	1	Return to Panel

One Network Member abstained as they did not believe this modification has an impact on Gas Network Parties. One Other Parties Member also abstained.

The Change Board:

- **CONSIDERED** the Final Modification Report and Modification Report Consultation responses; and
- **AGREED** that the Final Modification Report should be returned to the SEC Panel with a recommendation for further clarification to be made on the costs of implementing the modification.

2. SECCB_21_2287_02 – SECMP0025 ‘Electricity Network Party Access to Load Switching Information’.

SECAS provided the Change Board Members with the Final Modification Report and the Modification Report Consultation responses for [SECMP0025 ‘Electricity Network Party Access to Load Switching Information’](#).

The Change Board discussed the recommendation by the Panel that the modification should not be determined upon at this time as further clarification around the full implementation costs is required.

One Change Board Member raised a concern that this modification was cited to have an impact on Large Suppliers, which was not included in the original proposal. It was noted that cost implications to Suppliers and their involvement in testing had been cited as the impact on Suppliers. One Member felt that if this was the case then every modification would be deemed to impact Suppliers. Some Large Supplier Members highlighted that the main impacts on Suppliers will be from the DCC, specifically with testing and also with the impact this might have on the levels of Service Requests passing through the system; however, they believe that there is not enough information at present to determine how much these will be. Another Member mentioned there will be costs created by any future interactions between Suppliers and Electricity Network Parties.

One Member asked why only two Network Parties had responded to the Modification Report Consultation when they were the biggest beneficiaries of the change. One Network Member noted that there has been a consultation between Network Parties about the proposal and that it is generally supported by Network Parties as a whole; however, at present this modification will only affect a couple of Network Parties, with the potential to impact more in the future. The first Member noted it would be helpful if Network Parties noted this in their response, and perhaps a Networks-wide response could be submitted in these scenarios, as otherwise these discussions are invisible to the wider industry.

One Member highlighted that this modification is very similar to SECMP0046 ‘Allow DNOs to control Electric Vehicle chargers connected to Smart Meter infrastructure’. They suggested that modifications be better grouped where there is over-lap in order to save on time, effort and costs.

Change Board Vote on SECMP0025:

The Change Board agreed to send this modification back to the Panel for further consideration, in order to clarify the issue stated surrounding costs.

The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Proceed to Vote	Return to Panel	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	0	5	0	Return to Panel
Small Suppliers	0	1	0	Return to Panel
Networks	0	2	1	Return to Panel
Other	0	3	0	Return to Panel

One Network Member abstained as they did not believe this modification has an impact on Gas Network Parties.

One Other Member noted that it is possible that the costs may be too high to proceed to vote. They felt that this was another modification where a large amount of time and effort was being spent to develop a solution, but the costs to implement it could be too high for it to succeed.

One Member expressed their frustration that the costs have not yet been obtained.

The Change Board:

- **CONSIDERED** the Final Modification Report and Modification Report Consultation responses; and
- **AGREED** that the Final Modification Report should be returned to the SEC Panel with a recommendation for further clarification to be made on the costs of implementing the modification.

3. SECCB_21_2208_03 – SECMP0029 ‘Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Testing Amendments’

SECAS provided the Change Board Members with the Final Modification Report and the Modification Report Consultation responses for [SECMP0029 ‘Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Testing Amendments’](#). SECAS informed the Change Board that the SEC Panel had agreed that due process had been followed and that the Working Group had unanimously believed that SECMP0029 should be approved.

A concern was raised by one Member regarding the wording within the legal text that had been noted in the consultation. It was clarified that this comment has since been amended by the Working Group as part of its review of the legal text.

It was highlighted that the modification will go into the November 2018 SEC Release if there are no referrals.

Change Board Vote on SECMP0029:

The Change Board voted to **APPROVE** SECMP0029 under Self-Governance. The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	5	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	1	0	0	Approve
Networks	2	0	1	Approve
Other	3	0	0	Approve

The view of the Change Board is that SECMP0029 will better facilitate Objectives (a)¹ and (c)². Members believed this would provide earlier notice of any Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery testing and any updates when needed, giving Parties more time in which to prepare.

One Network Member abstained as they did not believe this modification has an impact on Gas Network Parties.

The Change Board:

- **CONSIDERED** the Final Modification Report and Modification Report Consultation responses for SECMP0029;
- **AGREED** that the Final Modification Report should not be returned to the SEC Panel;
- **APPROVED** SECMP0029 under Self-Governance for implementation on 1st November 2018; and
- **PROVIDED** rationale as to why SECMP0029 better facilitates the General SEC Objectives.

4. SECCB_21_2208_04 – SECMP0049 ‘Section D Review: Amendments to the Modification Process’

SECAS provided the Change Board Members with the Final Modification Report and the Modification Report Consultation responses for [SECMP0049 ‘Section D Review: Amendments to the Modification Process’](#). SECAS informed the Change Board that the SEC Panel had agreed that due process had been followed and that the Working Group had unanimously believed that SECMP0049 should be approved with a majority preference for the alternative solution.

It was discussed that there is general support for the modification. Several amendments have been made to the legal text following the comments received from E.ON in the Modification Report Consultation. It was noted that estimated costs for SECMP0049 are limited to the SECAS effort to implement the document changes.

It was noted that the Panel had considered the creation of a separate body as unnecessary and that the responsibilities of the ‘Change Sub-Committee’ should sit with the Change Board. It was highlighted that the industry in general had expressed strong support for this being a separate body. The logistics of how this would work if Change Board was to take on the additional responsibility was discussed, with one Member suggesting that Change Board meetings could be split into two, where Members who are only involved in the Change Board votes could leave or dial out once those were complete. This would also require the terms of reference to be clear on the two sets of responsibilities. One Member was concerned that the Change Board could end up marking its own homework if it was to approve a modification it had helped to develop.

¹ Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers’ premises within Great Britain

² Facilitate Energy Consumers’ management of their use of electricity and gas by providing information through Smart Metering Systems

One Member commented that some Network Parties have expressed that not all Parties should be required to vote on everything.

One Member highlighted that the success of SECMP0049 would rest on whether industry adopts the cultural changes this would require. They stressed that SECAS will need to really push the new process to industry participants ahead of its implementation to ensure that the full benefits are realised.

Change Board Vote on SECMP0049

The Change Board voted on both the **proposed solution** and the **alternative solution** for SECMP0049. Although all Change Board Members were in support of both solutions compared to the current baseline, they were only able to officially vote for a maximum of one option to be approved.

The voting outcome for the **proposed solution** is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	2	3	0	Reject
Small Suppliers	0	1	0	Reject
Networks	0	3	0	Reject
Other	0	3	0	Reject

The voting outcome for the **alternative solution** is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	3	2	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	1	0	0	Approve
Networks	3	0	0	Approve
Other	3	0	0	Approve

The Change Board voted to recommend that the Authority **REJECTS** the SECMP0049 **proposed solution** and **APPROVES** the SECMP0049 **alternative solution**.

The view of the Change Board is that SECMP0049 will better facilitate SEC Objective (g)³. Introducing a 'pre-modification process' into the SEC will improve the efficiency of the process and result in more thoroughly assessed proposals being progressed to the Panel Overall, Members believe these changes will speed up the overall process.

Two Large Supplier Members voted for the proposed solution as they believed that the Panel should have visibility and oversight of when a modification is sent back by the Change Board. The remaining Members supported the alternative solution as they believed this would further improve efficiency in the process by removing an unnecessary step from the process.

³ Facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of the SEC

The Change Board:

- **CONSIDERED** the Final Modification Report and Modification Report Consultation responses for SECMP0049;
- **AGREED** that the Final Modification Report should not be returned to the SEC Panel;
- **VOTED** to recommend the Authority **APPROVES** the SECMP0049 alternative solution; and
- **PROVIDED** rationale as to why SECMP0049 better facilitates the General SEC Objectives.

SECMP0049 will be implemented on 1st November 2018 if either the proposed or alternative solution is approved by the Authority on or before 18th October 2018.

5. SECCB_21_2208_05 – SECMP0050 ‘Section D Review: Moving the Working Group Terms of Reference to a separate document’

SECAS provided the Change Board Members with the Final Modification Report and the Modification Report Consultation responses for [SECMP0050 ‘Section D Review: Moving the Working Group Terms of Reference to a separate document’](#). SECAS informed the Change Board that the SEC Panel had agreed that due process had been followed and that the Working Group had unanimously believed that SECMP0050 should be approved.

SECAS commented that there has been a recommendation from E.ON that further work is needed to refine the terms of reference. These comments will be passed to the Panel to consider when it approves the terms of reference document, subject to SECMP0050 being approved.

Change Board Vote on SECMP0050:

The Change Board unanimously voted to **APPROVE** SECMP0050 under Self-Governance. The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	5	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	1	0	0	Approve
Networks	3	0	0	Approve
Other	3	0	0	Approve

The view of the Change Board is that SECMP0050 better facilitates SEC Objective (g). Change Board Members noted that this modification will improve efficiency and flexibility in establishing and managing Working Groups.

The Change Board:

- **CONSIDERED** the Final Modification Report and Modification Report Consultation responses for SECMP0050;
- **AGREED** that the Final Modification Report should not be returned to the SEC Panel;

- **APPROVED** SECMP0050 under Self-Governance for implementation on 1st November 2018; and
- **PROVIDED** rationale as to why SECMP0050 better facilitates the General SEC Objectives.

6. SECCB_21_2208_06 – SECMP0051 ‘Section D Review: Amendments to the Fast Track Modification process’

SECAS provided the Change Board Members with the Final Modification Report and the Modification Report Consultation responses for [SECMP0051 ‘Section D Review: Amendments to the Fast Track Modification process’](#). SECAS informed the Change Board that the SEC Panel had agreed that due process had been followed and that the Working Group had unanimously believed that SECMP0051 should be approved.

Change Board Vote on SECMP0051:

The Change Board unanimously voted to **APPROVE** SECMP0051 under Self-Governance. The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	5	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	1	0	0	Approve
Networks	3	0	0	Approve
Other	3	0	0	Approve

The view of the Change Board is that SECMP0051 better facilitates SEC Objective (g). Change Board Members noted that this modification will improve efficiency and will simplify market governance through aligning processes across the different Codes.

The Change Board:

- **CONSIDERED** the Final Modification Report and Modification Report Consultation responses for SECMP0051;
- **AGREED** that the Final Modification Report should not be returned to the SEC Panel;
- **APPROVED** SECMP0051 under Self-Governance for implementation on 1st November 2018; and
- **PROVIDED** rationale as to why SECMP0051 better facilitates the General SEC Objectives.

7. SECP_59_1008_09 – Change Status Report

The Change Board noted this month’s Change Status Report. There were no questions or comments raised.

8. Any other business

One Member questioned whether SECAS will be presenting release costs in a similar manner to DCC regarding cost efficiencies. SECAS advised it will clarify what the cost will be for multiple modifications, and that it is unlikely implementing the document changes for multiple modifications simultaneously would incur much more costs than for a single modification.