

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.

| Paper Reference: | CSC_04_2506_03 | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Action: | For Information | | | | | | | |

New IRP SEC Modification

1. Purpose

This paper provides a summary of our assessment of the Issue Resolution Proposals (IRPs) that have been handed over to SECAS by BEIS to progress into the SEC. We are asking the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) to consider the proposed approach to implement the IRPs into the SEC.

2. What is the issue?

Previously, BEIS have implemented the required IRPs for earlier SEC Releases; however, this process has now been handed over to SECAS for changes to be implemented through the Modifications Process. To improve efficiency, it was agreed these changes should be progressed under a single proposal at regular intervals. This will be the second of these proposals, the first being SECMP0055 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC'.

These IRPs add clarity and corrections to the Technical Specifications documents. Device Manufacturers are required to follow these documents for the specifications of their Devices. Therefore, any errors or miscommunication of these specifications will mean the Device will not work as intended. The industry group Technical Specification Issue Resolution Sub-group (TSIRS) have agreed that these are issues and have agreed upon the solutions.

IRPs are varied in their size, nature and impact, some are simple legal text changes, some will impact Device Manufacturers and others will impact DCC Central Systems. In order to progress IRPs in the most efficient way, we need to fully understand the lead time, impact and cost for each of these IRPs. Once these variables are understood the IRPs can be 'batched' together and potentially split into a number of Modifications which can progress at an appropriate rate, for example, simple legal text changes with little or no impact to DCC or industry can progress more quickly than, for instance, system impacting IRPs.

The current list of IRPs to be processed and an initial review of the impacts these will have can be found in the Table below:





| | | | ecific Impac | | | | User | ed | | De | evice | s Im | pact | ed | | | | | |
|--------|---|------|---------------------------------------|------|--------|--------------|----------|-----|----|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|-------|------------|--|
| IRP | Title | SING | SMETS | GBCS | CHTS | DCC Impacted | <u>S</u> | GS | ED | ĞТ | CHF | GPF | GSME | ESME | HCALCS | 呈 | PPMID | Complexity | Notes |
| | Default Response in GCS21k message 'profile/cluster' flag | | , | Y | \neg | Υ | ` | Y | | \neg | | Υ | Υ | | | | | Low | Limited / no impact on GS |
| | GCS20r - Response when an error occurs | | , | Y | \neg | Ť | \ | Y | | | | • | Υ | | | | | Low | Limited / no impact on GS |
| | Future Dated command handling if activation in the Past | | , | Y | | Υ | Y | Y , | Y | Y | | Υ | Υ | Υ | Υ | | | Low | Likely no impact on Users. Potential impact on Devices |
| | Tariff prices for Twin-Element ESME query | | Υ | | | | | | | | | | | | | Υ | Υ | Medium | Potential impacts on displays |
| IRP582 | Read ALCS Event Log values | | , | Y | | | Υ | | | | | | | Υ | | | | Low | Understood to align GBCS to current operation |
| IRP587 | Marking CCS05-CCS04 deprecated Use Case | | , | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | None | Document change only |
| IRP588 | Mirror Reporting attribute not available in ZCLv4 | | , | Y | | | | | | | | See note | See note | | | | | None / Low | Already supported by each CH, optional for GSME |
| IRP589 | CS02b authentication sequence | | , | Y | | | | | | | See note | | | None / Low | Allows flexibility and does not mandate change |
| IRP590 | References in T16.2 for 81BE 81BF + 8F84 | | , | Y | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | None | Document change only |
| IRP591 | Clarification of HCALCS Time Cluster | | Ϋ́ | Y | | | | | | | | | | | Υ | | | Low | Impact on HCALCS design |
| IRP592 | Clarification required for channel change operation | | ' | Y | | | | | | | | | Υ | | | | | Medium | Potential impacts on sub-GHz GSME logic |
| IRP594 | Mirroring Tariff Block Counters | | , | Y | | | | | | | | See note | See note | | | | | Low | Already supported by each CH, assumed to align to current GSME behaviour |
| IRP596 | transCoS Execution Counters - CS02b query | | , | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | None | Document change only - allows flexibility replicating existing behaviour |
| IRP599 | Correcting references to Section 23 in GBCS | | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | None | Document change only |
| IRP600 | Typo Errors in ZB Commands in T7.4 | | · | Y | | | | | | | | | | | | | | None | Document change only |
| IRP601 | ZigBee spec reference for removal | | , | ſ | | Υ | | | | | Υ | | | Υ | | | | Low | Should be standard ZigBee functionality observing GBCS whitelisting |





3. Comments on the issue

Following the progression of SECMP0055, we believe that informed discussions about the 'batching' of these IRPs cannot take place until we have the DCC's views on which IRPs will impact the DCC Systems. We are coordinating with the DCC to gather impacts, costs and lead times of these IRPs.

SECAS have been working closely with Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) to establish the proposed approach to processing these IRPs.

4. Next steps

We welcome any comments from the CSC on the proposed process and wish to highlight that there will be a new Draft Proposal raised for consideration in the coming weeks.

Initial thoughts are that a new Draft Proposal will be raised shortly, comprised of the IRPs that have been deemed to be DCC System impacting. This would be recommended to go through a Refinement Process and have a targeted implementation in the November 2020 SEC Release.

A second IRP Draft Proposal would be raised later in the year to progress the remaining document only IRPs. As these would have a shorter lead time, this would be targeted for the June 2020 SEC Release.

5. Recommendations

The Change Sub-Committee are requested to:

- NOTE the contents of this paper; and
- CONSIDER the proposed approach for implementing these IRPs into the SEC.

Jordan Crase

SECAS Team

21 June 2019

decision

