

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 Sub-Committee Meeting 05_2307

23 July 2019, 10:30 – 11:30

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Street, London, EC3M 4AJ

Final Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	Name
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp
Large Suppliers	Paul Saker (<i>teleconference</i>)
Large Suppliers	Simon Trivella (<i>teleconference</i>)
Small Suppliers	Chris Brown (<i>teleconference</i>)
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna (<i>teleconference</i>)

Other Participants:

Representing	Name
DCC	Amanda Rooney
Ofgem	Michael Walls (<i>teleconference</i>)
SECAS	Veronica Asantewaa
	Jordan Crase
	Bradley Baker
	Joe Hehir (part meeting)

1. Welcomes and introductions

The Chair welcomed Members to the fifth Change Sub-Committee (CSC) meeting.

2. DP077 'DCC Service Flagging' Draft Proposal decision

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP077 'DCC Service Flagging'](#).

A Large Supplier raised concern that the DCC Service Flags are being set but not where they are supposed to be positioned and requested that this be looked at separately by the DCC. The Proposer and the DCC noted that this will be investigated offline.

The CSC acknowledged the query raised by the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) as to whether this issue should be raised as a defect with the DCC rather than as a SEC modification. One CSC Member stated they believed it was right that this be progressed as a modification as the solution would be wider than just a defect fix. However, the CSC were strongly of the opinion that the modification should only cover general improvements around this process, and that any defect fixes, e.g. ensuring the DCC are setting the correct values now, should be covered by the DCC separately.

One Member noted that the proposed solution should ensure it looks at issues affecting SMETS1 as well as SMETS2 and should also consider future scenarios. CSC Members noted that the solution will need to take into account the issues of today and of the faster switching world in the future. The cost of changing the process if defects are identified will also need to be considered.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that the issue identified under DP077 is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** to recommend to the Panel that this Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **AGREED** to recommend to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process.

3. DP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Part 2' Draft Proposal decision

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Part 2'](#).

CSC Members queried the implementation process and the validity periods of the uplifted versions of the Technical Specification documents. SECAS noted that they are continuing to work with BEIS, the TABASC and the DCC to establish this. It is targeted to have only one Technical Specification document amendment per year, with this modification targeted for the November 2020 SEC Release. However, BEIS are currently likely to make changes to the Technical Specifications that will align with the June 2020 SEC Release. One member queried what this approach would mean for Users, such as whether they would be forced to upgrade, whether validity periods would be end-dated and how Users would be expected to transition to newer versions.

The DCC representative queried the long-term future for Issue Resolution Proposals (IRPs). SECAS responded that the Technical Specifications Issues Resolution Subgroup (TSIRS) will be transitioning to become a TABASC sub-group in the next few months, enabling end-to-end management of IRPs within SECAS.

The Other SEC Party CSC Member queried whether the Proposer was happy to be sponsoring this proposal, noting that the TABASC had queried if it would have been beneficial for a manufacturer to sponsor this change. The Proposer confirmed that they were happy to sponsor the proposal.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** that the issue identified under DP078 is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** to recommend to the Panel that this Draft Proposal should be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **AGREED** to recommend to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process.

4. New Draft Proposals - DP079 'Provisions for withdrawing modifications'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP079 'Provisions for withdrawing modifications'](#).

CSC Members noted that this proposal will be useful, with the Proposer clarifying that while the introduction of the Development Stage and the CSC reduces the need for this proposal, it would still be beneficial for a backstop to be introduced, which they expect would be used very rarely. One CSC Member queried if it was only the Proposer who can withdraw a modification or members of other Sub-Committees. It was noted that some guidelines would be needed on what can be withdrawn and who is authorised to do so.

It was queried whether this process was being developed with vexatious modifications in mind. The Proposer confirmed it was more around having a backstop for proposals that lack support or are no longer needed that subsequently stall within the process. A CSC Member noted they had seen Working Groups held open for proposals that the Proposer did not want to let go of.

Comments were made that this Draft Proposal would represent a shift away from full Proposer ownership; however, this could be mitigated through the development of the appeal process. Members felt any solution would need to have clearly laid out rules, including warning to Proposers, and one Member noted care was needed as to which modifications could be closed as not all proposals are the same.

It was noted that there could be a positive impact in terms of modification timescales, making sure they progress on a timely basis. It was also mentioned that there could theoretically be a timeout on modifications that have been in stasis for a certain period of time. Ofgem commented that this could potentially be implemented into an existing process, such as the Panel's abilities to set progression timetables, as opposed to introducing an entirely new one.

5. Any Other Business (AOB)

The CSC were presented with slides from the DCC on their reassessment of rejected or withdrawn Modification Proposals.

The DCC explained that they have been reviewing the Modifications that have been withdrawn or rejected due to high costs. The group discussed whether any of these modifications should be raised again after being rejected. It was concluded that anyone could re-raise these proposals if they so desired, but that unless there is a valid reason then members felt that the time that had passed since

these proposals were first raised meant these solutions were unlikely to be viable even with significantly reduced costs.

The CSC Members also discussed [DP072 'Change Of Supplier Process'](#) as this will soon be presented to the Operations Group (OPSG) for discussion. A Large Supplier noted that there will need to be clear procedures as there have been many issues and noted that more information is needed to let Suppliers know what they are required to do. An Other SEC Party Member raised an issue and a fundamental flaw in the CoS process whereby around 1,600 SMETS1 Meters that have become dormant due to them being gained by Suppliers who are non-DCC Users. They noted that if this is not addressed soon, it may become an issue for SMETS2 Meters.

The DCC explained that they are working with BEIS and will be looking at regulations and guidelines soon. SECAS stated that they will take the views raised to the OPSG and report back to the CSC.

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

Next Meeting: 27 August 2019