

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 33

21 August 2019, 10:00 – 10:45

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

SECCB_33_2108 - Final Minutes

Attendees:

| Category | Change Board Members |
|--------------------|--|
| Change Board Chair | David Kemp |
| Large Suppliers | Simon Trivella |
| | Tim Larcher (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | Alex Hurcombe (<i>alternate</i>) (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | David Rodger (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | Richard Vernon (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | Sam Cannons (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| Small Suppliers | Karen Lee (<i>alternate</i>) (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| Network Parties | Shanna Barr (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | Jeremy Meara (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | Paul Fitzgerald (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| Other SEC Parties | Mike Woodhall (<i>teleconference</i>) |
| | Elias Hanna (<i>teleconference</i>) |

| Representing | Other Participants |
|--------------|--|
| DCC | Amanda Rooney |
| SECAS | Harry Jones |
| | Veronica Asantewaa (Meeting Secretary) |

1. SECMP0062 'Northbound Application Traffic Management – Alert Storm Protection'

The Change Board were invited to perform the final vote on [SECMP0062 'Northbound Application Traffic Management – Alert Storm Protection'](#) that seeks to provide Alert Storm protection through a DCC designed mechanism, which will count the number of Alerts originating from a specific Device within a defined time window.

A Large Supplier noted that following discussions with the DCC and Technical Specifications Issue Resolution Subgroup (TSIRS) around nuisance Alerts, there was concern that the intent of the modification had been diluted. They noted they are receiving a vast amount of erroneous Alerts that do not concern them.

A Network Party Member echoed these comments and felt that this modification is not fit for purpose due to the limited scope. They believed the intent of the modification was to protect the system, but only a small proportion of potential issues would be covered by the solution, making it incomplete. In particular, they noted the modification would not cover power outage Alerts. It was noted that Network Parties are receiving a vast amount of Alerts through the Self-Service Interface (SSI) for meters that they do not manage. While Electricity Network Parties need to know about discarded Alerts, a significant amount of time and money would have to be spent on resolving notifications, increasing complexity for little benefit.

The DCC noted the comments and stated that they are working with the Energy Network Association (ENA) to resolve the issues faced by the Electricity Network Parties. The main outcome that they are trying to achieve through this Modification is a preventative measure to protect the DCC Systems from infected Devices sending multiple alerts that cause traffic. They noted that an Alert Storm has never happened, and the modification is intended to proactively protect against any that may occur in the future.

An Other SEC Party Member highlighted [SECMP0067 'Service Request Traffic Management'](#) is looking at another aspect of traffic management, and felt the solutions should be considered and determined upon holistically. Combining the solutions may also realise a cost-saving. They agreed that there is a need to manage Alerts but considered the solution had been rushed through. The DCC noted the original intent was to progress the modifications in parallel but delays to SECMP0067 caused them to split apart. They also noted they raised two separate modifications to mitigate the risk of issues with one part of the solution causing the other part of solution also being rejected.

A Large Supplier stated that they could not approve the Modification in light of the issues raised by the Network Parties. Their main concerns were that scope had not been made clear and the costs are unjustified. They were also unclear why this is being shoehorned into the November 2019 SEC Release. They did not want to reject the modification though as they supported resolving the identified issue. Other Members across all categories echoed these views.

The Change Board felt that too many issues had been raised that needed to be clarified in the Modification Report before they could vote on this proposal. They therefore elected to return the Modification Report to the Working Group for these clarifications to be made. As part of this, the Change Board believed that SECMP0062 should be looked at holistically with SECMP0067 and progressed back to vote in parallel with this.

Change Board Vote: SECMP0062 decision:

The voting outcome is shown below:

| Party Category | Send back | Proceed to vote | Abstain | Conclusion |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|------------|
| Large Suppliers | 6 | 0 | 0 | Send back |
| Small Suppliers | 1 | 0 | 0 | Send back |
| Network Parties | 3 | 0 | 0 | Send back |
| Other SEC Parties | 2 | 0 | 0 | Send back |
| Consumers | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

The Change Board **AGREED** to return the Modification Report to the Working Group for further clarification and analysis on the Proposed Solution, in order to address the comments and concerns raised in the Modification Report Consultation and consider how SECMP0062 and SECMP0067 interact.

2. SECMP0067 ‘Service Request Traffic Management’ Request for Impact Assessment

The Change Board were invited to perform the final vote on [SECMP0067 ‘Service Request Traffic Management’](#) which seeks to define a maximum system capacity, operating threshold and appropriate Service User allocations.

One Change Board Member sought clarity on what solution was being progressed to Impact Assessment. SECAS clarified that it was requirements 1-5 from the Preliminary Assessment, with these unchanged from then.

Given the concerns raised with SECMP0062, a Large Supplier Member considered that a more holistic view of the two modifications is required. They wanted to understand how the two modifications would interact, and believed it would be better not to rush forward with SECMP0067 if doing so would be detrimental. It may be more beneficial to merge SECMP0067 with SECMP0062 for better analysis of the proposals.

The Change Board agreed that further assessment alongside SECMP0062 is required before the cost of an Impact Assessment is incurred.

Change Board Vote: SECMP0067 request for Impact Assessment:

The voting outcome is shown below:

| Party Category | Agree | Disagree | Abstain | Conclusion |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|------------|
| Large Suppliers | 0 | 6 | 0 | Disagree |
| Small Suppliers | 0 | 1 | 0 | Disagree |
| Network Parties | 0 | 3 | 0 | Disagree |
| Other SEC Parties | 0 | 2 | 0 | Disagree |
| Consumers | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

The Change Board **DID NOT AGREE** that a DCC Impact Assessment should be requested for SECMP0067 as more analysis is required.

3. Change Status Report – August 2019

The Change Board **NOTED** the Change Status Report.

4. Any Other Business

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