

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.

DP091 ‘Updating Security Assurance Status’

Problem statement – version 0.1

About this document

This document provides a summary of this Draft Proposal, including the issue or problem identified, the impacts this is having, and the context of this issue within the Smart Energy Code (SEC).

Proposer

This Draft Proposal has been raised by Gordon Hextall on behalf of the Security Sub-Committee (SSC).

What is the issue or problem identified?

Unclear Assurance Status

SEC Section G 'Security' states that once a Party has completed their Full User Security Assessment (FUSA) the SEC Panel shall assign them an assurance status.

Section G8.36 sets out four potential assurance statuses:

1. **Approved;**
2. **Approved subject to** the Party taking the mitigating steps outlined in FUSA;
3. **Provisionally approved** subject to the Party taking the mitigating steps outlined in FUSA, undertaking a Follow-up Security Assessment and the Panel approving the results of this; and
4. **Deferred** subject to the Party amending its User Security Assessment Response to resolve issues that are inadequately addressed, resubmitting their User Security Assessment Response and the Panel reconsidering that Party's assurance status.

The first two assurance statuses allow the Party to complete the User Entry Process. However, the latter two assurance statuses do not and indicate significant security deficiencies that require substantial remediation.

Having reviewed over 150 User Assessments the SSC believes the current wording to be potentially confusing as to what the statuses actually mean. It would like the wording to be clear and obvious to Parties. It is proposing to amend "Provisionally Approved" to "Deferred" and amend "Deferred" to "Rejected" as that more accurately reflects the situation and is in line with original policy intent.

Instructing a second FUSA

The SSC also believes it would be more appropriate that where a Party is set a status of "Rejected" ("Deferred" under the current drafting) a second FUSA is more appropriate than an updated User Security Assessment Response. A second FUSA would provide assurance for all Parties, and the DCC, that the (significant) deficiencies have been addressed.

How does this issue relate to the SEC?

SEC Section G8.36 sets out the assurance status the Panel can set (noting that this responsibility has been delegated to the SSC).

What is the impact this is having?

The current wording in the SEC is confusing. This can create the wrong impression for Parties as to what the consequence of their assurance status actually is. Removing any confusion over what the assurance status means and making it clear and obvious to Parties what is expected will make the process clearer for all.

In addition, the SSC does not currently have the ability to request a new FUSA be completed even though that may be the most appropriate course of action to efficiently and effectively resolve issues and address concerns raised.

After reviewing the Section, the SSC believes this is a sensible change to ensure greater clarity regarding different User Assessment outcomes.