

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.

# SECMP0062 ‘Northbound Application Traffic Management - Alert Storm Protection’ Conclusions Report

## About this document

---

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation and the decision of the Change Board regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

## Summary of conclusions

---

### Change Board

The Change Board voted to **approve** SECMP0062. It believed the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a).

### Modification Report Consultation

Six responses were received to the third Modification Report Consultation. Three respondents believed the modification should be approved and three believed it should be rejected. Those believing it should be approved considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a) and those voting to reject believed it didn't better facilitate any of the objectives.

## Modification Report Consultation responses

---

### Summary of responses

The three positive respondents were all Large Suppliers who believe the SEC Objectives were better facilitated by the solution. One respondent acknowledged that although the solution does not solve the root cause, it provides a good means of mitigating and suppressing the impacts. The three negative respondents were Network Parties who believed the SEC Objectives were not improved by the solution and that the resources should be used on a solution dealing with the root causes of nuisance Alerts.

### Change of Parameters

The respondents noted the change of parameters in the solution which aligned to those agreed at the last Working Group meeting. As this was a concern raised prior to this consultation, respondents who voted to reject still acknowledged this change and noted it would improve the number of Alerts that could be consolidated.

### Support of intent, but not solution

The respondents who gave positive responses supported both the intent of the Modification Proposal and the Proposed Solution. They acknowledged that this would not be dealing with the root causes of nuisance Alerts, but as the solution would remedy a more immediate issue of Alerts that was hindering the DCC Systems. Because of this, the respondents believed the solution and the intent was warranted.

The negative respondents made statements acknowledging the intent of the solution, that the issue is one that should be fixed and that the DCC Systems should have some form of protection given how little there is against these Alerts. However, they all took issue with how the solution was designed under this Modification Proposal. These ranged from asking why the Data Service Provider (DSP), rather than the Communications Service Providers (CSPs), was targeted for the protection, enquiring about why a global setting was used rather than being able to target individual Alert Codes and most significantly around the use of emails as the means of notifying where Alert consolidation was in effect.

## Change Board vote

### Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to **approve** SECMP0062.

The vote breakdown is summarised below.

Change Board vote				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	5	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
Small Suppliers	3	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
Network Parties	1	2	0	<b>Reject</b>
Other SEC Parties	3	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
Consumer Representative	1	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
<b>Overall outcome:</b>				<b>APPROVE</b>

### Views against the General SEC Objectives

#### Objective (a)<sup>1</sup>

The majority of the Change Board believed that SECMP0062 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a) by improving the process via the removal of nuisance Alerts and prevent additional expense of expanding the infrastructure to cope with these Alerts. The members who voted to reject believed the solution did not better facilitate any of the objectives.

### Change Board discussions

One Network Party representative felt that the solution had been rushed, that the process of delivering this Modification Proposal had returned mistakes in the documentation which should have been avoided, and that they felt the views of Network Parties had not been considered during the creation of the solution. They felt that lessons needed to be learnt for future proposals.

Multiple members expressed a desire for a solution in future that can help mitigate the root causes of nuisance Alerts, rather than dealing with their symptoms as additional DCC traffic. However, they acknowledged that SECMP0062 provided an interim step in the right direction in advance of a more comprehensive solution.

<sup>1</sup> Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, operation and interoperability of smart metering systems at energy consumers' premises within Great Britain.