

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 11_2801

28 January 2020, 10:00 – 11:00

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Sub-Committee Members
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp
Large Suppliers	Paul Saker (<i>teleconference</i>)
Small Suppliers	Andrew Margan (<i>teleconference</i>)
Electricity Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (<i>teleconference</i>)

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Remi Oluwabamise (<i>teleconference</i>)
	Mari Toda
SECAS	Louise Evans (<i>Meeting Secretary</i>)
	Bradley Baker
	Alison Beard
	Joe Hehir
	Harry Jones

Apologies:

Representing	Name
Other SEC Parties	Jonathan Lishawa
	Elias Hanna
Consumers	Ed Rees

1. Welcome and introductions

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

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
ACTION CSC 10/01	DCC to provide the CSC with draft legal text for their proposed solution, and a breakdown of the previous cost analysis for amending the DCC Systems with detail behind the cost for DP096.
<p>An update was provided under the DP096 update of Agenda Item 3. A meeting has been arranged between SECAS and the DCC in the w/c 27/01/2020 to fully define the issue before proceeding.</p> <p>Status: Open.</p>	

3. Draft Proposal Report

DP094 'Supporting prepayment customers in no SM WAN scenarios'

The CSC was provided with a verbal update on [DP094 'Supporting prepayment customers in no SM WAN scenarios'](#) which seeks a solution to be able to effectively manage Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) 2 prepayment customers in no Wide Area Network (WAN), intermittent WAN or Data Communication Company (DCC) outage scenarios equivalent to the commercially developed solution available from the Secure SMETS1 product.

DP094 was raised by Utilita who believes the issue would affect 9% of its customers. However, one Large Supplier typically sees that 3% of Home Area Networks (HANs) experience connectivity issues with the WAN.

The Proposer is yet to provide a breakdown of the estimated size of the problem. SECAS proposes to issue a Request for Information (RFI) to SEC Parties to establish the impact of intermittent or no WAN.

One CSC Member (PS) suggested there may be challenges with the RFI. It suggested the RFI should focus on WAN coverage and how this prevents Devices from being installed, rather than focusing on SMETS2 pre-payment where volumes are relatively low.

SECAS suggested the RFI could be worded to cover issues with WAN as a whole and whether Devices can be installed. SECAS also agreed to raise broadening the problem statement for the Draft Proposal with the Proposer. A progress update on discussions with the Proposer and progression of the RFI will be provided at the next CSC meeting.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue

DP095 'Alignment of Credit Cover'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP095 'Alignment of Credit Cover'](#) which seeks to explore the current credit cover requirements to identify if there are ways it can be amended to reduce the risk of cost socialisation across the industry. DP095 was raised by EDF Energy.

SECAS informed CSC members that it is still examining the problem.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

DP096 'DNO Power Outage Alerts'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP096 'DNO Power Outage Alerts'](#) which seeks to address a SEC Obligation which the DCC is unable to meet. In the case of a power outage lasting more than three minutes, the DCC is obliged under the SEC to provide Power Outage Alerts (POAs) to Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) within a given timeframe.

The SEC states that the timeframe POAs must be set within is 60 seconds after the initial three minutes of the outage to allow time for power to be potentially restored automatically. Once power has

been restored, a Power Restoration Alert (PRA) is sent to the DNO. This must also be sent within 60 seconds.

The Chair (DK) provided an update on **Action CSC 10/01**, noting that SECAS is still working closely with the DCC and a meeting has been arranged with the DCC in the w/c 27/01/2020 to look to fully define the issue before moving to the Refinement Process.

One CSC Member (GS) noted that it is positive that the proposal was raised and has senior support at the DCC. They explained that there had been a suggestion from the DCC that the legal text for any solution could be worded to allow the detail to be included in a subsidiary document. GS stated that if this were to be the way the modification progressed then all documentation will need to be drawn up as part of the solution. GS voiced concern that the SEC might hold something vague and then the detail would never follow.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

DP098 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Batch 3'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP098 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Batch 3'](#) which seeks to introduce 21 non system impacting Issue Resolution Proposals (IRPs) to amend the Technical Specifications following transition from BEIS to the SEC Modifications process.

SECAS informed the CSC that the legal text has been drafted. This could potentially be targeted for the November 2020 SEC Release if it can be considered by the SEC Panel in February and proceed straight to the Report Phase.

The Draft Proposal is due to be presented to the Technical and Business Architecture Sub Committee (TABASC) at its meeting on 6 February 2020.

A DCC Representative (RO) noted that DCC Systems may be impacted by some of the IRPs included in the proposal and agreed to provide details to SECAS as soon as possible. Should they be system-impacting, they would be removed from the scope of the modification

<p>CSC 11/01: The DCC to provide SECAS with information on any IRPs currently in scope of DP098 that may impact on DCC systems.</p>

The CSC:

- **AGREED** this Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Report Phase, subject to agreement by the TABASC.

DP100 'Service Response Traffic Management'

The CSC was provided with a verbal update on [DP100 'Service Response Traffic Management'](#) which seek to manage scenarios where the DCC Systems have suffered an outage or restriction and are then restored. In these scenarios Service Responses will be queued while the DCC Systems are restricted and then be sent to the Users when DCC Systems come back online. Users' adapter systems will receive all of these Service Response messages at once, irrespective of priority.

SECAS informed the CSC that further input is still required from the Sub-Committees and a progress update will be provided to the CSC next month.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

DP101 'Large Gas Meter Displays'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP101 'Large Gas Meter Displays'](#) which seeks to resolve a discrepancy between the SMETS2 and the Measuring Instruments Directive (MID) which was introduced via [SECMP0006 'Specifying the number of digits for device display'](#). This is regarding the number of digits a Large Gas Meter must display on its user interface.

SECAS informed the CSC that the issue is clear and understood. Although there are no DCC impacts, SECAS recommends the proposal proceeds to the Refinement Process to ensure there are no unintended consequences of the change and to coordinate with other Codes that may be affected (specifically the Supply Point Administration Agreement (SPAA)). SECAS will also be presenting the proposal to the TABASC at its meeting on 6 February 2020.

A CSC Member (PS) questioned whether Suppliers did not realise that they were non-compliant with SECMP0006. SECAS clarified that the SECMP0006 Modification Report had highlighted that the Proposed Solution contradicted the MID. However, it was still approved by the industry knowing this was the case.

The change will apply to the next Principal Version of the SMETS (likely version 5). The Member (PS) questioned how Suppliers of SMETS2 Large Gas Meters that have already been installed would be impacted.

SECAS agreed to seek feedback from the TABASC and the Working Group regarding the draft legal text, and on this scenario and to ensure that the implementation approach is clear, as part of the Refinement Process.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** this Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and

- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process

DP104 'Security Improvements'

The CSC was provided with a verbal update on [DP104 'Security Improvements'](#) which was raised by Gordon Hextall, Independent Chair of the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) and Smart Metering Key Infrastructure (SMKI) Policy Management Authority (PMA). The SSC is aware of circumstances where Users are using SMKI Keys to sign DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) XML format Service Requests as well as the Pre-Command. In order to ensure the proper application of the SEC security arrangements, and to help support the Security Controls Framework, the SSC believes a requirement for the DCC to validate the separation of these keys should be introduced.

SECAS noted that since the last CSC meeting, the document classification for the proposal has been downgraded from RED to GREEN in accordance with the Panel Information Policy and will be presented to the Panel for decision on it's progression at its February meeting.

The CSC **NOTED** this Draft Proposal will now be presented at the February 2020 Panel meeting.

DP106 'CHISM update for Unknown WAN Variant'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP106 'CHISM update for Unknown WAN Variant'](#).

When a User sends Service Request 12.1 'Request WAN Matrix' to receive Smart Metering Wide Area Network (SM WAN) Coverage, in most cases they will receive an Availability Date and WAN Variant. However, in an exception case, the Communications Service Provider (CSP) for the South and Central regions may respond to a SM WAN Coverage request (CSPM-S1 or CSPM-S2) with an Availability Date for coverage but without being able to confirm the WAN Variant that will need to be used. This results in " " (Space) being returned as WAN variant, which has been identified by a customer as potentially confusing.

The word "unknown" has been proposed for return as the WAN variant rather than a blank space.

SECAS informed the CSC that the issue is clear and understood; a DCC Assessment is required and therefore SECAS recommends the proposal proceeds to the Refinement Process.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** this Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process

DP107 'SMETS1 Validation of SRV 6.15.1'

The CSC considered new Draft Proposal [DP107 'SMETS1 Validation of SRV 6.15.1'](#). To send a Critical Command to a SMETS1 Device, the User must be the owner of the relevant certificate on the Device and the owner of the Device in the RDP data. If a Network Operator updates the Network Operator Certificate with another in error, this error cannot be corrected.

One CSC Member (GS) explained that the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements (S1SR) document contains detail that all Service Requests require an additional validation to check against the Registered Data Provider (RDP) data, the User needs to be the owner of the Network Operator Certificate and be the correct DNO for that meter. The member added that the issue is low risk and only affects DCC enrolled SMETS1 Devices, as SMETS2 meters do not have this validation.

A cost benefit analysis would need to be undertaken to assess whether there is sufficient benefit to removing the validation to justify the cost.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

DP108 'SSI Job Type Role for SRO/ARO'

The CSC considered new Draft Proposal [DP108 'SSI Job Type Role for SRO/ARO'](#).

There are several procedures that only Senior Responsible Officers (SROs), or Authorised Responsible Officer (AROs) are empowered to undertake with or request of the DCC. However, the Self-Service Interface (SSI) currently has no restrictions available to limit access to these processes/requests to SROs and AROs only. For example, submitting Anomaly Detection Threshold (ADT) forecast data.

One Member (GS) believed that more examples are required to understand what the problem is, as it was felt that the ADT example was insufficient due to ADT files having to be signed by AROs prior to submission. SECAS informed CSC members that further examples have been requested of the Proposer to understand the functional components and DCC concerns.

The member added that presumably a system change would be required to add SROs and AROs to the SSI role table and restrict access by anyone other than an SRO or ARO. If not, the risk of unauthorised access would remain the same.

SECAS informed CSC members that if the solution to the problem prescribes a change to the SSI, this will need to go through the SSI Change Governance Process. A DCC Representative (MT) clarified that this was not the original intent of the DP and agreed to confirm this with DCC colleagues.

SECAS informed members that DP108 and DP109 are not interdependent.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

DP109 'ADT and Exit Quarantine file delivery mechanism'

The CSC considered new Draft Proposal [DP109 'ADT and Exit Quarantine file delivery mechanism'](#) which seeks to require that the Anomaly Detection Threshold (ADT) File and Exit Quarantine files be provided to the DCC via the SSI as a more secure method than by email. The ability to share the files via email would still be retained.

The CSC was supportive of the issue and agreed it was clear. Members believed there would be benefit to it being presented to the other Sub-Committees for comment first, in particular the Security Sub-Committee (SSC), and returned for decision at next month's meeting.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

DP110 'Aligning SEC Appendix D with DCC Processes'

The CSC considered new Draft Proposal [DP110 'Aligning SEC Appendix D with DCC Processes'](#) which seeks to amend SEC Appendix D. The DCC and the SMKI PMA have agreed changes that should be made to SEC Appendix D to align with DCC processes.

One Member (GS) raised that presumably the SMKI PMA is comfortable with the SEC changing to meet DCC processes rather than DCC complying with the wording of the SEC. SECAS confirmed this was the case and as the drafting of SEC Appendix D was prior to go live, it is no longer fit for purpose.

CSC 11/02: SECAS to clarify in the Modification Report the justification for amending the SEC to align with DCC processes in the Modification Proposal for DP110.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** this Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Report Phase

DP111 'SMDA Budget Amendments'

The CSC considered new Draft Proposal [DP111 'SMDA Budget Amendments'](#) which seeks to review the Smart Meter Device Assurance (SMDA) funding model to ensure that the SMDA can provide long-term test assurance. It was noted that there is a low risk that the SMDA may not be able to continue in its current format.

One member (PS) raised whether this needs to be considered by the SMDA separately and what the connection is with the SEC. They were also concerned the problem was too open. Another member

(GS) agreed this is a valid issue but was unclear if this would require a Modification Proposal or would need to be resolved via another route. There was a consensus that further work is needed to understand the issue and the Draft Proposal should not be converted to a Modification Proposal until the issue is sufficiently understood.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to define and understand the issue.

4. Any Other Business (AOB)

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

Next Meeting: 25 February 2020.

DRAFT