

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 13_3103

31 March 2020, 10:00 – 11:20

Teleconference

SECCSC_13_3103 - Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Sub-Committee Members
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp (DK) <i>(teleconference)</i>
Large Suppliers	Paul Saker (PS) <i>(teleconference)</i>
	Simon Trivella (ST) <i>(teleconference)</i>
Small Suppliers	Chris Brown (CB) <i>(teleconference)</i>
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna (EH) <i>(teleconference)</i>
Consumers	Ed Rees (ER) <i>(teleconference)</i>

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Mari Toda (MT) <i>(teleconference)</i>
	Paul Howard (PH) <i>(teleconference)</i>
	David Walsh (DW) <i>(part meeting)</i> <i>(teleconference)</i>
	Charlotte Semp (CS) <i>(part meeting)</i> <i>(teleconference)</i>
SECAS	Holly Burton (HB) <i>(Meeting Secretary)</i> <i>(teleconference)</i>
	Alison Beard (AB) <i>(teleconference)</i>

	Joe Hehir (JH) (<i>teleconference</i>)
	Emmanuel Ajayi (EA) (<i>teleconference</i>)
	Bradley Baker (BB) (<i>teleconference</i>)
	Damien Bevan (DB) (<i>part meeting</i>) (<i>teleconference</i>)
Draft Proposal Proposer	Alastair Cobb (AC) (<i>part meeting</i>) (<i>teleconference</i>)

Apologies:

Representing	Name
Electricity Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)

1. Welcome and introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

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

The Chair confirmed that one set of comments were received on the minutes from the previous CSC meeting held on Tuesday 25 February 2020 which have been incorporated. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as modified.

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.
The DCC will present a project plan at the Delivery Hub Working Group on 7 April 2020. Status: Open	
ACTION CSC 12/01	SECAS to arrange a meeting with DCC and DNO representatives to discuss plans and capabilities for DP096.

Action Reference	Action
	The DCC will present a project plan at the Delivery Hub Working Group on 7 April 2020. Status: Closed

3. Draft Proposal Report

Recommended for conversion:

DP123 ‘IVP and MVP realignment of SMETS2 v2.0’

The CSC was provided with a verbal update on [DP123 ‘IVP and MVP realignment of SMETS2 v2.0’](#).

The Proposer (AC) confirmed the current end date for installation is October 2020. However, as a result of the current delay with Meter installation, due to the impact of the coronavirus (COVID-19), the high level of Meters currently waiting to be installed will still be due for installation in October 2020. This will affect the majority of Large Suppliers, and therefore a considerable number of Devices will be affected by this (roughly 200,000 Devices).

The Proposer noted the plan for the SMETS2 v4.2 Devices was functioning with clarity being sought as to whether this change should go ahead. An Industry Working Group is taking place regarding this functionality but there is no option to rework these Meters.

A CSC member (ST) questioned whether there has been any discussion with BEIS on the dates and appetite from their perspective to change the date rather than going through the SEC process. The Proposer confirmed a session was held two weeks ago with all customers as part of a regular Forum providing a proposal to proceed with this change, they didn’t perceive at the time that BEIS would take any action without this request.

SECAS (AB) confirmed that over the next two weeks SECAS would investigate BEIS’ position along with seeking input from the TABASC and the Operations Group, before taking to the SEC Panel for conversion to a Modification Proposal.

The system impact was questioned, and whether Suppliers were able to commission and install Devices or whether the DCC System functionality needs to change if the validity period was to change. A CSC Member (ST) queried the impact if the date wasn’t changed. Technically, any Device installed outside of the validity period would not count towards the total number of installs, but the Member (ST) queried whether it could still be installed and commissioned. Another member (PS) advised that the intent was not to have a DCC system impact for such changes, but purely a regulatory impact. A DCC Representative (PH) confirmed this change would not impact the DCC Systems.

CSC members queried if this would count as an Urgent Modification, and agreed the importance of confirming whether this would meet Ofgem's urgency criteria. SECAS (AB) noted there is enough time to complete an expedited process and the Chair noted that may be quicker than waiting for a decision on urgency from the Authority. The Proposer highlighted there is a three to four month lead time for Suppliers for ordering Devices so urgent feedback is required as Devices cannot be reworked.

A CSC Member (PS) noted it needed to be clear which SMETS versions the change applied to, and noted it was only the Installation Validity Period for which an end date has been set.

A CSC Member (ST) queried if there would be any compatibility issues if the end-date was to be extended. The Proposer replied that everyone he had spoken to had been expecting to transition to SMETS2 v4.2 Devices from October. There is an incompatibility matrix, but this has only six issues noted on it, and BEIS has been expecting people to be installing different Devices on different versions at the same time.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the 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

CSC 13/01: SECAS to look into whether DP123 would meet the urgency criteria before taking to SEC Panel for progression.

DP100 'Service Response Traffic Management'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP100 'Service Response Traffic Management'](#).

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the 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.

DP116 'Service Request Forecasting'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP116 'Service Request Forecasting'](#).

SECAS (BB) noted that the proposal has been presented to each Sub-Committee and has received positive feedback. Each Sub-Committee was happy for the proposal to progress, and the Operations Group (OPSG) wishes to be kept up to date with the progress of the proposal.

A CSC member (PS) questioned why the Refinement Process is needed. SECAS (BB) noted that the process has been reviewed by the Proposer who believes this modification would benefit from going through to the Refinement Process. One Working Group member stated ensure there was enough time to allow a trial period within it to ensure that any proposals are fit for purpose and appropriate for everyone. SECAS agreed to double check with the Proposer the next stage for this Modification, whether it be refinement or incorporating into the SEC, and to issue the response to CSC members.

One CSC Member (EH) was concerned whether the changes proposed under this proposal could create new issues later that would need further modifications to resolve. They wanted to ensure that whatever solution is developed is designed to be enduring. Another member (CB) supported the proposal to remove forecasting but queried what the DCC was going to put in its place. Members agreed these questions needed to be answered during the Refinement Process. One member (ST) queried if the CSC could debate those points, but the Chair clarified the CSC's role was to ensure the identified issue was clear and it was not within the Sub-Committee's remit to develop solutions.

The CSC:

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

DP117 'Bulk CH returns'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP117 'Bulk CH returns'](#).

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the 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.

DP118 'Communications Hub Finance Charges'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP118 'Communications Hub Finance Charges'](#).

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the 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.

DP119 'CH Alert Storm Consolidation'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP119 'CH Alert Storm Consolidation'](#).

A CSC Member (EH) queried the number of modifications that had been raised around Alert management. He was concerned that the many different solutions to Alert issues could create confusion, and that issues were being considered case-by-case without the overall issue being considered. He agreed the industry needs to sort out these issues, which are affecting everyone, but felt that running with different solutions under different modifications was not the best way. He queried if it is time to go a couple of steps backwards, understand the underlying issues with Alerts, and move forward with a holistic solution.

A DCC Representative (DW) noted that the idea of this modification is to address the Communications Hub element. The intent is to use the solution and the configuration parameters that have already been defined under [SECMP0062 'Northbound Application Traffic Management - Alert Storm Protection'](#) and to re-use this functionality for Communications Hubs. The DCC stressed that this is not a completely independent solution but a solution that needs to run alongside SECMP0062.

The Chair considered whether there were any other elements that would benefit from straddling this solution in parallel, as opposed to raising a new modification in the near future which builds the same element. The DCC believed it would not be beneficial to cover too much under one solution and that it would be better to ensure this piece was done correctly. A CSC Member (PS) agreed that expanding the solution would be too complex, but agreed with the concerns over a piecemeal approach being taken.

The first CSC member (EH) noted he was not against the idea of DP119 but wanted to ensure the solution is optimised. A mechanism has been established under SECMP0062; can the DCC simply add the Communications Hub elements to this?

It was noted that the DCC's intention would be to use the solution of SECMP0062 to throttle and consolidate the Alerts at the Communications Hub rather than sending them over the network to the Data Service Provider (DSP). CSC members were informed the same method and approach would be followed for SECMP0062, with coding and implementation being the only difference. The CSC Member (EH) acknowledged this, but wanted to ensure all the different solutions were being properly co-ordinated within the DCC ecosystem.

The CSC Chair (DK) clarified this will be flagged to the SEC Panel when setting the questions being resolved during the Refinement Process. He also felt that no further modifications on Alerts should be

raised until the wider picture had been reviewed. The DCC agreed that under the scope of DP119, a review of the wider architecture regarding Alerts will be assessed under a careful, considered approach, which may or may not be implemented under the DP119 solution.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the 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.

DP122 'Operational Metrics'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP122 'Operational Metrics'](#).

A DCC Representative (MT) noted the Operational Metrics Review (OMR) was still ongoing and queried if raising this proposal now risked duplicating work. SECAS (DB) noted this modification is interdependent with the review and will be progressing some of the recommendations. The Draft Proposal had been raised now to be progressed alongside the final report, with both being presented to the April 2020 Panel meeting.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the 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

Continuing in development:

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'](#).

The Request for Information (RFI) document has been drafted and SECAS is aiming to issue this this week, but is still waiting for feedback from the Proposer on this. Assuming no issues are raised with

the questions being proposed, this will be issued to industry at the end of the week. Once the RFI responses are returned and assessed, this will then be brought back to the CSC for decision.

One CSC Member (PS) questioned what information is being sought in the RFI. SECAS (JH) confirmed the following three questions are being raised:

- 1) When you attempt to install a SMETS2 prepayment Meter, how often do you find a lack of WAN?
- 2) Do you keep statistics on how long it takes for WAN issues to be resolved from the point they are logged with the DCC and are you prepared to share them with SECAS?
- 3) What percentage of WAN issues that you have raised with the DCC are resolved with a positive conclusion, i.e. WAN is established and a prepayment Meter could be installed if needed, or, a connection is established with a prepayment Meter which has lost connectivity?

The CSC Chair (DK) confirmed the CSC will be kept up to date with progress on questions being raised.

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

DP096 'DNO Power Outage Alerts'

The CSC was provided with a progress update on [DP096 'Power Outage Alerts'](#).

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

DP108 'SSI Job Type Role for SRO/ARO'

The CSC was provided with a progress update on [DP108 'SSI Job Type Role for SRO/ARO'](#).

It was noted that this proposal had been taken to relevant SEC Sub-Committees. An action was raised for Smart Meter Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) to provide an understanding of whether the implementation would contradict the responsibility of the SRO in the SEC. Another question raised was whether the SMKI PMA was seeking to add the SRO or ARO job type role to Appendix AH, which is the SSI control specification, or if it is also seeking to add functionality to the SSI which would validate certain requests against SROs and AROs.

In the proposal, the DCC has provided submission of Anomaly Detection Thresholds as an example which the CSC had previously questioned as there are already Certificates in place for AROs and

SROs that require validation. The CSC's previous request for further specific examples to be provided also remains outstanding.

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

DP111 'SMDA Budget Amendments'

The CSC was provided with a progress update on [DP111 'SMDA Budget Amendments'](#). Work is continuing to clarify the issue with the Proposer.

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

DP121 'Commissioning non-commissioned Devices after CoS'

The CSC considered new Draft Proposal [DP121 'Commissioning non-commissioned Devices after CoS'](#).

A CSC Member (PS), who was the Proposer of this Draft Proposal, noted he was seeing a number of meters that can't be commissioned and wanted to raise this issue to seek feedback to assess if this is a wider problem.

A CSC Member (EH) queried how this issue would be affected in a dual-Supplier scenario. The Proposer was not sure, but noted this issue could arise under a number of scenarios.

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

4. Delivery of DCC Assessments (RED)

This item is classified as **RED** and is therefore recorded in the Confidential Minutes.

5. Any Other Business (AOB)

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

Next Meeting: 28 April 2020.