

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.

# SECMP0067 ‘Service Request Traffic Management’

## Conclusions Report – version 1.0

### 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 recommend that the Authority **rejects** SECMP0067. It believed the modification did not better facilitate SEC Objectives (a)<sup>1</sup> and (e)<sup>2</sup>.

#### Modification Report Consultation

Seven responses were received to the Modification Report Consultation. The majority of respondents believe the modification should be rejected. They considered that the modification will not better facilitate SEC Objectives (a) and (e).

---

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

<sup>2</sup> To facilitate innovation in the design and operation of energy networks to contribute to the delivery of a secure and sustainable supply of energy

## Modification Report Consultation responses

---

### Summary of responses

There were seven responses to the Modification Report Consultation (MRC), four responses from Large Suppliers and three from Electricity Network Parties. Two Large Suppliers were in favour of approving, one abstention and one in favour of rejecting. The three Electricity Network Parties all believed that the Modification Proposal should be rejected.

Of those respondents who favoured rejection, one of the most commonly cited reasons was the wider business case and the cost of the Modification Proposal. Statements were provided that the cost of a solution (in the region of £1.6 million) was significant and that they wanted further analysis to prove spending money on this solution was better than any other alternative the money could be used for improving traffic management.

Those in support of the Modification Proposal noted that the solution will provide protection to the DCC Systems and better addresses the issue raised. One of the Large Suppliers stated that it will likely offer the most reassurance for the needs of the most vulnerable of their consumers and reduce the likelihood of unplanned DCC outages.

Prior to the Change Board convening to vote, the Proposer addressed the respondents' queries raised in the MRC responses:

### The Priority Service Request list

Respondents raise issues surrounding the priorities of Service Requests. The Proposer confirmed that with having the Priority Service Request list blank at the point of going live, it will be down to the individual User to choose which order they send the Service Requests in within their allocation. The rationale was so that it will mean the User will not have their priorities dictated by other SEC Parties or the DCC.

### Other Traffic Management initiatives

Some respondents cited the other initiatives with traffic management as a reason why they were less supportive of this Modification Proposal. The Proposer stated that ongoing work into improving system traffic through [SECMP0062 'Northbound Application Traffic Management - Alert Storm Protection'](#) would only provide protection to northbound traffic against too many Alerts. Because the Modification Proposal would be affecting southbound traffic against too many Service Requests, it remains independent of some of these other initiatives. Therefore, southbound DCC system traffic could still lead to issues if the proposal isn't passed.

### The Service Request Traffic Management Document

Some clarity was requested into why the location of the solution's mechanism formula, the formula's parameter values and the Priority Service Request list was moved away from the Traffic Management Mechanism Document. SECAS presented this to Panel with the intention of including these in the Traffic Management Mechanism Document, but that the Panel was concerned this would contradict the governance of the Traffic Management Mechanism Document as it had not yet been

implemented. The legal text, modification report and other annexes were amended in line with this decision.

## **The business case**

Other issues that were raised concerned the analysis used to prove that the Proposed Solution was the most suitable solution and the best to deliver SEC objectives (a) and (e). The Proposer believes that the economic breakdown in spending the equivalent funding on additional system capacity and accompanying rationale has been provided in Section 7 of the Modification Report.

## Change Board vote

### Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to recommend that the Authority **rejects** SECMP0067.

The vote breakdown is summarised below.

Change Board vote				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	2	4	0	Reject
Small Suppliers	0	2	0	Reject
Network Parties	0	3	0	Reject
Other SEC Parties	1	2	0	Reject
Consumer Representative	0	0	0	-
<b>Overall outcome:</b>				<b>REJECT</b>

The Consumer Representative was not present for the vote.

### Views against the General SEC Objectives

#### Objective (a)

The majority of the Change Board believes that SECMP0067 would not better facilitate SEC Objective (a) stating that although supporting the intention of the Modification Proposal, they were not convinced that the Proposed Solution was the most cost effective means of ensuring efficiency within the DCC Systems and mitigating heavy Service Request traffic. Those who supported the Modification Proposal believed Objective (a) would be better facilitated by improving the reliability of the installation and operation of smart metering devices by ensuring the DCC Systems has a lower probability of facing an unplanned outage.

#### Objective (e)

The majority of the Change Board believes that SECMP0067 would not better facilitate SEC Objective (e) stating that although the solution did offer innovation in the design of the DCC Systems and acknowledge that it would help fix a serious flaw, they stated concern with cost of the solution. The Change Board additionally questioned how much research had been undertaken into finding alternative means of delivering this improved system design. Those who supported the Modification Proposal believe that Objective (e) would be better facilitated by innovating the DCC Systems to help prevent against a Denial of Service attack and to better cope with Service Request traffic peaks without purchasing increased infrastructure.

## Change Board discussions

### Business case

The Change Board members had mixed reactions when discussing the Modification Proposal's business case. One Change Board member felt the solution was providing something essential to the DCC Systems where even if the cost was large, the benefits it could deliver and outages it could mitigate would outweigh this cost.

By contrast, another Change Board member stated their unease with contributing to a solution they felt was incredibly expensive and that they weren't reassured would be the best use of funding to mitigate heavy Service Request traffic issues. In particular they wanted further investigations into alternative solutions such as additional infrastructure to cope with the traffic of more solid data that could show how the solution would prove to be cost effective. Without these forms of cost benefit analysis cases being substantial and removing doubt, they stated they would be inclined to reject the Modification Proposal. Another Change Board member agreed with this opinion, citing that the expense of the solution was a problem for them, even though they acknowledged the issue it is trying to resolve is a legitimate one.

### Views of the TABASC chair

The chair of the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) was present at the meeting to provide their opinion on the Modification Proposal. They stated that the Modification Proposal had been taken to the Sub Committee multiple times during its duration, although not recently. He stated that the TABASC had not formed a view specifically but he felt that the issue needs to be addressed. The TABASC Chair further stated that the protection that would be provided is something that will be necessary in future, but conceded that the cost is a barrier to this. They suggested that when the contract for the Data Service Provider (DSP) is renewed sometime between 2021 and 2023, then the sort of protection that was being offered by this solution will be considered essential in those discussions.