

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 Board Meeting 41x

29 April 2020, 14:00 – 14:30

Teleconference

### SECCB\_41x\_2904- Draft Minutes

#### Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Simon Trivella (ST)
	Tim Larcher (TL)
	David Rodger (DR)
	Paul Saker (PS)
	Emslie Law (EL)
	Rachel Norberg (RN) (Alternate for Jenny Smith)
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (CB)
	Gareth Evans (GE)
Networks	Paul Fitzgerald (PF)
	David Mitchell (DM)
	Gemma Slaney (GS)
Other SEC Parties	Gerdjan Busker (GB)
	Mike Woodhall (MW)
	Alastair Cobb (AC)

Representing	Other Participants
SECAS	Holly Burton (HB) (Meeting Secretary)
	Harry Jones (HJ)
	Ali Beard (AB)

DCC	Mari Toda (MT)
	Gary Bailey (GB)
	Vince Rawle (VR)
	Simon Harrison (SH)
	Graeme Liggett (GL)
	David Walsh (DW)
Ofgem	Jonathan Coe (JC)
	Michael Walls (MWa)
TABASC Chair	Julian Hughes (JH)

## 1. MP123 'IVP realignment of SMETS2 v2.0 and v3.1' Change Board vote

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP123 'IVP realignment of SMETS2 v2.0 and v3.1'](#).

No comments were raised, and the Change Board proceeded to vote.

### Change Board Vote – MP123 decision:

The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
Large Suppliers	6	0	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	2	0	0	Approve
Network Parties	3	0	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	3	0	0	Approve
Consumers	0	0	0	-
Overall conclusion:				APPROVE

The view of the Change Board is that MP123 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a)<sup>1</sup> for the reasons given in the Modification Report by making the SEC more efficient.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** that MP123 should proceed to vote:
- **DETERMINED** that MP123 should be **APPROVED** under Self-Governance; and
- **PROVIDED** rationale for this decision against the General SEC Objectives.

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

MP123 has been progressed as a Self-Governance Modification, and so there will now be 10 Working Days for any SEC Party who wishes to refer the Change Board's decision to the SEC Panel, to do so. This referral period will close at **5pm on Thursday 14 May 2020**.

If no referrals are received by this date, then MP123 will be implemented on 29 May 2020 as a standalone Release.

## **2. SECMP0067 'Service Request Traffic Management' Change Board vote**

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [SECMP0067 'Service Request Traffic Management'](#).

Change Board members noted the cost to implement this modification is roughly £1.6million with a proposed implementation date 7 November 2020 as part of the November 2020 SEC Release if approved by the Authority.

SECAS (AB) noted that several responses had been received to the Modification Report Consultation and provided a breakdown of the questions and responses.

Comments were raised regarding [SECMP0062 'Northbound Traffic Application Traffic Management – Alert Storm Protection'](#) in that, this modification will provide Alert Storm protection through a DCC designed mechanism. There were questions raised about why this modification and the recent addition of a new 'motorway' was not sufficient to increase the capacity. The response from the DCC noted that the Alert Traffic management solution is for Northbound traffic only, the additional capacity recently added is sufficient for 'normal traffic' not a sudden large burst of traffic. In addition, this modification is not about managing capacity, but about providing a protection mechanism and managing overloads while both protecting the DCC System and Users.

A Change Board member (GS) noted that, based on the potential of an additional 'motorway', there is still an element of doubt regarding the cost of this modification and felt that additional motorways have not been fully investigated as part of the cost benefit analysis. She asked if it would be cheaper for the DCC to operate two motorways more than needed for the expected capacity, to manage spikes in demand. A Change Board member (PF) questioned whether it had been confirmed that if there were more motorways, it could potentially reduce the likelihood of a spike where the DCC would not be able to cope with the surge. SECAS (AB) noted the DCC can have a certain amount of motorways which will in turn provide plenty of capacity but they would not protect against a spike of traffic or if there is intent to cause an outage. The idea of this modification is to build a protection mechanism. Another member (ST) acknowledged the lower costs of the motorways compared to the cost of the solution but queried what the cost would be to Parties of the DCC Systems crashing. He could not see how adding additional motorways would prevent the issue from ever arising and noted that increased maintenance costs that would be associated with additional motorways.

A Change Board member (CB) noted another response highlighted the removal of the Priority Service Request list. SECAS responded that following comments from the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) and a discussion at the Working Group, where a member had pointed out that a Party could still cause a Data Service Provider (DSP) outage by sending enough priority Service Requests, the Proposer decided to empty the Priority Service Request list. This functionality still exists though, should it be needed in the future. DCC Users will now have control over their own Service Requests and can choose to send them in whichever priority order they chose.

Other consultation responses considered that the business case was incomplete. SECAS (AB) noted the Working Group had discussed and requested additional investigations to support the business case, including additional 'motorways' and Disaster Recovery Scenarios. These were addressed at the Working Group meeting and were detailed in Section 7 of the Modification Report.

Additional comments were raised on the Service Request Traffic Management Mechanism Document. SECAS (AB) noted that initially the legal text changes for SECMP0067 were made as changes to the Traffic Management Mechanism Document which would be implemented by [SECMP0062](#). However, following confusion at the Working Group and further discussions at Panel regarding the governance of changing the document before it had been implemented by SECMP0062, it had been decided to move this legal text into a separate document for clarity.

The last comment highlighted the configuration parameters still had square brackets. It was advised that these were examples and were accurate as possible. The values have not changed and will be used in testing.

A Change Board member (ST) thanked SECAS and the DCC for providing responses to the queries raised in the Modification Report Consultation in advance of the meeting, which had been helpful.

The TABASC Chair (JH) considered that without some level of control, the DCC would have to invest in more equipment, and even with this there is a risk of the DCC Systems being overrun by a surge. He noted the cost was high and acknowledged that this protection likely should have been included in the original implementation; implementing it now as a standalone change means it is much more expensive. He considered that this protection would be included as a requirement under the forthcoming DSP re-procurement, and noted the TABASC is looking into the strategic requirements for this.

No further comments were raised, and the Change Board proceeded to vote.

### Change Board Vote – SECMP0067 decision:

The voting outcome is shown below:

Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Conclusion
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
Consumers	0	0	0	-
Overall conclusion:				REJECT

The view of the Change Board is that SECMP0067 would not better facilitate SEC Objective (a) in the way put forward in the solution. Members did not have an issue with the Proposal but were not supportive of the solution as the cost benefit analysis required further investigation along with the rationale for including this in the November 2020 SEC Release.

The Change Board:

- **AGREED** that SECMP0067 should proceed to vote
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Authority that SECMP0067 should be **REJECTED**

- **PROVIDED** rationale for this decision against the General SEC Objectives.

SECMP0067 has been progressed as an Authority Determined Modification and so will be submitted to the Authority, in order for it to undertake the necessary Authority determination activities.

If SECMP0067 is approved by the Authority on or before 31 May 2020, it will be implemented on 5 November 2020 as part of the November 2020 SEC Release.

### 3. Any Other Business

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

**Next scheduled meeting date: 27 May 2020**