This document is classified as **Green** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with other SEC Parties and SMIP stakeholders at large, but not made publicly available.

Paper Reference:	**OPSG_38x_2311_02**
Action:	**For Discussion**

CH and Network – OPSG Requirements Review

1. Purpose

This paper provides an overview and the status of the OPSG's review of the project scope and operational requirements of the CH and Network Project.

2. Role of the OPSG

BEIS have requested that the SEC Panel consider the CH & Network Evolution proposal particularly *"the potential specific requirement is a recognized user business need; whether it is core/desirable/optional on the basis of the provision of realistic and full ROM costs; and by when it is needed or desired."*

The role of the OPSG will be to review and consider the Service/Operational elements and impacts of the CH and Network project (including specifically the sunsetting of the 2G Network) with the following objectives:

a. **Objective 1**: To provide advice to the SEC Panel regarding the CH & Networks proposals, considering implications of service definition, quality of service, deployment model, operational impacts for Users

b. **Objective 2**: To provide input to DCC on the proposals and their development and implementation

TABASC will review the technical aspects of the proposal; SSC will advise on the Security implications. TAG will be considering the proposed testing approach and services that will be required to support the delivery of this project.

3. OPSG Review

Review Meetings

The OPSG reviewed the DCC's overview of the scope of the programme and requirements of the CH & Network project at the 28 September 2020 Reporting meeting (OPSG_36x). The documents reviewed can be found under Appendix A and B. The OPSG requested additional information and clarification on the following:

- Transition Approaches with key dates and dependencies

- The 4G Service
- SMETS1 Scope
- Single Band and Dual Band Communication Hubs delivery
- SEC Compliance and expected changes
- DNO Alerts and on-going industry changes
- Comms Hub lifecycle
- Operational Areas linked to Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM)

The DCC agreed to follow up with details on these areas and additional summaries at the OPSG reporting meeting on 26 October 2020 (OPSG_37x).

At OPSG 37x, the group reviewed the summaries and responses provided by the DCC, the relevant documents can be found in Appendix C and D.

Overall Approach

1. The OPSG noted that the advice to the Panel (and subsequently BEIS) should clearly refer to the requirements and business case for the Minimum Viable Product (although further complementary commentary might also be provided). The OPSG confirmed that the MVP comprises the Single Band CH, the Dual Band CH, and the required 4G service.
2. To make the review of the proposed requirements practicable, OPSG asked that DCC identify how the requirements stated differed from the current SEC requirements. Following this approach, OPSG did not review the full Requirements Tracking Matrix (RTM). DCC highlighted parts of the RTM in response to OPSG queries.
3. It is noted that the conclusions set out here are interim, pending review of the Cost Benefit Analysis document (CBA)

Conclusions

Business Need

The OPSG agreed that there was a clear and recognised user business need for the project, given the forecast closure of the 2G service.

The OPSG noted that it had not been involved in the consideration or definition of any alternative approaches to satisfying this business need[1].

Programme Definition and Schedule

The OPSG noted that no formal Programme Brief specifically for the work had yet been published and noted that clarity and control of scope and assumptions was essential.

The OPSG noted the DCC's view that a key delivery date for the Programme would be 2022, and net benefits would be materially impacted if this date is not achieved.

[1] TABASC have been reviewing the technical aspects of solutions

Transition, Deployment, Concurrent Operation, and Consumer Impact

The OPSG emphasised that a key feature from the operational perspective would be the planning assumptions and scenarios regarding the deployment of the new devices, operation concurrently with existing devices, and, as appropriate, end of life for existing devices.

DCC said they were unable to provide these assumptions at the requirements stage, but that they would be explicitly set out in the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to be published subsequently.

It was noted that an important aspect will be any assumptions regarding SMETS1 installations.

Requirements

The OPSG noted that DCC's documents and presentations addressed requirements beyond those required for the MVP. The OPSG therefore asked for the requirements to be categorised as follows:

(a) The requirements for the MVP

(b) Any requirements relating to facilitating, enabling, enforcing, the delivery of the current SEC requirements (termed "Quality Requirements")

(c) Other candidate requirements, to be considered separately and subsequently from the requirements for the MVP. The OPSG noted that these will be considered subsequently and in the light of the CBA.

Requirements for the MVP

The OPSG were asked to consider the Minimum Viable Product (MVP) requirements on Service Functionality and Service Quality (see Table 1).

The OPSG agreed that there are several outstanding questions on Candidate Service Improvements that is dependent on the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) review, which is currently targeted for 23 November 2020 (OPSG_38x).

Area	Criteria	OPSG View
Service Functionality Requirements for MVP	Are all areas of changes to current SEC requirements clearly identified and acceptable?	The OPSG acknowledged the DCC's statement that all existing SEC requirements will be supported. In particular, the OPSG noted DCC assurances that: (a) All existing SRVs will be supported without change (b) All existing User orchestrations will be supported without change (c) All existing HANS will be supported without change (d) Logistics processes will be unchanged other than to recognise the MVP devices as new variants
	Do the requirements reflect operational requirements and priorities as perceived by the OPSG and Users?	The OPSG agreed the MVP requirements reflect their priorities as Users

	Are any essential functionality requirements missing?	The OPSG agreed there are no essential requirements missing from the MVP.
Service Quality Requirements for MVP	Are all requirements intended to improve service quality identified and acceptable?	The OPSG noted the summary from the DCC on Service Quality. The OPSG accepted the MVP requirements.
	Are any service quality requirements missing?	The OPSG agreed there are no missing requirements from the MVP.

Table 1. OPSG MVP Requirements view

4. Next Steps

The next steps are as follows:

1. The OPSG to review the Cost Benefit Analysis, starting on 23 November 2020 (OPSG_38x), (subject to document publication). The OPSG to provide a view on MVP requirements against Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) costs, taking account of the planning assumptions for transition, deployment, and concurrent operation, and consumer impact.
2. The OPSG to subsequently review and comment on the desirability of candidate additional requirements, taking account of costs and benefits
3. It is understood that TABASC have agreed that the MVP requirements are suitable for inclusion in an RFP to be published by DCC. It is proposed that OPSG support this position, given its current position on requirements

5. Recommendations

The OPSG is requested to:

- **REVIEW** the current OPSG view outlined against the MVP requirements in Table 1,
- **PROVIDE** any additional comments or changes on the OPSG statements

Joey Manners

SECAS

16 November 2020