

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 20_2710

27 October 2020, 10:00 – 10:40

Teleconference

SECCSC_20_2710 – Final Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	Other Participants
Change Sub-Committee Chair (<i>Alternate</i>)	Ali Beard (AB)
Large Suppliers	Paul Saker (PS)
	Simon Trivella (ST)
Small Suppliers	Chris Brown (CB)
Electricity Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)
Other SEC Party	Elias Hanna

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Remi Oluwabamise (RO)
	Sasha Townsend (ST)
	Glenn Critchley
SECAS	Holly Burton (<i>Meeting Secretary</i>)
	Louise Evans
	Manny Ajayi
	Harry Jones
	Bradley Baker

1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

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

The Meeting Secretary (HB) informed the CSC that no comments had been received on the minutes from the previous CSC meeting prior to this meeting. CSC (GS) highlighted four formatting changes from the previous CSC meeting held on Tuesday 29 September 2020. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as written subject to the agreed amendments being made post-meeting.

2. Draft Proposal Report

Recommended for Conversion:

DP147 'SMKI Full Extract'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP147 'SMKI Full Extract'](#).

Currently the DCC provides a full SMKI extract and seven incremental changes during the preceding 24 hours daily as required by SEC Appendix O 'SMKI Repository Interface Design Specification', Section 2.3.3.

The issue is the full SMKI extract, which is run daily, is currently 16GB in size, and will only grow as Devices are added to the DCC ecosystem. This full extract is now taking several hours for Parties to download, and more than 24 hours for the DCC to produce.

CSC (GS) noted a question for consideration is when Parties would need and use this extract as once it has been extracted, it will be out of date as Devices are constantly added.

The CSC acknowledged the issue and agreed more work should be undertaken as part of the Refinement process to try and fix the problem.

No further comments were raised.

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:

DP096 'DNO Power Outage Alerts'

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

SECAS (BB) advised after recent conversations with the DCC, DNOs would like to see current DCC testing in terms of performance and accuracy of Alerts which should be based on hard evidence. DNOs will be looking at choosing enhancement options once DCC projects B and C have been completed. Project B will consist of testing of Alerts and Project C will focus on Alert measurement capability. These projects should conclude by the end of 2020 and as a result, the DCC would like to progress this modification on 4 January 2021.

The current expected implementation date is estimated within Q1 of 2022 however, this is dependent on results of testing.

No further comments were raised.

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

DP126 'Smart meter consumer data access and control'

The CSC was provided with a progress update on [DP126 'Smart meter consumer data access and control'](#).

SECAS (MA) recapped on previous CSC discussion, where it was agreed the draft Modification Report would be updated to provide greater clarity on the role of the Data Controller, as there is no mechanism for Consumers to approach the DCC and request who is processing/sharing this data. There was a subsequent action for Citizens Advice to undertake a privacy sample assessment to see if the work is being done correctly and how Consumer data is being processed. To date, no timescales in relation to the privacy sample assessment has been received from Citizens Advice.

No further comments were raised.

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

DP144 'Charging of Random Sample Privacy Assessments'

The CSC was provided with an update on [DP144 'Charging on Random Sample Privacy Assessments'](#).

SECAS (HJ) noted a Random Sample Privacy Assessment is an assessment carried out by an Independent Privacy Auditor (IPA) to identify the extent to which an Other User is compliant with each of its obligations. Any costs which are incurred in the completion of Random Sample Privacy Assessments are then socialised across all Users. Because of this, it results in the industry as a whole paying for assessments which only Other Users undertake.

One CSC member noted the issue is whether the Panel are asking for these assessments to be completed and what would cause a random sample assessment. It is not currently clear or appropriate for Users to be picking up these costs in addition to their periodic assessments (which they should pay for).

CSC (CB) advised that as a Supplier, they are required to pay for their own Privacy assessments however, questioned whether Suppliers were being asked to pay for socialised costs for another Supplier on top of this. It would be useful to understand what the costs of these random sample Privacy assessments would look like as opposed to the routine costs to seek whether or not this is a fair allocation and if not, explore other possible routes.

SECAS agreed to look at historic records for Privacy Assessments in order to determine what the costs of random assessments would look like so a benchmark can be set before seeking views as part of the Refinement process on whether the costs could be shared across Suppliers or whether this should sit with Other Users.

CSC 20/01: SECAS (HJ) to review historic records for Privacy Assessments to determine the costs of random assessments. This will set a benchmark before seeking views as part of the Refinement process.

This modification will be taken to Security Sub-Committee (SSC) to seek their views and comments before bringing back to the CSC.

No further comments were raised.

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

DP145 'Align SEC Documentation with DCC Solution for SR8.3 Decommission Device'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP145 'Align SEC Documentation with DCC Solution for SR8.3 Decommission Device'](#).

Currently, SEC Sections A 'Definitions and Interpretation' and H 'DCC Services' conflict with the DCC design for Service Request (SR) 8.3 (Decommission Device). As it stands, a Communications Hub which forms part of a Smart Metering System (SMS) can only be removed and returned by a Responsible Supplier Party. If a Communications Hub is no longer part of an SMS, then it no longer has a Responsible Supplier as per its definition in SEC Section A, and which leads to further contradictions in SEC Section H.

The CSC advised further comment should be sought from the SEC Operations Group on how this modification should sit within the operational processes and what the potential impacts could be. SECAS (HJ) confirmed the DCC problem statement suggested there was no intention to change any material aspect of this but simply to confirm any contradictions throughout.

No further comments were raised.

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

DP146 'SM WAN Coverage Date'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP146 'SM WAN Coverage Date'](#).

The DCC are required to provide information to Parties via the Self Service Interface (SSI) regarding the Smart Metering Wide Area Network (SM WAN) availability for SMETS1 and SMETS2 Devices. Some Users systems may use a hardcoded date of 1 January 2021 within their business process which may cause issue for them now the date is no longer relevant.

The Alternate Chair (AB) highlighted SECAS have been in contact with the DCC to find out whether this has been hardcoded into their systems or whether this will cause a problem. CSC members were asked to contact SECAS if they felt the hardcoding date could be an issue within their internal systems or someone else's.

CSC member (PS) suggested this could be a problem for them and that this date is hardcoded into licenses as the end date for proactive install where there is a future coverage date. As part of a previous BEIS consultation regarding the Smart Meter rollout, there was mention to not move this date due to a disconnect between DCC activity and the license agreement. These obligations do not allow proactive install and leave beyond 1 January 2021.

3. SEC Section D Review

The Change Board noted that SECAS carried out a review of the SEC modifications process in early 2018 whereby, the below modifications were raised to improve the modification process within SEC Section D;

- [SECMP0049 'Section D Review: Amendments to the Modification Process'](#)
- [SECMP0050 'Section D Review: Moving the Working Group's Terms of Reference to a separate document'](#)
- [SECMP0051 'Section D Review: Amendments to the Fast Track Modification process'](#)

On 16 October 2020, the SEC Panel agreed for SECAS to initiate a further review of SEC Section D. As part of this review, SECAS will be seeking feedback from Parties against the current modifications framework via a Request For Information (RFI). This was circulated on 21 October 2020 which set out a range of questions around the process and is due to close on Friday 13 November 2020.

Specifically, SECAS are requesting feedback on the end to end framework of the Modification process alongside the approval process which is currently shared between three Sub-Groups (CSC, Change Board and SEC Panel). There are further questions around streamlining the DCC process. Following this, an industry workshop will be held before refining proposed enhancements.

SECAS will be contacting Suppliers who are familiar with the process directly to provide feedback, anyone is welcome to input on 1:2:1 basis as opposed to just responding to the RFI.

The Change Sub-Committee **NOTED** the update.

4. Panel Sub-Committee Survey – Actions

SECAS presented the Change Board with the feedback received from Parties on the quality of remote meetings and the proposed actions to resolve the feedback areas. The Change Board agreed with all approaches, and provided comments on the below point:

- Agenda timings not always adhered to: SECAS noted that timings will be added to future meeting agendas to maintain alignment across other SEC Sub-Committees.

5. Any Other Business (AOB)

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

Next Meeting: 24 November 2020