

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 48

25 November 2020, 10:00 – 10:40

Teleconference

SECCB_48_2511- Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Emslie Law (EL)
	Simon Trivella (ST) (part)
	Paul Saker (PS)
	Rachel Norberg (RN) (<i>alternate for Jenny Smith</i>)
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (CB)
	Gareth Evans (GE)
Networks	David Mitchell (DM)
	Paul Fitzgerald (PF)
	Gemma Slaney (GS)
Other SEC Parties	Gerdjan Busker (GB)
	Alastair Cobb (AC)
	Mike Woodhall (MW)
Consumers	Ed Rees (ER)

Representing	Other Participants
Data Communications Company (DCC)	Richard Amey (RA) (part)
	David Walsh (DW)
Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS)	Holly Burton (HB) (Meeting Secretary)
	Ali Beard (AB)

	Bradley Baker (BB)
	Khaleda Hussain (KH)
	Harry Jones (HJ)

Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Large Suppliers	Jenny Smith (JS)
Large Suppliers	David Rodger (DR)
Large Suppliers	Tim Larcher (TL)

1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Secretary confirmed no comments had been received on the minutes from the previous Change Board meeting held on Wednesday 21 October 2020. The Change Board **APPROVED** the minutes as written.

2. Actions Outstanding

Action Ref	Action
46/01	SECAS and the DCC to clarify how the costs associated with completing an Impact Assessment for Issue Resolution Proposal (IRP) solutions are handled and consider whether these costs should be incurred by Parties.
	Both the DCC and BEIS have confirmed that the work done at the Technical Specifications Issues Resolution Subgroup (TSIRS) is at a very high level. The information recorded and passed over to SECAS from the TSIRS includes high level descriptions. Full details have been included within the Actions paper previously circulated. Status: Closed
46/04	SECAS and the DCC to seek availability from Service Providers for the next Change Board meeting in October 2020, to present and discuss the rationale for the costs for MP078.
	Following the Change Board's decision to request more work be done on MP078, the input from the Service Providers will be sought as part of the Working Group's review of the business case for this change. Status: Closed

3. SECMP0056 'IHD / PPMID Zigbee Attributes Available on the HAN' Change Board vote

The Change Board was invited to perform a vote on [SECMP0056 'IHD / PPMID Zigbee Attributes Available on the HAN'](#).

SECAS recommended this modification be sent back to the Working Group due to SECAS having received additional information that should be included in the Modification Report. This includes updated costs from the DCC for inclusion in a standard SEC Release as opposed to a standalone SEC Release. The figures for implementation have decreased from £3m to £1.7m and is looking to be scheduled for the June 2022 SEC Release. During this time, SECAS has also engaged with the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), who has submitted a generic response due to the SEC modification being quite open. SECAS has engaged with its internal Data Protection team who has provided a formal letter; this will be taken to the Working Group in December 2020.

By sending the Modification Report back, SECAS can go back to the Working Group for it to review this additional information and issue a second Refinement Consultation before providing a much more detailed Modification Report for decision.

A Change Board member (EL) highlighted that more consideration and clarity is needed when setting out which technical specifications are being uplifted and to what versions. This is to ensure that Users are clear which Devices are affected and whether they will need to be updated as a result of the change. The implementation approach to these documents is not usually considered within the Working Group discussions. This process should be considered for all future modifications at an earlier stage and included in the Modification Report.

Change Board Vote – SECMP0056 decision:

The Change Board **AGREED** to send back this modification to the Working Group to allow the Modification Report to be updated with the new information received on the business case, before being returned for vote at a future Change Board meeting.

4. MP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Part 2' Impact Assessment Request

The Change Board was invited to consider the DCC Impact Assessment request for [MP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Part 2'](#).

SECAS (AB) noted the cost for completing the Impact Assessment had been estimated at around £94,000 with the rough order magnitude of cost to deliver MP078 to be £705,680 up to the end of Pre-Integration Testing (PIT). As the cost for this Impact Assessment are still quite substantial despite being reduced, SECAS believes further investigation into the specific Issue Resolution Proposals (IRPs) is needed, which has not yet been discussed in the Working Group.

Three IRPs are included in this modification. IRP 550 relates to a message being received from the Communications Hub to a Gas Smart Metering Equipment (GSME) known as GCS20r. Currently when a GSME receives a message from the Communications Hub it reports the event configuration back to the Communications Hub, which in turn sends a Service Response to the DCC User. However, there are no instructions in the technical specifications (GBCS) on what response the GSME should give if it cannot send the information (for instance if it does not have the data). This in turn means no Service Response will be received by the DCC User requesting the information. IRP

604 resulted from a typographical error in IRP 550. Lastly, IRP 603 relates to In-Home Displays (IHDs), Prepayment Meter Interface Devices (PPMIDs) and Consumer Access Devices (CADs) on the Home Area Network (HAN) which can request security log information from the GSME or Electricity Smart Metering Equipment (ESME) and display the information to the consumer. These issues had been accepted by the TSIRS as requiring a change to the technical specifications to resolve, and so were subsequently passed through to the modifications process to be progressed.

SECAS (AB) requested a formal rejection from the Change Board in relation to this Impact Assessment request in order for SECAS to take this back for further work, highlighting the business case is too expensive and will need further work before returning to the Change Board for vote. SECAS will also look at any other ways to resolve the highlighted issues that will not require a change to the DCC Systems.

Several Change Board members voiced their support for SECAS's proposed approach. One member (AC) noted this change would likely enforce uplifts of the technical specifications on Users which would be hard to justify. Another member (EL) noted that the TSIRS does not investigate the business case for changes, and no review of the impacts or costs is carried out at that group. Therefore, the right lens needs to be applied to these changes under the modifications process. The Change Board **DEFERRED** the Impact Assessment request for MP078, pending further investigation on the associated costs for delivering these IRPs, and for the business case to be better understood by the Working Group.

5. MP107 'SMETS1 Validation of SRV 6.15.1' Impact Assessment Request

The Change Board was invited to approve the DCC Impact Assessment request for [MP107 'SMETS1 Validation of SRV 6.15.1'](#).

SECAS (BB) noted the cost to implement this modification up to the end of PIT has been quoted at £193,125. The cost for completing an Impact Assessment was quoted as £2,596 with 30 days effort. Five responses had been received to the Refinement Consultation. Whilst agreeing the principles of the change, some respondents believed there was no evidence that the benefits to Network Operators would outweigh the costs, with questions around the lack of clarity to the actual scale of the problem.

In terms of the business case, the Proposer had noted no Meters are currently impacted; however, if the issue did occur, the only way to fix the problem would be through a site visit by a Supplier to manually swap the Meter which would cause resource impacts for the Suppliers and a negative experience for consumers.

Questions were raised by Change Board members regarding the obligation being put on a Supplier to manually swap the asset, noting this would likely not happen. The Proposer (GS) suggested this is to do with the fact there is an additional validation for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS) 1 Devices that is not there for SMETS2 Devices. Whether the Device would need to be replaced is unclear, but they felt this would be the only viable option to resolving the issue.

One member (PS) asked how long an Impact Assessment response would be valid for, noting if the case for change is not there now, this work could be quickly re-raised at a later date if the issue did arise. The DCC (DW) noted it would be valid for at least a year, although the costs would be reassessed annually based on rate card changes.

Members queried if there was benefit in incurring the costs of the Impact Assessment if the case for change on the current estimate was not there, noting the post-PIT costs had not yet been included.

However, one member (CB) was comfortable with proceeding, noting the scenario where the issue did arise and a lengthy process then needed to implement a fix. They considered the highlighted validation step should not have been included in the original design. Another member (EL) considered returning this to BEIS for resolution but noted more information on the costs was needed first.

On balance, all Change Board members agreed the best way forward was to complete the Impact Assessment and use the costs provided to measure the benefits case for the change with more clarity.

The Change Board **AGREED** that a DCC Impact Assessment should be requested for MP107.

6. MP117 'Bulk CH returns' Impact Assessment Request

The Change Board was invited to approve the DCC IA request for [MP117 'Bulk CH returns'](#).

SECAS (HJ) noted the cost to implement this modification has been quoted at £550,000 up to the end of PIT. The cost to complete the Impact Assessment was £16,532.

No comments were raised.

The Change Board **AGREED** that a DCC Impact Assessment should be requested for MP107.

7. Any Other Business

SECAS (AB) highlighted SECAS's Modcasts, which are issued periodically. Modcasts provide a short but useful update on everything that is happening with SEC modifications and releases.

The Chair (DK) highlighted that the current Change Board term of office was due to end at the end of January 2021, and so nominations for 2021/22 would be issued shortly.

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

Next scheduled meeting date: 18 December 2020