

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 25\_3003

30 March 2021, 10:00 – 10:45

Teleconference

### SECCSC\_25\_3003 – Draft Minutes

#### Attendees:

Representing	CSC Member
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Paul Saker (PS)
Small Suppliers	Chris Brown (CB)
Electricity Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna (EH)

Representing	Other Participants
SECAS	Holly Burton (HB) ( <i>Meeting Secretary</i> )
	Ali Beard (AB)
	Bradley Baker (BB)
	Khaleda Hussain (KH)
	Joe Hehir (JH)

#### Apologies

Representing	CSC Member
Large Suppliers	Simon Trivella (ST)
SECAS	Harry Jones (HJ)
Consumers	Ed Rees (ER)

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

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

The Meeting Secretary (HB) informed the CSC that no comments had been received from the previous CSC meeting held on 24 February 2021. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as written.

## 2. Draft Proposal Report

### DP153 'Follow up changes for Communications Hub Finance Charges'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP153 'Follow up changes for Communications Hub Finance Charges'](#).

A CSC member (PS) questioned whether this modification could be progressed as a Fast-Track Modification given that it has been raised to resolve an inconsistency in the Code. SECAS (JH) highlighted that the changes required to Section J1.2(b) to facilitate the Proposed Solution were erroneously omitted from the legal text of MP118 during the Refinement Process due to human error. While this wasn't a typographical error, SECAS agreed it could be considered to be resolving an inconsistency in the Code.

The CSC Chair agreed SECAS can recommend to the Panel to progress this proposal as a Fast-Track Modification. A CSC member (GS) agreed with the benefit in suggesting this should be progressed as a Fast-Track Modification, whilst noting that SEC Section D2.8 states:

*'A Modification Proposal submitted to correct typographical errors or other minor factual inaccuracies or inconsistencies in this Code that do not constitute material changes shall have a status of a Fast Track Modification.'*

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** the Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed as a Fast-Track Modification.

### DP154 'CH Returns SLA Amendment'

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP154 'CH Returns SLA Amendment'](#).

Four responses had been received to a Request for Information. All respondents were supportive of this change. There are current concerns regarding the removal and returns processes for Communication Hubs with a five Working Day Service Level Agreement (SLA). It is believed that the SLA should be extended to 15 Working Days to prevent a breach of the SEC and incur charges.

A CSC member (PS) suggested it would be useful to understand what the impact of changing this SLA will have on the DCC and what efficiencies they have in place. The consequences of failing to return Communications Hubs within five Working Days is that this will have an impact on subsequent charges for Suppliers including faulty Communications Hubs becoming the Users responsibility/liability. This will have a consequential effect on the DCC. The CSC agreed that this should be looked into alongside the charging methodology when being discussed at the next CSC meeting.

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

#### **DP155 'Communications Hub Re-Flash'**

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP155 'Communications Hub Re-Flash'](#).

A CSC member (CB) noted the benefits of this modification. However, they questioned:

- What the explicit charge for the proposed service would be;
- whether the DCC has an idea of the volume of Communications Hubs impacted by this; and
- who will be responsible for the Communication Hubs that are in transit.

Another member (PS) queried how likely it would be that people use this. They were cautious about implementing a change that no-one then uses. They also sought clarification on what would happen if the firmware version changed, as Devices would come pre-loaded with a version, and how this would be recorded in the Smart Metering Inventory (SMI).

SECAS (JH) agreed to look into these comments with the DCC, particularly on the scale of the problem.

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

#### **DP156 'Unit Inconsistency'**

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP156 'Unit Inconsistency'](#).

No initial comments or queries were raised by members.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to fully define and understand the scale of the issue.

#### **DP157 'Removal of DUIS v1.0 and v2.0'**

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP157 'Removal of DUIS v1.0 and v2.0'](#).

A CSC member (GS) assumed this modification would consist of a tidy up in that DUIS v1.0 and v2.0 rows would be removed from tables as there are already end dates for these versions. SECAS (AB) highlighted that this is a complicated area, and the idea is to get all Users to move to the newer version of DUIS. Whilst the DCC will not force Users to move over to the new version of DUIS, they will provide support and assistance in trying to make the change. A CSC member (PS) noted instead of removing these versions, the end date of when this will be supported should be included. The CSC agreed that an enduring process should be put into place otherwise there will be continuous modifications trying to address and update the older versions.

SECAS (JH) agreed with the above comments but noted the issue is that currently the way in which the text has been drafted does not facilitate the intent of an end date meaning that those versions will be unsupported.

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

## DP158 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Batch 5'

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP158 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Batch 5'](#).

A CSC member (PS) considered that the industry needs to understand what these IRPs mean and the real-world impact they have. They highlighted even if there are no changes to Devices, there will always be firmware upgrades to be considered to make Devices compliant with the associated GBCS version. Once these IRPs are implemented there is a SEC obligation for Suppliers to perform an upgrade and the practicality and impacts of this needed investigating. They wanted to ensure the impacts of these changes would warrant a new version of the relevant technical documentation. The member highlighted the views of another Large Supplier that these IRPs are discussed in detail at the Technical Specification Issues Resolution Sub-group (TSIRS) and so there was no need to discuss each IRP in detail further.

A CSC member (EH) noted looking at trying to adopt the previous process where modifications have been raised in relation to IRPs. Another member (PS) noted it is not so much the changes that is an issue, but it is important to consider how these changes will be implemented and what this would mean for different versions of the Technical Specification Applicability Tables (TSATs) (which currently has not been discussed with TSIRS).

SECAS (AB) clarified there will always be IRP changes; the important issue is to address how these are being implemented to make the changes less disruptive for the industry. BEIS has confirmed any critical defects will be included as part of BEIS designations and that each of the IRPs which pass through the Modification Process should have its own business case for implementation assessed as part of the industry's decision.

It was agreed that this modification will be taken to TABASC for input before progressed to the next stage of the framework.

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

### 3. Any Other Business (AOB)

The Chair highlighted the CSC elections that had recently taken place. They noted this will be the last meeting for Paul Saker, Simon Trivella, Elias Hanna and Jonathan Lishawa, who had all chosen to step down from the CSC. The CSC Chair thanked these members for their service over the past two years and advised that new members will take office from the April 2021 meeting.

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

**Next Meeting:** 27 April 2021