

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 26_2704

27 April 2021, 10:00 – 10:30

Teleconference

SECCSC_26_2704 – Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	CSC Member
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Sarah-Jane Russell (S-JR)
Small Suppliers	Chris Brown (CB)
	Daniel Davies (DD)
Electricity Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Sasha Townsend (ST)
	Remi Oluwabamise (RO)
SECAS	Holly Burton (HB) (<i>Meeting Secretary</i>)
	Ali Beard (AB) (<i>part</i>)
	Bradley Baker (BB)
	Harry Jones (HJ)
	Kev Duddy (KD)

Apologies

Representing	CSC Member
Other SEC Parties	Alastair Cobb (AC)
Consumers	Ed Rees (ER)

1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Chair welcomed members to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) meeting, and introduced the new members beginning their terms on the CSC.

The Meeting Secretary (HB) informed the CSC that no comments had been received from the previous CSC meeting held on 30 March 2021. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as written.

2. Draft Proposal Report

DP154 'CH Returns SLA Amendment'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP154 'CH Returns SLA Amendment'](#).

As part of an investigation led by SECAS when presenting this Draft Proposal to SEC Sub-Committees, the Operations Sub-Group (OPSG) expressed an interest in this proposal based on previous discussions. A Request for Information (RFI) has also been issued on this Proposal, with a few responses being received. Some respondents have confirmed there are some issues around the existing five Working Day service level agreement (SLA), noting that this time period is too short and agreeing an extension on this time period is needed. Respondents also collectively believe there are thousands of Communications Hub units that have been left outside of the SLA between March 2020 and March 2021. This indicates that this not only is this affecting individual cases, but this is affecting the Industry on a larger scale on a regular basis.

When asking if there would be a benefit to increasing the five Working Day SLA period to 15 Working Days, half of respondents agreed with this statement with the other half believing the SLA could be extended further. This confirms the issue and an extended SLA period, different to the proposed 15 Working Days can be drawn at a later date.

A CSC member (GS) questioned what the proposed revised SLA will be as the RFI responses hold different opinions as to what will be adequate. SECAS (HJ) clarified 15 WD has been the solution initially proposed under this Proposal. However, this will be discussed and agreed as part of the Refinement Process, and SECAS and the Proposer are willing to take on board any opinions that arise as part of the Working Group discussions. This will also be discussed further with the OPSG.

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 to the Refinement Process.

DP159 'Credit Cover Review'

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP159 'Credit Cover Review'](#).

It was noted that the Data Communications Company (DCC) and the SEC Panel have reviewed SEC Section J3 'Credit Cover' and have identified several areas that would benefit from further clarification. There has been some misinterpretation of the current SEC legal text outlining the Credit Cover processes. This has led to increased risk of cost socialisation. The DCC and the Panel propose to update the Credit Cover processes to clarify obligations on Parties and reduce the opportunity for misinterpretation, as well as to address inefficiencies.

SECAS has confirmed it will be working with the SEC Lawyer as part of the Refinement Process to make these obligations clearer and to address any inefficiencies. The DCC has a direction on a few of the areas being investigated, but these will again be developed further once in the Refinement

Process. This Draft Proposal has been presented to SEC Sub-Committees; however this does not fall under the specific remit of any Sub-Committee.

The CSC had no comments on this Draft Proposal at this stage.

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

DP160 'Certificate Signing Request forecasting'

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP160 'Certificate Signing Request Forecasting'](#).

SEC Section L 'Smart Metering Key Infrastructure and DCC Key Infrastructure' currently sets out the obligation whereby each Party which is an Authorised Subscriber shall provide the DCC each quarter with a forecast of the number of Certificate Signing Requests (CSRs) it expects to send in the following eight months. The forecasts contain a breakdown of the total number of CSRs for Device Certificates, including the issue of a single Device Certificate and ones that are batched together.

The DCC believes that the obligation on Users to provide these forecasts should be removed. There is sufficient capacity within the Smart Metering Key Infrastructure (SMKI) services to no longer require the CSR forecasting process except in the case when exceptional volumes of CSRs are to be sent in a given period by a SEC party.

SECAS (BB) opened a question to the CSC, asking whether anyone completes these forecasts and if so, how long does this roughly take to complete. Current figures stated between half an hour to an hour. A CSC member (CB) noted that these timings sounded accurate and is not currently a labour-intensive task. Another CSC member (DD) noted the forecast procedure is not as complex as for Service Request (SR) forecasts. The DCC has stated that there is sufficient capacity within the SMKI Services, making the CSR forecasting process unnecessary. Removing the obligation will have some resource benefit for Authorised Subscribers. Overall, the CSC member (DD) noted it would be beneficial to phase out this process. A further member (S-JR) agreed it is not a large job to prepare these forecasts and did also question its value.

SECAS (BB) informed the CSC that a guidance document would be produced by the DCC which would inform Authorised Subscribers of the exceptional circumstances where it would be beneficial to inform the DCC of potential CSR numbers being sent. A CSC member (GS) noted that, although this guidance document is not going to be a SEC requirement, this modification will not be able to go through without that document being completed and available. In order to sign off on a revised process the Industry needs to fully understand how exactly the process will work. The member requested this guidance note be produced as part of the Refinement Process and included alongside the Modification Report.

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

3. SEC Section D Review – Proposal to delegate modification oversight from the Panel to the CSC

The CSC Chair highlighted of the recent review of SEC Section D, which sought to enhance and streamline the end-to-end modification process. One of the recommendations was to consolidate some of the governance of modifications. As part of this, SECAS is proposing the Panel delegate its oversight of modifications to a Sub-Committee, with the CSC believed to be best placed. This would

consist of not just looking at modifications during the Development Stage, but to also oversee modifications progressing through the Refinement Process and agreeing progression to the Report Phase.

SECAS is currently agreeing the details with the Panel, and sought feedback from CSC members on any initial comments or concerns around this proposal before taking it further. A CSC member (S-JR) noted this was their first meeting, due to the recent change in membership, and requested to take this offline and liaise internally before providing feedback.

No further comments were raised.

The CSC **NOTED** the update.

ACTION 26/01: CSC members to inform the Chair of any further comments on the proposed delegation of modification responsibilities by **5pm on Tuesday 11 May 2021**.

4. Use of Microsoft Teams

SECAS (DK) informed the Change Sub-Committee that a new Microsoft Teams platform is being implemented by SECAS for the Panel and each Sub-Committee, including the CSC. This platform will be where all meeting papers are uploaded to for the CSC to view, discuss and ask questions within the chat function, to support collaborative working. SECAS advised that within the coming weeks it will circulate to CSC Members videos and information on how this functionality works and how to use it before it is implemented for full use for the 1 June Change Sub-Committee meeting.

ACTION 26/02: SECAS (HB) to grant access to all Change Sub-Committee members to the new Microsoft Teams channel and issue to issue guidance in the week commencing 3 May 2021. Change Sub-Committee members are requested to raise any problems to sec.change@gemserv.com in order for it to assist further.

5. Any Other Business (AOB)

SECAS (HB) reminded members that communication was circulated on Thursday 15 April 2021 seeking consent to take part in the 2021 Ofgem Cross-Code Administration Performance Survey, specifically in relation to the Smart Energy Code (SEC). Members are requested to respond to the link in the email by **5pm on 4 May 2021**.

SECAS (BB) reminded members of the current RFIs that were circulated on Friday 23 April 2021, requesting people to respond with views and comments by **5pm on Monday 17 May 2021**.

In addition, several CSC members confirmed they will not be able to attend the CSC scheduled for 1 June 2021 due to the OPSG taking place on the same day, and others having annual leave.

ACTION 26/03: SECAS (HB) to seek potential dates via Doodlepoll to hold the next Change Sub-Committee meeting, which is currently scheduled on 1 June 2021.

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

Next Meeting: Date to be re-arranged