

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 55

23 June 2021, 10:00 – 10:40

Teleconference

### SECCB\_55\_2306- Final Minutes

#### Attendees:

Category	Change Board Members
Change Board Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Sarah-Jane Russell (S-JR)
	Rachel Norberg (RN)
	David Rodger (DR)
	Tim Larcher (TL)
	Alex Hurcombe (AL)
	Emslie Law (EL)
Small Suppliers	Carolyn Burns (CB)
	Gareth Evans (GE)
Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)
	Paul Fitzgerald (PF)
	David Mitchell (DM)
Other SEC Parties	Gerdjan Busker (GB)
	Mike Woodhall (MW)
Consumers	Ed Rees (ER)

Representing	Other Participants
Data Communications Company (DCC)	David Walsh (DW)
	Sasha Townsend (ST)
Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS)	Holly Burton (HB) ( <i>Meeting Secretary</i> )
	Ali Beard (AB)

	Harry Jones (HJ)
	Piers Garton (PG)
	Mike Fenn (MF)

## Apologies:

Representing	Other Participants
Other SEC Party	Alastair Cobb (AC)

## 1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Secretary confirmed no comments were received on the minutes from the previous Change Board meeting held on Wednesday 26 May 2021. The Change Board **APPROVED** the minutes as written.

## 2. Actions Outstanding

Action Ref	Action
52/02	<p>The DCC to provide an update on what it is doing to manage and challenge the differences in CSP costs.</p> <p>The DCC provided an update which can be found in the following paper '<a href="#">SECCB 55_2306_02 – Actions Outstanding v2.0</a>'.</p> <p>A Change Board member (EL) appreciated the difference in Communications Service Provider (CSP) costs but considered the mitigations set out in the DCC's statement do not support the vast difference in costs between CSP North and CSP Central &amp; South. There is a potential concern that future modifications could be raised which will not be applied to the North due to the un-justifiable costs.</p> <p>The DCC (DW) agreed there are differential costs and an example of this has been explained as part of <a href="#">MP122B 'Operational Metrics'</a>. There are cases where the associated costs are the same or where one is exceptionally higher however, costs associated with North are not always the most expensive. The DCC is requesting detailed breakdowns from all Service Providers and are routinely challenging and investigating any submissions.</p> <p>It was agreed to close this action on the basis that the DCC continues to challenge costs within a submission from CSPs.</p> <p>Action: <b>Closed</b>.</p>
54/01	<p>SECAS to host a call offline with Change Board members (AC, S-JR and RN) to review the layout of Teams across several Sub-Committees in an attempt to make reviewing and communication easier for future meetings. Any other members who wish to join this or a further call should contact SECAS.</p> <p>SECAS highlighted the issues members have experienced has been resolved based on guidance previously circulated from SECAS.</p> <p>A meeting was set up with S-JR and Gemserv's IT department on Thursday 17 June 2021 and has since been resolved. Members have been requested to contact <a href="mailto:sec.change@gemserv.com">sec.change@gemserv.com</a> should future issues arise.</p>

Action Ref	Action
Action: <b>Closed</b> .	

### 3. MP140 'CH Stock Transfer' Impact Assessment Request

The Change Board was invited to approve the DCC IA request for [MP140 'CH Stock Transfer'](#).

A Change Board member (TL) noted as part of the consultation submission, E.ON did provide some queries which have not yet been responded to. They questioned whether guidance would be provided. The DCC (ST) acknowledged it has seen these responses and, dependent upon the Change Board's decision to approve the Impact Assessment, then these questions will be answered in parallel as they were more process-based questions (around how the DCC would bid, transferring of Communications Hubs etc). The member was satisfied with this approach.

Another Change Board member (AH) suggested that this has been piloted and successfully completed during the last 12 months due to a global shipping issue. The DCC (ST) confirmed a manual process has been used as a short-term basis. The problem is that in the contract, when a stock transfer happens there is no way to inform the CSPs that the Communications Hub has been transferred to the new Supplier. The liability still sits with the existing Supplier. This modification is trying to resolve this issue in a more efficient way.

The DCC agreed to liaise with its logistics team to draw out how the manual process is laborious, and the costs associated with this approach. This will then be fed back into the business case.

A Change Board member (GS) sought clarity the cost of the Impact Assessment would cover the assessment of both options. The DCC (DW) confirmed this was the case.

No further comments were raised.

The Change Board **AGREED** that a DCC Impact Assessment should be requested for MP140.

**ACTION 55/01:** The DCC (ST) to draw out the effort and costs of manually inputting Communications Hub Stock Transfers, to support the cost benefit assessment for MP140.

### 4. MP141 'SRV Visibility for Devices on SSI' Impact Assessment Request

The Change Board was invited to perform the final vote on [MP141 'SRV Visibility for Devices on SSI'](#).

A Change Board member (RN) requested further sight of the benefits and a detailed breakdown of those involved, as opposed to just the triaging benefits currently stated within the Modification Report. It would also be beneficial to call out the benefits for Network Parties.

Another Change Board member (GS) suggested that when there is random behaviour from a Device, Network Parties will be able to see if something has happened. Perhaps something triggered by the Supplier triggered this behaviour or another example given was following an OTA firmware update. At the moment, Network Parties are unable to see what a Supplier has done, and vice versa which results in an incident being raised with the DCC to investigate.

No further comments were raised.

The Change Board **AGREED** that a DCC Impact Assessment should be requested for MP141.

## 5. Remote vs. Office-hosted Meetings

SECAS highlighted a paper was presented to the SEC Panel on Friday 18 June 2021 comparing the costs and benefits of hosting meetings remotely versus hosting them at the Genserv offices. The Change Board noted the proposed approach which seeks to arrange quarterly face-to-face office-hosted meetings to commence from December 2021, but also offering members the option to participate remotely. This was subsequently approved by the SEC Panel with an additional recommendation to the SECCo Board to use some of the accommodation budget to fund quarterly business networking events.

The Change Board noted general support for face-to-face meetings. However, Change Board meetings are typically very short, usually less than one hour, with not much debate on items. As such, the benefits associated with remote meetings outweighed those for office-hosted meetings. As a result, members agreed there was no appetite to return for face-to-face Change Board meetings from December 2021 unless there was a meeting with a particularly long agenda.

The Change Board;

- **NOTED** the benefits for operating remote and office-hosted meetings;
- **NOTED** the proposed approach for hosting meetings moving forward; and
- **CONSIDERED** the current appetite to return for face-to-face meetings.

The Change Board was requested to provide any further feedback offline to [sec.change@genserv.com](mailto:sec.change@genserv.com) around the current remote working measures in place and if anything else could be done better.

## 6. Any Other Business

One item of business was raised regarding MP147 'SMKI Full Extract', where the Operations Group (OPSG) raised a question around why an error in the systems and the length of time it took to download had not been addressed before the modification was originally approved. The DCC representative at that OPSG meeting confirmed there was a 'fix' to the code; however, this had been interpreted and in fact the 'fix' was the modification solution.

Another item of business was raised by SECAS, highlighting that the SEC Panel recently approved version 1.4 of the Change Board Terms of Reference. These will now be updated and uploaded to the SEC website [here](#).

Change Board members **NOTED** the updates.

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

**Next scheduled meeting date: 28 July 2021**