

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 Panel Meeting 45

### Meeting SECP\_45\_0906, 9<sup>th</sup> June 2017

10:00 – 14:00, Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

## Final Minutes

### Attendees:

Category	SEC Panel Members
SEC Panel Chair	Peter Davies
Large Suppliers	Simon Trivella
	Adam Carden (via teleconference)
Small Suppliers	Andrew Green (Alternate)
	Mike Gibson
Electricity Networks	David Lane
Gas Networks	Hilary Chapman
Other SEC Parties	Mike Woodhall
	Hugh Mullens
DCC	Carmen Strickland

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Duncan Stone
	Patrick De Nijs
Ofgem (the Authority)	Michael Walls
	Raymond Elliot
DCC	Ashley Hannah (part)
User Competent Independent Organisation (CIO)	Luke White (part)
	James Leaton Gray (part)
	Bryan Hurcombe (part)
Meeting Secretary	Hollie McGovern
SECAS	Sarah Gratte

	Jill Ashby
	Alys Garrett
	David Barber

## Apologies:

Category	SEC Panel Members
Large Suppliers	David Ross Scott

## 1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The minutes from the May 2017 Panel meeting were approved via ex-committee decision, noting that suggested changes were included in the final minutes.

SECAS provided the Panel with an update on the Actions Outstanding from previous meetings, noting that the majority of the actions had been closed, with the outstanding actions on target for completion and/or updates to be provided under respective agenda items. A brief update was provided on the following actions:

Action reference	Update
SECP44/04	SECAS noted that guidance on the relationship between Licences, SEC Parties and DCC Users will be produced and published prior to the July Panel meeting.
SECP44/06	SECAS to confer with TABASC before updating the TABASC Terms of Reference to undertake monitoring of DCC performance reports.

## 2. DCC R1.3 Governance Update

SECAS provided the Panel with an update on the DCC Release 1.3 (R1.3) decision-making activities that have been ongoing in the lead up to R1.3 Live. It was noted that the DCC had successfully gone through the DCC Testing Assurance Board (TAB) for Systems Integration Testing (SIT) Exit in all regions. The Testing Advisory Group are scheduled to meet on 15<sup>th</sup> / 16<sup>th</sup> June to review SIT completion and to provide the Panel with recommendations for discussion at the ex-committee Panel meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

A timeline outlining the R1.3 milestones was provided, and the Panel were informed that completion of SMKI and Repository Testing (SRT) was currently scheduled for mid-June, based on the latest information available.

The Panel were provided with an update on the review being undertaken by independent auditors on R1.3 SIT and it was noted that the auditors have requested to speak to TAG members regarding the investigation. SECAS requested that the formal Panel records detailing the issues and risks raised following the initial R1.3 review be declassified from red or amber in order for them to be discussed with the auditor for the purpose of their review. The Panel agreed to declassify the information to help inform the review.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the verbal update; and
- **AGREED** to declassify the formal records from RED/Amber to allow them to be shared with the R1.3 auditors.

### 3. SMKI and Repository Testing (SRT) Approach Document

SECAS presented the Panel with an amended SRT Approach Document following consultation with Parties and further review and refinement by the SMKI Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA).

It was noted that following the deferral of approval at the last Panel meeting, the SMKI PMA Chair had worked with the DCC to ensure the appropriate amendments were included in the document.

Following the amendments being made, the SMKI PMA were provided with the final version for any final comments prior to the Panel meeting. Nothing further was raised and a letter of recommendation had been provided by the SMKI PMA Chair to the Panel to approve the document.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **APPROVED** the SRT Approach Document v5.0 as set out in Appendix A.

### 4. Technical Specification Versioning

BEIS presented the Panel with two options for the configuration management of the SEC Technical Specifications, GB Companion Specification (GBCS) and other specifications for the next few releases which contain BEIS driven changes.

The options presented relate to:

- Release 4, which is expected to contain a mixture of BEIS driven transitional resolution proposals and approved Modification Proposals;
- SMETS1 enrolment and adoption (now being referred to by BEIS as Release 3); and
- Release 2 (Dual Band Communications Hubs and the Technical Specification Grouping (TSG) 2 changes).

The Panel discussed each option and noted the relating issues that could affect future releases:

- Option A, involves generating and designating the next few release versions (but not having them in force) enabling subsequent revision (via approved Modification Proposals) prior to them being activated.
- Option B, would be the continuation of existing mechanism involving the baselining of the documents by the transitional Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG).

The Panel provided initial feedback, with a preference for Option A. SECAS noted that a paper would be provided to the Panel in July, and will include full details of the two approaches and the transitional resolution proposals that could go into 'Release 3' and 'Release 4' for discussions and agreement by the Panel. The Panel questioned who determines what goes into a release. It was confirmed that it is in the Panel's remit to determine enduring release content, however BEIS controls the content from a transitional IRP perspective.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **AGREED** that a paper providing further details would be presented to the Panel in July 2017.

**ACTION SECP45/01:** BEIS to work with SECAS to develop a paper to set the approach to technical specification versioning for the first few enduring releases for approval at the July Panel meeting.

## 5. Privacy Assessment Update

The User Competent Independent Organisation (CIO) attended the Panel to follow-up on the discussion held at the May 2017 Panel meeting. The Panel were provided with the background to the issue noting that a consideration for the Panel had arisen following the first Privacy Assessment undertaken by the User CIO. It was noted that the Party wished only to access tariff data, not consumption data and therefore have not built their systems to support the processes for obtaining consent for consumption data. The User CIO was requested to amend the Privacy Control Framework (PCF) to capture the intentions of collecting the data types. However, it was noted that a challenge remains as they cannot provide evidence against the obligation requiring them to have the system processes in place and therefore, the Panel would have no information on the measures in place to prevent misuse of functionality that would be open to the User.

The Panel were presented with the following options that could be taken forward to provide them with assurance on the Parties privacy obligations:

- Option 1: The User CIO could request a direct letter of response from the organisation requesting confirmation that there are controls in place to prevent accessing consumption data. It was noted that this would rely solely on trust.
- Option 2: An Independent Party could check to see that controls are in place to prevent accessing consumption data. This option would require a potential change to the SEC.

The Panel discussed the implications of each option, and noted that either option would set a precedent and the Panel should also consider adhering strictly to the SEC arrangements and require the Party to meet each obligation as set out in SEC Section I.

It was noted that Option 2 would provide assurance for the Panel that the necessary controls are in place. The Panel discussed the roles and responsibilities of the Panel and whether they would be seen as a Data Controller. The Panel agreed to seek legal advice around whether the Panel have the role of Data Controller. BEIS agreed to feed in policy intent and legal advice previously sought.

The Panel also discussed the definition of Personal Data and whether there were implications if some of the data that Other Users could access is classified as personal. BEIS agreed to liaise with the Information Commissioner if necessary and subject to consideration with SECAS of existing guidance, on the type of data that is defined as Personal Data that an Other User would have access to.

The Panel agreed that the SEC obligations should be adhered to and if the Party wished to change the assessment framework then they should raise a SEC Modification Proposal. SECAS agreed to discuss this outcome with the Party.

It was agreed that a paper setting out the discussions and outcome would be provided to the July Panel meeting to provide transparency to Parties on the discussions to date.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the update; and
- **AGREED** the necessary actions to take the matter forward.

**ACTION SECP45/02:** SECAS to seek legal advice on the role of the Panel and whether they are a Data Controller. BEIS to provide input from legal advice previously sought.

**ACTION SECP45/03:** BEIS to liaise with the Information Commissioner on the definition of Personal Data and what may fall into that category from the Other User data available, should this be necessary following consideration with SECAS of existing guidance.

**ACTION SECP45/04:** SECAS to liaise with the Party who have undergone a Privacy Assessment to provide the outcome of the Panel discussions regarding the Privacy Assessment obligations.

**ACTION SECP45/05:** SECAS and the User CIO to produce a paper for the July Panel meeting setting out the discussions and outcomes in relation to the Privacy Assessment process from the May and June Panel meetings.

## 6. Security Assessment Process Review

The Panel were provided with an update regarding areas of consideration and resultant actions in relation to the Security Assessment Process that had previously been raised at the May Panel meeting.

SECAS presented the following action areas in detail for the Panel's consideration: Larger Supplier Threshold, Costs and Smoothing Demand.

### Large Supplier Threshold

The Panel discussed the three-year assessment cycle, and when verification assessments vs full user security assessment will be required. It was noted that SEC Section G8.42 set out that any Supplier with <250,000 Smart Metering Systems would require a verification assessment in Year 2. It was noted that this was not necessarily the assumption that all Large Suppliers were working to.

There was discussion on the assessment cycle for small suppliers using shared resource providers with a combined total of 250,000 Smart Metering Systems across all the small suppliers using that provider. It was noted that they would be assessed in the same way as a large supplier, although a Member noted that a shared resource provider could potentially separate out the systems to stay below the threshold.

SECAS noted that a question remained over the point at which an assessment would be completed and therefore, start the clock on when the following year's assessment would be required. The Panel agreed to seek legal advice on this and report back to the Panel. It was noted that this could have implications for smoothing the demand profile.

### Costs

The Panel discussed the cost estimates that have been provided for small suppliers undertaking a Full User Security Assessment. The User CIO informed the Panel that they have reviewed their cost model, and while the 'worst case estimate' is £28k, the actual costs for a number of Small Supplier Parties going through the process have been lower. The Panel discussed that further information and guidance could be provided to the Parties in advance of their assessment to support their preparation

for the assessment which would help to reduce costs. SECAS agreed to work with the User CIO to implement further communication and guidance.

#### Smoothing Demand Profile

SECAS highlighted the challenges with forecasting demand for assessments. SECAS are currently producing a rolling three-month demand profile, however are continuing to work with the User CIO to enable a full-year demand estimate for the updated contract schedule.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of the update; and
- **AGREED** the necessary actions to take forward.

**ACTION SECP45/06:** SECAS to seek legal advice on the point at which an assessment is deemed to be complete.

**ACTION SECP45/07:** SECAS to work with the User CIO to provide a full year assessment demand estimate for the User CIO contract.

## **7. SEC Panel Risk and Issue Register Update**

The Panel were presented with the proposed updates to the Risk and Issue Register, which included amendments to the mitigations for a number of risks. No new risks had been identified.

SECAS noted that a full review of the risk register would take place following Release 1.3 Live to ensure the risks remained appropriate and mitigations were in place.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **AGREED** the amendments to the SEC Panel Risk Register and SEC Panel Issues Log.

## **8. Event of Default**

SECAS informed the Panel of an Event of Default, and next steps were provided for the Panel's consideration.

The Panel **APPROVED** the decision to expel the Party from the Smart Energy Code (SEC), due to the dissolution of the organisation and license revocation, and requested all Parties be informed of the details of the expulsion through SECAS communication. Further information can be found within the Confidential Minutes from this SEC Panel meeting.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **APPROVED** the decision to expel the party from the SEC.

## 9. Release Management Update

SECAS provided a brief overview of the previous discussions around release management and when DCC System Impacting Modifications Proposals could be implemented, SECAS noted the concerns that had been raised by the Panel, SEC Parties and transitional groups regarding the DCC's indications that it is unable to implement approved SEC Modifications before 2019. SECAS noted that the DCC analysis on testing environments and release frequency had been provided and circulated to the Panel.

The DCC then provided a brief overview of the information that had been circulated on the DCC's current capability to support enduring releases, and the cost implications for supporting one, two or three Releases per year.

The DCC informed the Panel that Release 1.4 and Release 2.0 are currently scheduled and aim to deliver a significant increase in DCC functionality and capability. The DCC confirmed that the Release 2.0 delivery plan will be finalised in July 2017, and that it will not be able to deliver additional releases or release content in the form of approved Modification Proposals (excluding R2.0 and SMETS1) in 2018.

The DCC also highlighted its ongoing work to establish and implement a delivery hub in order to improve their ability to deliver at pace, although initially this is based around 1 DCC System impacting release a year from 2019. It was noted that the DCC delivery hub would need to engage with the Panel on trying to improve the way in which modifications can be implemented, as currently there is no indication of when these modifications may be delivered. A Panel Member raised concern that the paper did not provide timescales for modification implementation, and the issue of Users raising Modification Proposals and have no prospect of knowing when they can be delivered. It was also noted that there is no break-down of costs associated with the additional testing environments included in the analysis, to help justify them or how the DCC had reached that figures.

A SEC Panel Member also observed that Modification Proposals, where there is a DCC System impact seem to have been deprioritised in comparison to the implementation of transitional Resolution Proposals, and sought clarity on who determines governance over this. The SEC Panel Chair noted that the paper that would be provided at the July meeting in relation to agenda item 4, the Technical specification versioning may aid with the understanding in this.

The Panel commented on how the switching programme is referenced in materials provided by the DCC on why approved Modification Proposal cannot be implemented by the DCC in 2018, and that the DCC should resource the switching programme separately as it is an activity that sits outside of current SEC requirements.

Following the discussion of the DCC information, SECAS noted that additional clarity and information was needed on a number of points in order to inform what will happen with current and future Modification Proposals and also any potential changes with the panel release Management Policy these consist of:

- DCC capability to implement approved industry Modification Proposals and from when;
- DCC capacity as it is unclear on how many approved Modification Proposals the DCC can accommodate in a single release; and
- What the Minimum lead times will likely be, and that in the future there should not be a default position of requiring a 12-13 lead time for every DCC System impact Modification Proposal.

SECAS also noted that there are approximately 19 open Modification Proposals with a potential DCC system impact, all of which if approved would need to go in 2019, or be further delayed by another



year to 2020, based on the current one release a year approach set out by the DCC. In addition, SECAS noted a further 5 Modification Proposals that could be affected by the DCC ability to implement approved Modification proposals as they impact documentation that the DCC Systems use or reference.

The Panel **AGREED** that the analysis provided by the DCC was insufficient to prompt changes to the Panel Release Management Policy. Once further information was provided the Panel would reconsider the need to make changes to the Panel Release Management Policy.

**ACTION SECP45/08:** DCC to provide further information on:

- the first implementation date for industry Modification Proposals;
- information on the DCC capacity for the number of approved Modification Proposals the DCC can accommodate in a single release; and
- what the minimum lead times will likely be for a DCC System-impacting Modification Proposal.

## 10. TAG Terms of Reference Update

SECAS provided the Panel with an updated Terms of Reference (ToR) for an enduring Testing Advisory Group (TAG).

The Panel recognised the key role the TAG has played in testing activities and decisions to date, and it was proposed that TAG should continue to be available during enduring releases, and be available to further provide considerations and recommendations on an ad-hoc basis.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** the revised TAG Terms of Reference.

## 11. Cross-Code Administration Survey Action Plan

SECAS provided the Panel with a paper setting out the feedback themes arising from the Cross-Code Administration Survey undertaken by Ofgem. An action plan was provided in an appendix for approval, setting out the actions that would be taken forward by SECAS to address the feedback provided.

It was noted that SECAS would report on the progress made on each action item to the Panel Chair and provide the Panel with any updates as required.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** the proposed actions in the associated Action Plan appendix.

## 12. Modification Proposal Testing Principles Update

SECAS presented the Panel with an update and proposed a way forward in helping to better inform and capture testing requirements for Modification Proposals in Modification Reports and Modification



Proposal forms following a workshop involving TAG and TABASC members, which took place on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017.

One of the key outcomes was to include a testing matrix in the Modification Reports to aid Parties in assessing testing implications. It was noted that the testing matrix should form an initial assessment of the testing requirements for the Modification Proposal and be expanded on as appropriate with specific testing detail as the modification progresses.

It was noted that SECAS, with approval from the Panel, will convene further workshops or undertake discussions with the TAG if further work in this area is necessary.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

### 13. SEC Modification – DCC Assessments

The Panel were provided with the monthly update on the progression of the Preliminary Assessments (PAs) and Impact Assessments (IAs) for Modification Proposals by the DCC.

SECAS made the Panel aware of the cost of the DCC undertaking the full IA of SECMP0007, that was included in the PAs. It was noted that while there are no specific costs for the DCC to undertake the PAs, there are costs for IAs. These IAs costs to date have ranged between £16K and £50K depending on the number of DCC systems and Service Providers that are impacted. However, it was raised that a cost for the IAs of SECMP0007 had been estimated at £346,442. SECAS highlighted that it was seeking clarity on the justification of the IAs costs and the Panel also suggested that the WG should support this by seeking clarity on the justification for the costs. SECAS also suggested that IAs costs, could be considered as part of the reporting element of Modification Proposal SECMP0034 with the information provided by the DCC then aiding any activities undertaken by the Authority as part of the DCC price control activities.

The Panel **NOTED** the content of the update.

### 14. Modification and Release Content Status Report – June 2017

The Panel were provided with an update on the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the Modification Process.

The Panel were updated on the recent Authority (BEIS) decisions regarding SECMP0004, SECMP0008 and SECMP0011, with discussions focusing on the necessary next steps and actions required to take forward SECMP0004 and SECMP0008 following the Authority decision to send them back for further work.

For SECMP0004, SECAS provided details on a number of approaches to resolve the areas highlighted in the Authority decision letter.

The Panel discussed a number of potential approaches, ruling out some approaches such as specific requirements for SEC Parties to respond to consultations, while noting that the production of Cost benefit analysis has historically been difficult under other Industry codes, and such challenge equally applies to the SEC, as any consultation responses, including details of costs and benefit will be influenced by how much the party supports the change, hence the focus within codes on the benefits a change has against the SEC Objectives. In addition it has always been a challenge across Industry codes to get cost, benefit and impact information from Parties. The BEIS representative noted that the

intent of the send back was to gain extra understanding in support of the views expressed against the objectives.

Having considered the different approaches to resolve the matters included in the Authority decision letter, the Panel agreed to issue a further consultation with focused questions to cover of the areas highlighted in the Authority decision letter, with the aim of teasing out the additional information on benefits, costs and impacts requested.

The Panel also agreed to seek input from Ofgem on one aspect of the letter regarding alternative solutions and whether the aim of SECMP0004 would be covered off by the Faster Switching Programme through the Centralised Registration Service (CRS). In addition the Panel noted that the DCC would need to provide input into the revised implementation date for SECMP0004 as the date on which it would be able to implement the Modification Proposal in 2019, would inform the new implementation date put to consultation and included in the revised Modification report submitted to the Authority.

For SECMP0008, the authority sent the Modification Proposal back for a revised implementation date. The panel agreed to take the same approach as per SECMP0004, while focusing just on the new implementation date and consideration of any impacts the date change would have on the benefits and impacts.

The Panel chair sought input from the BEIS representative e on whether the approach discussed and agreed was suitable for covering the points raised in the send back letters. The BEIS representative indicated that they believed it would be satisfactory.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of the report; and
- **AGREED** the approaches for resolving the matters highlighted in the Authority Send -back letters for SECMP0004 and SECMP0008

## 15. Modification Proposals – Initial Modification Reports

SECAS presented the Panel with three Initial Modification Reports (IMRs) to discuss and determine whether and how they should be progressed through the Modification Process. The Modification Proposals raised are listed below. The IMRs were accepted, and the suggested progression Paths and progression timescales were **AGREED**.

- SECMP0036 – Single User ID for Users acting in one or more User Roles
- SECMP0037 – Pairing Local PPMIDs
- SECMP0038 – Sending Commands via PPMIDs

A Panel Member raised a concern about the impact SECMP0036 may have on export suppliers if they are different from import supplier. It was noted that the Modification Proposal could progress but the issue raised would need to be resolved.

## 16. DCC Update

The DCC provided the Panel with an update on the activities undertaken by the DCC since the last Panel meeting. It was noted that due to delays in the completion of R1.3 testing, the delivery plan for

R1.4 is being re-planned. It was also noted that the DCC will publish a draft Development Plan in Autumn 2017 to align DCC business planning activity to development planning.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the update.

## **17. SMETS1 Initial Enrolment Project Feasibility Report Consultation**

Ashley Hannah (DCC) presented the Panel with an update on the DCC's proposed SMETS1 delivery plan. It was noted that the DCC had completed consultation with customers on the Initial Enrolment Project Feasibility Report (IEPFR) and had submitted the final report to BEIS and is awaiting direction on the delivery plan. The report outlines six integration options with down-selection expected as they move through the Discovery Phase. The options include an integration path using SMSO capability, an integration path direct to the meter and a hybrid solution. It was noted that a hybrid model would create flexibility with customers to balance time and cost and quality.

The Panel discussed the importance of understanding the release strategies for cohort by cohort enrolment and the impact this would have on Users. Specifically, clarity on testing requirements and obligations on Users was requested.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the update.

## **18. DCC Reporting**

The Panel were provided with a paper that includes reports issued to the Panel from the DCC as required by the SEC. It was noted that the TABASC are to commence discussing reporting trends and issues arising from the monthly DCC Performance Measurement Report.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

## **19. BEIS Update**

The Panel were provided with an update on the forthcoming consultations and upcoming key milestones from BEIS, including an upcoming consultation on a number of Subsidiary Documents to support R2.0.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the update.

## **20. Technical Specification Maintenance Handover Update**

SECAS provided a final update to the Panel on the activities and progress made on the Technical Specification Maintenance Handover since January 2017, which has now been handed over to SECAS. It was noted that further updates would be provided if any items arise from the remaining post-handover user acceptance testing exercise.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

## 21. User Security Assessment Update

The Panel discussed a confidential agenda item, regarding an Evidence Update provided by a SEC Party to the SSC in May 2017. Further information can be found within the Confidential Minutes from this SEC Panel meeting.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the update.

## 22. Operations Report – May 2017

The Panel were presented with the Operations Report for May 2017. The report provided an outline of the SECAS activities undertaken by the SECAS team in support of the SEC. Headline items from each of the Sub-Committee meetings held in the month were also provided.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper, which included a breakdown of days by driver, product and grade.

## 23. SEC Panel Elections Update

The Panel were informed of the scheduled elections for the SEC Panel Members, following vacancies arising from the retirement of Elected Members after their 24 month term. The Panel noted that the invitation for nominations would be circulated on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017 to allow elected members to take their seats by 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of this paper.

## 24. SEC Party Engagement Day

SECAS provided the Panel with an approach to the SEC Party Engagement Day to be held in July 2017. As discussed at the April Panel meeting, the agenda has been structured for the morning session to be the Panel-hosted event, with SECAS to run a Spotlight on the SEC session in the afternoon.

The Panel **NOTED** the approach and SECAS noted that they would continue preparation in the lead up to the day to be held on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2017.

## 25. Smarter Markets Project Update

SECAS provided an overview of the developments and work undertaken in May 2017 in support of the Smarter Markets project.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

## 26. Transitional Governance Update

SECAS presented the Panel with an update from the transitional governance entities and other smart metering related meetings and workshops attended by the SECAS in the last month.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

## 27. SEC Panel Activity Planner

The Panel were presented with the SEC Panel Activity Planner as a standing agenda item. The Activity Planner provides a high-level overview of the forthcoming Panel activities, and a forward look at Panel agenda items for the next three months based on the latest information available.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

## 27. SEC Party Update

SECAS informed the Panel of the Parties who have officially completed the User Entry Process as described in SEC Section H1.10 and confirmation of Parties that have completed various testing activities as required by the SEC.

The Panel noted that the following organisations would be admitted as Parties to the SEC following countersignature of their Accession Agreements by the SECCo Board:

- Entice Energy Supply Limited (Small Supplier)
- Huddle Energy Limited (Small Supplier)
- Daisy Energy Limited (Small Supplier)
- ESB Energy Limited (Small Supplier)
- Snowdrop Energy Supply Limited (Small Supplier)
- Magnum Utilities Ltd (Other SEC Party)
- EDM Europe Supply Limited (Other Sec Party)
- Rockfire Energy Limited (Small Supplier)
- Sunflower Energy Supply Limited (Small Supplier)

SECAS also highlighted that there had been a number of off-cycle accessions prior to the Panel meeting to enable Parties to commence their User Entry activities in the lead up to the Small Supplier User mandate.

The Panel **NOTED** the contents of the paper.

## 28. Any Other business (AOB)

There was no other business and the Chair closed the meeting.