

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 46

Meeting SECP_46_1407, 14th July 2017

10:00 – 13:30, Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	SEC Panel Members
SEC Panel Chair	Peter Davies
Large Suppliers	Simon Trivella
	Alex Travell
Small Suppliers	Eric Graham
	Mike Gibson
Electricity Networks	David Lane
Gas Networks	Hilary Chapman
Other SEC Parties	Mike Woodhall
	Tom Thorp (Alternate)
DCC	Carmen Strickland

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Duncan Stone
	Patrick De Nijs
	Julian Hughes (Part)
Ofgem (the Authority)	Michael Walls
	Raymond Elliott
	Colin Down (Part – Teleconference)
DCC	Helen Fleming (Observer)
	Matt Roderick (Part – Teleconference)
	Dave Broady (Part)
Citizens Advice	Morgan Wild

TABASC	Julian Hughes (Part)
Meeting Secretary	Hollie McGovern
SECAS	Adam Lattimore
	Alys Garrett
	David Barber

Apologies:

Category	SEC Panel Members
Other SEC Parties	Hugh Mullens

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The minutes from the June 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 action:

Action reference	Update
SECP45/02	An item will be discussed at the August 2017 Panel meeting on the potential Data Controller role and General Regulation Data Protection.

2. DCC R1.3 Governance Update

SECAS provided the Panel with an update on the DCC Release 1.3 (R1.3) activities following the Panel decision meeting held on 30th June 2017, where the completion of Release 1.3 Additional SIT and the validation of the outcome of End-to-End (E2E) Entry Gate were approved. It was noted that BEIS had been notified of these decisions, and that a Live Services Criteria Report had been circulated to the Panel on 13th July 2017.

The Panel also noted that the completion documentation for SMKI and Repository Testing (SRT) Part 3a had been circulated on 19th July 2017. This included the completion report and a recommendation letter from the SMKI PMA. The Panel noted no concerns on the documentation provided, and approved SRT Part 3a as of 18th July 2017, subject to any issues being raised prior to that date.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

3. Establishment of Operations Group

SECAS presented the Panel with a proposal to establish an Operations Group as a Sub-Committee under the SEC, following a suggestion from BEIS. It was noted that the purpose of the Operation's Group would be to provide a forum to discuss operational matters, as the focus of the programme is now turning towards operational services. The proposal was well received by Panel, and it was noted that there would need to be clarity in regards to the sections which the Operations Group would be required to act on the Panel's behalf, and not to duplicate work being undertaken by the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC).

A draft Terms of Reference (ToR) had been provided and the Panel were requested to provide feedback for any comments, so that they can be finalised at the August Panel meeting. It was noted that the ToR are currently focussed on the operational aspects of the DCC Services, however, they should be amended so that the end-to-end operational services are in scope.

The Panel:

- **APPROVED** the establishment of the Operations Group; and
- **AGREED** to provide feedback on the draft ToR.

4. Release Management – Supporting SEC changes arising from Modification Proposals and BEIS Directions

SECAS and BEIS provided further details on the two options for managing changes to the Technical Code Specifications in the next few SEC Releases. This further detail follows on from a BEIS presentation at the June 2017 Panel meeting,

The two options were: Option A (Early Designation) and Option B (Late Designation). SECAS noted that the paper also included details of the transitional Resolution Proposals (RPs) that BEIS intend to be included in Releases 3 (which contains Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification 1 (SMETS) 1 Enrolment and adoption and descope transitional Resolution Proposals from Release 2.0)), and Release 4 (which will containing Communication Service Provider (CSP) impacting RPs descope from release 2.0 and any approved Modification Proposals)) for information. There was discussion around both options, and how the technical specifications for future releases would be affected. It was noted that the next steps for BEIS would be to work out the timing of the designation of these future technical specifications and how testing would be undertaken (particularly resolution proposals) as part of the 2019 DCC System impacting release (which is also be referred to as Release 4.0).

A Panel Member asked a question around how clarity would be given on subsequent changes, and expressed desire to have a clear cut off for raising further changes. SECAS clarified that the versions of the Technical Code Specifications designated early could then be amended by subsequently approved SEC Modification Proposals. These amendments would be subject to the changes meeting any industry and DCC required cut off periods or lead times. It was agreed that this information would be considered as part of implementation approach considerations of Modification Proposals and would be subject to industry consultation.

There was discussion around potential configuration management issues, including variants of SMETS specification upgrades. It was noted that multiple versions of releases and devices would increase complexity, and that timing of the releases would have significant impact on Parties. There was also discussion around optional and mandatory releases; it was noted that if a release contained

Technical Code Specification changes that results in a decimal increase to the specification version the changes are mandatory as the content being applied is retrospective. If the version increases by a whole number, the changes are prospective and the content of the new version would inform whether the changes are mandatory or not. It was noted that if Release 3.0 is close in proximity to Release 2.0 some of the changes will be a decimal point release, meaning the changes would be retrospective.

Concerns were raised around Parties understanding of the impacts of different versions of the specification, and the Panel requested that BEIS and SECAS produce generic guidance that would clarify the difference between point and full releases in order for them to prepare themselves. SECAS noted that details on the different types of versioning and how they apply is set out in SEC Section A3, but agreed to pull together additional guidance on this matter.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper
- **NOTED** the IRPs that BEIS intends to incorporate into Release 3 and 4; and

ACTION SECP46/01: SECAS to develop guidance note on the technical specification versioning.

5. International Standards Membership Recommendations

SECAS presented a paper setting out a recommendation from the TABASC for SECAS to become an adopter member of the Device Language Message Specification (DLMS) User Association. It was noted that this was needed in order to facilitate the TABASC's duty of ensuring the SEC Technical Code Specifications remain aligned with international standards. The membership will also aid SECAS and TABASC in supporting and advising on Modification Proposals that require change to the Technical Code Specifications, the End-to-End Technical Architecture and the Business Architecture.

There was discussion around the costs of each membership, and a Panel Member questioned if the Adopter membership could be upgraded in future if required. The TABASC Chair and SECAS noted that the Adopter level membership provided access to the finalised live documentation. However, in future if access to draft documentation and sight of proposed changes was required then a further level of membership could be requested. It was also noted that ZigBee alliance membership is not required as the live ZigBee specifications for smart are accessible without requiring formal membership.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **AGREED** that SECAS applies for Adopter membership with the DLMS User Association.

ACTION SECP46/02: SECAS to apply for Adopter membership with the DLMS User Association.

6. TABASC Effectiveness Review

The Panel were asked to approve an approach proposed by the TABASC, in order to fulfil their requirement to monitor and review the effectiveness of the technical and business architecture and the Home Area Network (HAN) requirements.

The Panel questioned the reasoning behind undertaking the review when the system had 10,000 prepayment meters installed. It was noted that the TABASC had determined that this milestone should mean that the system is being used at a sufficient level for meaningful responses to the questionnaire to be provided.

It was also questioned whether Registered Supplier Agents (RSAs) would receive the survey. It was clarified that all DCC Users at the time of undertaking the survey would be asked to respond to the questionnaire. This would include RSAs if they were DCC Users in their own right.

The DCC also asked if it could be clarified within the documentation to be circulated that if Users were experiencing any issues with the DCC Services then they should raise incident reports, and the questionnaire does not form part of the formal incident / issue resolution process.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the work undertaken by the TABASC; and
- **APPROVED** the proposed approach, questionnaire and Communication Plan.

7. DCC Release Management & Engagement with SEC Releases

Helen Fleming (DCC) presented the Panel with an update on the DCC's activities regarding supporting release management and the approach to managing change that they are required to implement.

The DCC provided a brief update on progress with its development of a 'Delivery Hub', which would pull together the different elements of release implementation management to aid deliverability and capability.

The DCC indicated that Delivery Hub development has also looked at mechanisms for improving the DCC contribution to the Modification Proposals process, including how Preliminary Assessments (PAs) can be delivered in shorter time by adopting a lighter approach and to work more closely with SECAS, TABASC and the Panel. At this point it was noted that the implementation dates for Modification Proposals SECMP0004 and SECMP0008 has been provided, with SECMP0004 being targeted at the June 2019 release and SECMP0008 targeted at the June 2018 release, with a fall-back implementation date of June 2019.

The Panel were informed that a release plan for SMETS1 Enrolment and Adoption would be finalised in the coming weeks, and as this would impact the SEC significantly. The Panel Chair requested that the DCC provide a credible plan for SMETS1 Enrolment & Adoption, and not simply a quick one. A Panel Member added that while the plan needed to be credible, it needed to be delivered relatively quickly to mitigate any risks on enduring issues over interoperability.

The DCC presented details of how it undertakes and would undertake internal Gate Process Overview, and it was noted that the 'gates' would not withhold progression of change, but allocate resources to allow for planning in a more predictable way.

It was noted by the Panel Chair, that during discussions with the DCC it had been indicated that the DCC expected to be able to implement one major release a year, containing device hardware

impacting changes, along with DCC System and firmware impacting type changes. Further releases could also be provided covering just DCC System changes and firmware impacting changes. There was discussion around what constitutes major changes and major drops, and that this would influence next steps. Along with the timing from when such a level of release service could be supported.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

8. 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 three risks. No new risks had been identified.

It was noted that Risk 17 was to be closed, subject to confirmation that SRT had completed successfully and agreed by the Panel on 18th July 2017.

Post meeting note, following the approval of SRT completion, Risk 17 will be closed.

SECAS reiterated that a full review of the risk register would take place following R1.3 Live to ensure the risks remained appropriate and mitigations were in place, with details of the review provided to the August 2017 Panel meeting.

The Panel:

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

9. 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 June 2017 Panel meeting.

SECAS presented the following action areas in detail for the Panel's consideration: Small Supplier Obligations, Costs, Alternate User Competent Independent Organisations (CIOs), and Smoothing Demand.

Small Supplier Obligations

There was discussion around shared services for small suppliers, and it was noted that the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) had approved an obligations matrix to be published in the next week or so as part of an update to the Security Controls Framework (SCF).

The Panel also discussed the cycle of assessments following the initial Full User Security Assessment. It was noted that the SEC requirements mean that for Suppliers with less than 250,000 installed meters would need a Verification Assessment in the second year. The Panel requested that SECAS provide some guidance on the user assessment cycle, taking the above into account.

Costs

SECAS and the User CIO met to discuss cost estimates for small suppliers undertaking a Full User Security Assessment. There was discussion on communication with small suppliers in order to provide them with a better understanding of the assessment process and the associated costs. A

Panel Member raised a concern that the level of costs could create a barrier to entry for some Small Suppliers undertaking the User Security Assessment.

Commercial Management

It was noted that SECAS had scheduled more regular meetings with the User CIO in order to discuss the commercial aspects of the User CIO relationship. It was noted that any areas to discuss with the Panel or the Board would be discussed at the following meeting.

Alternate User CIO

There was discussion around the possibility of introducing alternate User CIOs, as Parties currently feel they have no control in the Security Assessment process, whereby Deloitte is the only option and they are obligated to pay whatever cost is charged. A Panel Member suggested that if required in the future consideration be given to putting in place an accreditation process for organisations to undertake Security Assessments instead, so that alternate organisations could deliver the services of User CIOs.

Smoothing Demand

It was noted that the SSC would be raising a modification in August in order to provide clarity on the start date for year 2 assessments. This will enable providing certainty over the demand for assessments in subsequent years. SECAS noted that a demand estimate would be provided at the next Panel meeting for approval.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

ACTION SECP46/03: SECAS to provide a paper that provides guidance on the user security assessment cycle

10. Security Sub-Committee Terms of Reference

Following the May 2017, the SSC were requested to take a SMETS1 Security Risk Assessment forward. SECAS provided the Panel with an updated ToR for SSC to include this area of work.

The Panel:

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

11. User Security Assessment Update

A confidential agenda item whereby the SEC Panel discussed and agreed the assurance status for a number of Parties going through the Security Assessment Process. Further information can be found within the Confidential Minutes from this SEC Panel meeting.

12. Privacy Assessment Considerations and Update

SECAS provided the Panel with an update on the discussions to date following the first completed Full Privacy Assessment, as requested in the form of an action from the June 2017 meeting. It was noted that SECAS had contacted the Party regarding the Panel determination.

As per the BEIS action, for it to look at the definition of Personal Data, BEIS confirmed that SEC Parties and prospective Other Users should consult the guidance produced by the Information Commissioner's Office. It was noted that further information would be provided in regards to the Data Controller Role at the August meeting.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

13. Planned Maintenance Schedule Update

Dave Broady (DCC) presented on the options that they were considering as an approach to planned maintenance in place of the temporary maintenance schedule which has been in operation since November 2016. It was noted that industry have concerns about the enduring maintenance arrangements had become clear, following two consultations. The consultation responses highlighted concerns that the current SEC provisions relating to the Planned Maintenance do not focus sufficiently on consumer outcomes, in particular consumers using Pre-Payment Meters. It was noted that several respondents expressed the view that maintenance should only occur when Pre-Payment top-up activity is lowest.

The DCC presented the Panel with an initial proposal of using data provided by energy suppliers to identify the time of day and day of the month when it would be most appropriate to carry out Planned Maintenance, and make changes to reflect this in the SEC. It was proposed that systems would be categorised as either:

Category A: Maintenance of a system is likely to impact Pre-Payment Meters top-up activity; or

Category B: Maintenance of a system is not likely to impact Pre-Payment Meters top-up activity

The DCC presented an example whereby **Category B** maintenance would commence at 20:00, whereas **Category A** maintenance would be restricted to 02:00 and 06:00.

There was discussion on the surrounding Data Service Provider (DSP) and CSP components, and how that would affect Pre-Payment Meters.

Concern was raised regarding consultation and if the extent of impact on suppliers would be made clear. A Panel Member noted that the DCC should consider the non-disconnect periods that Suppliers have in place.

It was noted that the temporary maintenance schedule provisions are due to lapse in August 2017, and the DCC would seek an extension to the temporary arrangements which the SEC Panel would then consult with Users on to understand the impact of outages now that we are moving to live operations. This would allow time to fully develop the enduring arrangements that they wish to put in place.

Matt Roderick (DCC) also presented the Panel with the approach that would be taken to reduce upgrade downtime for future releases, noting the industry concern that 60 hour outage periods would not be acceptable in live operations. The DCC informed the Panel that they are looking to minimise if not remove the outage windows to create a round the clock platform of availability.

It was noted that during the 60 hour outage for R1.3, the DCC would be implementing a very significant change to the systems. It was agreed that sustaining Pre-Payment service as long as possible either side of the maintenance window, and avoiding impact to consumers are key areas to look into, which should engage industry and Panel to find out other areas to minimise service outages.

A Panel Member questioned the outage time for R1.4, to which the DCC stated a target of 4 to 6 hours, and agreed to provide further information on outage time and impacts at a future date. It was also noted that Release 2 faced similar challenges, and the expectation for Release 2 is similar to R1.4.

The Panel noted that there are challenges surrounding the outage windows, and commended the DCC's aspiration for delivering their services and reducing impacts, and that the issues needed to be resolved quickly so suppliers can plan around the outages and reduce impact.

The Panel **NOTED** the updates.

14. New Modification Documentation

SECAS presented the Panel with details of improvements to the suite of Modification Documentation, following industry feedback which indicated that the current documentation is overly complex.

It was noted that the key points from industry feedback were that the main documents were overly complex, and lacked plain English. There was a desire for clearer and more high level summaries in the documents, and for clearer indication of impacts to Parties up front. The feedback indicated that the current Modification Proposal form and reports lacked flow, contained repetitive information and had no clear purpose.

SECAS presented the Panel with changes to the modification documentation which included a mixture of either amalgamation or separation of the contents to better differentiate between 'report', 'consultation' and 'supporting' documentation. It was noted that the proposal form had been stripped back and that questions had been re-worded, and that each document now has a single clear purpose, which ultimately should improve the documentation lifecycle. The Panel were informed that cover pages for reports going to Panel and the Change Board will now include details of the decisions to be made so that the purpose and actions required are set out up front. It was also noted that for reports going to industry, a clearer indication of impacts will be included and set out on the first page and in summary.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

15. Modification and Release Status Report – July 2017

The Panel were provided with an update on the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the Modification Process. The report was presented using the new look Modification and Release Status Report to provide the Panel with a working example of how the new modification documentation will look going forwards.

The new look report also include the rational and details of proposed extensions to Modification progression timetables, specifically SECMP0034 which required a four month extension as more work than originally anticipated to cover off all four of the potential solution options that had been added.

SECAS also requested a one month extension to the SECMP0036 progression timetable due to it taking longer to re-confirm that the Modification proposal did not have a DCC System impact

The Panel **AGREED** to a four month extension to the SECMP0034 progression timetable and a one month extension to the SECMP0036 progression timetable.

16. DCC Preliminary Assessment and Impact Assessment Improvements

This was discussed under agenda item 07.

17. SEC Modification – DCC Assessments

The DCC provided an update on the current progression of SEC Modification Proposals as they undergo requested Preliminary Assessments (PAs) and Impact Assessments (IAs) including when they are due to be delivered along with any revisions to expected delivery timescales.

18. Modification Proposals – Draft Modification Report

SECAS presented the Panel with a Draft Modification Report (DMR) following the completion of the Refinement process to discuss and seek agreement for it to proceed to Modification Report Consultation and then change board vote, on the basis that all refinement activities had been completed and the solution had been fully developed and assessed.

A Panel Member raised a concern about whether the modification would affect the accuracy of data collection. SECAS and the TABASC Chair commented that the Modification Proposal solution was only changing how the information was displayed to the customer on a In Home Display (IHD), including the removal of trailing zeros. The actual accuracy of data within the meter was unchanged.

The Panel:

- **AGREED** that SECMP0006 is a Path 2 Modification Proposal;
- **AGREED** that the draft legal text delivers the intention of the modification;
- **AGREED** that the modification proceeds to Modification Report Consultation; and
- **AGREED** with the recommended implementation approach of:
 - June 2018 (as part of Release 2.0), if a decision to approve is made by December 2017; and
 - June 2019 (as part of Release 4.0), if a decision to approve is made after December 2017 but before December 2018.

19. Modification Proposals – Initial Modification Report

SECAS presented the Panel with one Initial Modification Report (IMR) to discuss and determine whether and how it should be progressed through the Modification Process. The Modification Proposal raised is listed below.

- SECMP0039 – Communication Hub returns notification mechanism for Other SEC Parties

A Panel Member raised a concern about installation and ordering and who can access service requests, and whether the Modification Proposal also need to consider a shorter term solution and it was agreed that this is something the Working Group would need to consider.

The Panel was accepted, and the suggested progression Path and progression timescale was **AGREED**.

20. Ofgem CMA Remedies Consultation

Colin Down (Ofgem) provided the Panel with an update following responses received by Ofgem since their initial consultation on the code governance remedies in November 2016.

It was noted that the responses came from a wide range including code administrators, code panels, code bodies, and large and small suppliers.

The presentation covered the following areas:

Scope of new arrangements

Ofgem had proposed new arrangements to include Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) codes and central system delivery functions, and it was noted that the majority of respondents agreed with the codes and functions identified. Some suggestions were to include additional codes, Data Transfer Service and Security and Quality of Supply Standard.

Licensing and competition

It was proposed that code managers and delivery body functions be included in a single licence; the majority of respondents did not support licensing but most supported including a code manager and delivery body in a single licence, given it is done on a case-by-case basis.

The Panel discussed the licensing arrangements, and whether it would take the form of a licence to be the Code Manager for a specific code or a licence to enable an organisation to bid to undertake the Code management of a specific industry code, undergoing competitive tender. Ofgem noted that the mechanism for licensing was yet to be determined.

Ofgem informed the Panel of four proposed licensing models which had different strengths and weaknesses to suit different codes. The proposed models were: licensing precedes tenders, licensing follows tenders, tendering is done by Ofgem or tendering is done by another body. It was noted that respondents preferred Ofgem running tenders and issuing licenses to winners.

Strategic Direction

Ofgem noted the forthcoming publication of a document to set out how code governance will work, and the key outcomes of various code changes. Ofgem also aimed to include key priorities, impacts on codes and industry and would implement workshops to communicate this with industry. It was noted that there was wide support for the strategic direction, but should be consulted upon.

Consultative Board

Ofgem proposed to establish a board to help industry to deliver on strategic cross code changes across codes. It was noted that respondents showed general support for the idea, but did not want to duplicate work or add complexity. It was also noted that the Board would need access to information from industry, and that the composition and funding of the consultative board are major issues to be decided on.

Moving to new arrangements

Concerns by respondents agreed that reforms are unlikely to affect the governance of major projects and programmes, and that input from industry is required.

The Panel were presented with the next steps which included Ofgem publishing an open letter later in the year, summarising the responses and steps on high level thinking.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

21. BEIS Update

The Panel were provided with an update on the forthcoming consultations and upcoming key milestones from BEIS, including upcoming proposed changes to the DCC licence and the quarterly statistical licence.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

22. 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 the DCC had held a customer engagement day, and that 100 organisations have now completed the SMKI Registration Authority Policies and Procedures (SMKI RAPP) process.

The Panel **NOTED** the update

23. DCC Reporting

The Panel were provided with a paper that includes reports issued to the Panel from the DCC as required by the SEC.

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

24. Operations Report – June 2017

The Panel were presented with the Operations Report for June 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.

25. Code Administration Code of Practice Annual Review

SECAS presented the Panel with an overview of the process for the 2017 annual review of the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP). The Panel were informed a meeting would take place in September 2017 to review any feedback received on the CACoP and Panel Members were requested to inform SECAS of any comments they wish to be included in the review.

An update was provided on the Forward Work Plan, and the Panel were informed that the format of the plan had been stripped back to focus on the horizon scanning element. This would be reviewed at the next Cross-Code Administrator meeting. It was also noted that SECAS will send the horizon scanning page to Panel for feedback to further inform the development.

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

26. 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.

27. 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:

- Bruntwood Energy Services Limited (Small Supplier)
- Dong Energy Sales (UK) Limited (Small Supplier)
- Red Fish Systems Limited (Other SEC Party)

The Panel **NOTED** that the following organisation would be withdrawn as a Party to the SEC following a voluntary request:

- CNG (Group) Limited (Small Supplier).

28. Any Other business (AOB)

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