

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 50

### SECP\_50\_1011, 10<sup>th</sup> November 2017

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

## Final Minutes

### Attendees:

| Category             | SEC Panel Members      |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| SEC Panel Chair      | Peter Davies           |
| Large Suppliers      | Simon Trivella         |
|                      | Ashley Pocock          |
| Small Suppliers      | Mike Gibson            |
|                      | Karen Lee              |
| Electricity Networks | David Lane             |
| Gas Networks         | Leigh Page             |
| Other SEC Parties    | Kate Fraser (Observer) |
|                      | Gary Cottrell          |
| DCC                  | Helen Fleming          |

| Representing              | Other Participants   |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Ofgem (the Authority)     | Michael Walls        |
|                           | Raymond Elliot       |
| BEIS (Secretary of State) | Duncan Stone         |
|                           | Robert Thornes       |
| DCC                       | Richard Kelly (Part) |
|                           | James Henton (Part)  |
|                           | Robin Healy (Part)   |
|                           | Dave Broady (Part)   |

|                   |                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Meeting Secretary | Hollie McGovern     |
| SECAS             | Adam Lattimore      |
|                   | Alys Garrett (Part) |
|                   | Sarah Gratte        |
|                   | Jill Ashby (Part)   |
|                   | David Barber (Part) |
|                   | David Kemp (Part)   |
|                   | Dave Warner (Part)  |

### Apologies:

| Category                | SEC Panel Members |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Consumer Representative | Rajni Nair        |
| Other SEC Parties       | Hugh Mullens      |

## 1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The minutes from the October 2017 SEC Panel meeting were approved ex-committee and circulated to SEC Parties.

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.

| Action Reference | Update   |
|------------------|--|
| SECP48/01        | SECAS informed the Panel that discussions were ongoing with the User User Competent Independent Organisation (CIO) on incorporating the new assessment demand profile forecasts in the contract. An update will be given at the December 2017 meeting.   |
| SECP49/04        | SECAS clarified that the concern raised by the Smart Meter Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) Chair in the recommendation letter regarding the SMKI and Repository Testing (SRT) Approach Document was in relation to the relevant process, timescales and planning of the DCC for proving SMKI Recovery rather than finding a volunteer User. The Panel noted that ongoing discussions between the SMKI PMA and the DCC were occurring, and that the issue would be discussed further at the November 2017 SMKI PMA meeting. |

## 2. Release Management Policy Consultation

The DCC and SECAS presented the Panel with a revised enduring Release Management Policy (RMP), that incorporates feedback provided by the Panel at the October 2017 meeting, and covers

the SEC Requirements for the Panel RMP and the DCC RMP, in accordance with SEC Sections D10 and H8.9 respectively.

The DCC introduced the approach to the Panel, noting the valuable support provided by SECAS and the Panel Chair in developing the Policy. The DCC highlighted that the proposed approach sets out two system-impacting SEC releases per year, with three scheduled maintenance releases per year, noting that there would be fixed dates for a degree of certainty. It was noted that the RMP will be effective to enable the first SEC Systems Release to be in June 2019, following DCC Release 2.0 and the initial deployment of the Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 1 (SMETS1) Service. The DCC also noted that once it is capable of proving successful delivery, a third system impacting release could potentially be introduced. The Panel Chair noted that both RMPs were consistent and is a major step forward in establishing modifications in the operations environment.

SECAS informed the Panel that the documentation now consisted of the high-level Release Management Document, noting that it was produced to cover the overarching release process for each policy, and to meet the SEC Requirements for each respective source of change.

SECAS then gave a detailed example of the associated implementation timetable. The Panel noted that it would need to agree an implementation timetable for Modification Proposals, and that a cut-off date would need to be applied for the inclusion of Modification Proposals to a release, to allow for certainty and to provide sufficient time for Users to prepare for the implementation date. SECAS proposed a cut-off date of 12 months before the implementation date for User impacting proposals, and 6 months prior to the implementation date for documentation impacting proposals.

It was noted that the SEC versioning for releases had not been amended in the version of the Panel RMP that had been presented, and that there could be more efficient ways to update/implement version control. The Panel noted that this consideration could be looked into once the final policy is ready to be signed off following consultation.

A Panel Member queried how many Technical Specifications of the SEC that the DCC will be capable of supporting at one time, and how long it planned to support each version. The DCC clarified that the modifications introduced would either be classified as voluntary or mandatory, and noted that if the changes are mandatory, then Users would have to update their systems to align with the current SEC version. If the functionality changes were voluntary, then the DCC would need to look into how long the previous version could be supported.

The Panel discussed the governance process for ad-hoc and emergency releases. It was noted that the policy document enables these types of releases, however the governance routes would require further thought, especially considering the timescales for decision making activities will be considerably shorter. It was noted that the Operations Group would be a key vehicle for the DCC in regard to implementation of any ad-hoc releases.

A Panel Member queried what criteria the DCC would have in place to approve go-live for each Release, taking into consideration testing and readiness to scale. It was noted that further work is required on developing Release Go-Live Criteria, and that this will be discussed further by the Testing Advisory Group (TAG).

It was raised that the proposed DCC release dates coincided with the Data Transfer Catalogue Releases and whether Users would find them desirable, and SECAS agreed to add a question to the consultation asking which dates for releases would be preferred. It was noted that SECAS and the DCC are planning to hold an education day in regard to the RMP and the change process.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **APPROVED** the amended documents to be consulted on with Parties.

**ACTION SECP50/01:** SECAS to issue the Release Management documentation to Parties for consultation.

### 3. Update to the Operations Group Terms of Reference

At the October 2017 Panel meeting, the Panel requested SECAS to amend the Operations Group Terms of Reference (ToR) to take account of a new duty to discuss DCC costs in relation to operational activities. The Panel were presented with the updated ToR, noting that the update had been discussed at the first Operations Group meeting and was well received.

The Operations Group Chair introduced himself to the Panel and informed them that the Operations Group had agreed that reviewing the cost drivers of proposed changes to DCC Operations and Services would be a useful activity to undertake, and would ultimately benefit Users in terms of giving them an early indication of proposed changes. It was noted that the work of the Operations Group will not duplicate or replicate the consideration and assessment of DCC costs through the SEC Modification Process or by the Authority as part of the Price Control activities.

The DCC sought further clarification on the scope of the new duty, and it was clarified that it should only relate to cost aspects of enduring activities. However, the Panel confirmed that elements of transitional releases that would impact the enduring arrangements should also be discussed with the Operations Group e.g. Testing Environments.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of the paper; and
- **APPROVED** the proposed changes to the Operations Group Terms of Reference (ToR).

### 4. Release 2.0 Testing Approach Documents

The Testing Advisory Group (TAG) Chair attended the meeting and presented the Panel with the first two detailed testing approach documents produced by the DCC in support of the overarching Release 2.0 SEC Variation Testing Approach Document (SVTAD): the Release 2.0 Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and Device Integration Testing (DIT) Approach documents.

The Panel were informed that the TAG had reviewed both documents on the 25<sup>th</sup> October 2017. At the meeting, the DCC discussed proposed revisions to the draft based on initial feedback provided by SECAS, and further feedback was provided by the TAG. The Panel discussed the main concerns highlighted in the paper and noted how the DCC had sought to resolve the feedback.

One key area of feedback related to the process for appointing and undertaking independent emulator assurance activities, and the Panel noted that the TAG are still awaiting the DCC to provide a timeline and key dates for when the appointment and deployment of the independent emulator assurance will occur. The Panel were informed that further details on this area would be provided and discussed at the next TAG meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017.

A Panel Member who attended the TAG meeting noted that the two approach documents were not formally recommended for approval by the TAG, due to concerns of several outstanding issues, including comments submitted by Large Suppliers that are still being discussed by the DCC. The Panel Member noted that a decision from the Panel should be deferred until the TAG can provide the Panel with a clean recommendation following the next TAG meeting. A question was raised on whether there were any time constraints around the Panel's subsequent recommendation to the Secretary of State (SoS) of whether the two approach documents need to be approved. The TAG Chair noted that the review timescales had been compressed due to the expectation that SIT would commence on the 13<sup>th</sup> November 2017. The BEIS representative and DCC Panel Member both noted that due governance should be followed and that on the basis that there were no specific concerns on the SIT entry criteria, that the TAG should have an opportunity to revisit the documents along with supporting DCC explanations of the changes made to resolve the feedback provided.

The Panel Chair, therefore noted that the Panel will require a clean recommendation from the TAG before making a recommendation to the SoS, on the approval of the SIT and DIT Approach Documents and requested agreement from the Panel that the recommendations could be considered ex-committee following the next TAG meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017.

The Panel Chair queried if the TAG were comfortable with making a recommendation on the approval of the SIT and DIT approach documents in advance of having sight of the User Integration Testing (UIT) Approach Document, and noted that it would need to be a consistent suite of documentation. The TAG Chair noted that with the exception of the SIT and DIT Approach Documents, all future approach documents would go through, at a minimum, a three-phase review cycle comprising one meeting to review the document and provide feedback, and a second TAG meeting where the actions taken by the DCC would be considered to inform a recommendation to the Panel, with the subsequent Document being presented to the Panel.

The Panel noted that in the case of the UIT Approach Document, an additional review phase would occur with the DCC to provide an overview of the approach for producing and structuring the UIT approach document, prior to it be formally reviewed at a subsequent meeting. It was noted that TAG have the opportunity to highlight any areas that need to be taken into account in the UIT approach Document at the same time they reconsider the SIT and DIT approach documents, at the November 2017 TAG meeting.

The Panel:

- **DEFERRED** recommending the approval of both documents to the Secretary of State (SoS) until the TAG formally consider the latest versions of both documents and make a supporting recommendation for the Panel to consider; and
- **AGREED** to consider any subsequent recommendation from TAG, ex-committee in advance of submitting a recommendation to the Secretary of State (SoS) on the approval of the Release 2.0 SIT and DIT Approach Documents.

**ACTION SECP50/02:** TAG to consider the latest versions of the Release 2.0 SIT and DIT Approach documents at the next TAG meeting, and make a supporting recommendation to the Panel for consideration via ex-committee in advance of submitting a recommendation to the Secretary of State on the approval of the SIT and DIT Approach Documents.

## 5. SEC Panel Risk and Issue Register Update

SECAS presented the Panel with the proposed updates to the Risk Register and the Issues Register, which included an amendment to the mitigations of an existing risk. No new risks had been identified.

A Panel Member raised a potential new risk, that had been discussed at Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), in relation to wider industry initiatives having impacts on the smart metering arrangements and ensuring that the current requirements are taken into account e.g. the switch to half-hourly and the faster switching programme. SECAS agreed to draft a new risk to be discussed and approved at the next Panel meeting.

The Panel questioned if more operational risks would arise through discussion at the Operations Group. SECAS clarified that each Sub-Committee had its own risk register with risks escalated to the Panel as required. It was noted that TABASC were having ongoing discussions in regard to developing a risk register from risks passed over from the transitional groups, some of these relate to operational activities and therefore, will be passed over to the Operations Group for discussion and ownership.

The Panel:

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

**ACTION SECP50/03:** SECAS to draft a new risk regarding wider industry initiatives having impacts on the smart metering arrangements, to be discussed and approved at the December 2017 Panel meeting.

## 6. SEC Panel Draft Budget 2018-2021

SECAS presented the Panel with an amended Draft Budget for the next three Regulatory Years (April 2018 to March 2021), which incorporated feedback from the Panel at the October 2017 meeting.

The Panel discussed the revised draft budget provisions, and SECAS provided commentary highlighting the key variations from the budget presented at the previous meeting.

The following areas were discussed:

- SECAS noted that provisions for the use of Huddle as a secure file sharing platform had been removed from the budget, as the Panel had agreed at the previous meeting to continue using Egress. It was also noted that an increase in the website maintenance provision had been included to replace the previous SECAS project.
- SECAS highlighted that Ofgem had provided estimated resource requirements for support to the Faster Switching programme during 2018/2019, and therefore the provisions for the programme had not changed.
- As part of the Change and Releases Service Area, SECAS noted that the budget included appropriate provisions for Release 2.0 and Release 3.0, and that the commentary had been updated to reflect this. It was noted that the budget provision covers standard delivery activity, and any activity required over and above that would be called on from contingency provisions.
- It was noted that the level of support required in relation to security and privacy assessments had been considered and it was confirmed that the provisions should be adequate for the level of activity expected. It was noted that the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) were



comfortable with these provisions and a Panel Member raised that through efficiency improvements that are looking to be made to the assessment process, the provisions should be adequate.

- The Chair requested an update to the commentary in relation to the Independent Chair budget provisions to indicate the specialist support they provide in addition to Chairing the meetings. It was also requested that a note be provided to clarify that the contractual terms are the same for all Independent Chairs.
- SECAS clarified that the increase of £40,000 for the Annual Security Obligations Project was due to a delay in the Risk Assessment work being undertaken this financial year, and therefore, the increase relates to a time-shift of expenditure rather than an increase in the estimated spend.
- It was noted that SECAS would incorporate feedback provided by the Panel into a further version that will be presented at the December 2017 meeting for approval for consultation with Parties in January 2018.

The Panel:

- **NOTED** the contents of this paper; and
- **CONSIDERED** any amendments to the Draft Budget 2018-2021.

**ACTION SECP50/04:** SECAS to amend the Draft Budget to include feedback provided by the Panel and present at the December 2017 meeting for approval for consultation with Parties.

## 7. Modification Proposal Timetables

SECAS presented the Panel with an approach of how existing SEC provisions, regarding modification timetables, can be used to mitigate concerns regarding the cost of DCC assessing modifications. SECAS noted the purpose of the approach was to avoid incurring assessment costs and effort for Modifications where detailed design may not be necessary.

SECAS highlighted that a pre-modification issues process does exist. The issues process is in essence an informal workshop to introduce a potential change to the industry, and discuss whether it would be supported. SECAS agreed to advertise the issues process more widely so proposers are more aware before they raise a modification.

The Panel were given a high-level overview of the current modification process, and SECAS noted that the current progression timetables are lengthy, with a number of extensions being requested and always result in each modification incurring cost, effort and time of a detailed Impact Assessment (IA).

SECAS proposed splitting the current refinement process into two sections: develop and detailed design. Once a modification is raised, it will go to the Develop stage, where the Working Group (WG) will determine a solution or any alternatives, Sub-Committees will offer input, DCC will do a Preliminary Assessment (PA), views from industry on benefits and objectives will be sought, as will views of the WG on objects. Once a WG has enough information to make a recommendation on a modification, a modification report will be issued to the Panel. If the Panel believe that a full DCC IA is required, then the Modification will enter the detailed design stage of refinement. If the Panel believe there is no need to complete a detailed design of the solution then the modification will go into the report phase and be sent out for consultation, to Change Board and ultimately to the Authority for

decision. When the Panel set the initial Modification timetable as part of the IMR they can set this split in refinement.

SECAS noted that this approach would require a sensible grouping of current modification proposals, and noted that the Panel would be provided a realistic timetable at the December 2017 meeting.

A Panel Member questioned if this approach had been discussed with the Change Board, and SECAS noted that individual Change Board Members had been approached, but it was yet to be discussed with the Change Board as a whole entity. The Panel Chair noted that as the Change Board makes the overall decision regarding Modification Proposals, that it should be utilised in the planning of this process.

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

**ACTION SECP50/05:** SECAS to present an up to date timetable to include all current modification proposals at the December 2017 meeting.

## 8. Modification and Release Status Report – November 2017

The Panel were provided with an update on the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the Modification Process. The report included the rationale and details of proposed extensions to two Modification progression timetables.

The Panel **NOTED** the update, and **AGREED** the following extensions:

- An extension to the progression timetable for [SECMP0002](#)<sup>1</sup> so that the Modification Report is presented in March 2018.
- An extension to the progression timetable for [SECMP0005](#)<sup>2</sup> so that the Modification Report is presented in April 2018.

The Panel were also provided an update on the current progression of SEC Modification Proposals as they undergo requested Preliminary Assessments and Impact Assessments, including when they are due to be delivered along with any revisions to expected delivery timescales.

## 9. BEIS Update

The Panel were provided with an update on the forthcoming consultations and upcoming key milestones from BEIS, including designation of technical specifications, the quarterly statistical release and engagement with non-domestic suppliers.

A Panel Member queried when BEIS would be releasing their decision on the final date for the Non-Domestic Supplier mandate, as the consultation closed in October 2017. BEIS confirmed that the decision would be released in the first quarter of 2018, before the Advanced Meter Exception (AME) date in May 2018. A Large Supplier representative requested that the response to the consultation be issued as soon as possible to provide clarity to the Non-Domestic market.

BEIS confirmed that the Smart Meters Bill currently progressing through Parliament is at the Committee Stage which should conclude by 30<sup>th</sup> November 2017. It was expected that Parties would

<sup>1</sup> SECMP0002 'Add New Command to Reset Debt Registers'

<sup>2</sup> SECMP0005 'Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices'



in general be supportive of the Bill and it was noted that there was opportunity to provide feedback to the Committee.

## 10. DCC Update

The DCC presented the Panel with an update on the activities undertaken by the DCC since the last Panel meeting. This included an update on Meter Recovery, the DCC Price Control submission, upcoming DCC engagements, a Smart Metering Delivery Group (SMDG) update on Testing and the DCC Readiness to Scale project.

### Meter Recovery

The DCC informed the Panel that a real meter had gone through successful recovery in the UIT environment and the DCC were confident that the same outcome could be achieved in the real environment. The Panel questioned how this recovery event had been explained on the slides, and the DCC agreed to amend the presentation slides to reference key recovery rather than removal and re-enrolment.

### DCC Price Control

The DCC noted that Ofgem had issued an interim determination in October 2017 regarding the DCC Price Control submission, and that the DCC had published extracts of the determination on their website in order to give customers more information on cost drivers. The DCC highlighted the key themes from Ofgem's publication, which included questions around the growth of the DCC, and supply chain efficiency and management. It was noted that Ofgem and the DCC will hold a joint stakeholder workshop on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017, where the content of the Price Control document would be presented.

### SMDG update on Testing

The Panel were provided an update from the SMDG meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2017, where current defects were discussed. It was noted that there had been a significant increase in defect identification, as there is a back log of defects from the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2017 in addition to new defects that have since been identified. The DCC highlighted that they are working closely with Users to resolve defects, and that a meeting had been held with key Users who are in intense testing stage, to share information regarding the defects that are arising. A Panel Member noted that the DCC were making positive progress in defect management timescales, and the DCC noted that this was currently an important focus for them.

### DCC Readiness to Scale

The DCC presented the Panel with an update on its Readiness to Scale plan. It was noted that the plan would focus on reviewing and testing critical areas to rollout at speed to scale, and specifically on improving performance and removing barriers in order to get to the next phase adequately. The DCC noted that this may be a good area for the Operations Group to discuss, in particular looking at potential resolutions to the potential barriers. A Panel Member questioned if the DCC is currently capable to support mass rollout, and noted that it would be beneficial to embed readiness to scale activity into future releases. The DCC noted that it was currently undertaking testing to destruction, in order to gain insight of the stresses and strains on the operations environment, which can be included in planning for future releases. BEIS suggested the DCC produce a timetable to show their timeline for improvements, and noted that this could be discussed by the Operations Group.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

## 11. 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 SECAS will present the Operations Group with a summary report to be discussed at their next meeting.

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

## 12. Release 1.4 Update

The DCC provided the Panel with an update on the successful deployment of Release 1.4 (R1.4) functionality into the production environment on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

The DCC noted that User testing was successfully completed for R1.4 features, and that three Severity 3 defects had been identified during User Integration Testing (UIT). It was noted that the identified defects would be fixed in the test environment on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2017, and in the production environment on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

The Panel noted that the outage ran over the planned time by 75 minutes, due to the diagnosis and removal of a workaround applied for Release 1.3 supporting an interface between the Data Service Provider (DSP) and one Communications Service Provider (CSP). A Panel Member queried why the residual work arounds were not identified prior to R1.4, and how the DCC planned to prevent future work arounds. The DCC confirmed that it would work more efficiently in the future to reduce the number of work arounds.

The Chair questioned whether the structural changes had been implemented successfully as part of the release, and the DCC noted that architectural changes had been implemented. It was noted that overall useful operation information had been gained from the release.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

## 13. Major Incident Report

The DCC presented the Panel with a summary report regarding the DCC Severity 1 Incident that was raised on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2017.

The DCC gave an overview of the incident which occurred as a result of a full Xoserve data refresh of over 20 million updates being processed. It was noted that an attempt to process this file quickly then caused disruption to the flow of low priority Service Requests onto the motorway for processing, and therefore the DCC were not able to process all Service Requests.

The DCC informed the Panel of the actions taken during and after the incident and noted that a detailed incident report was produced and would be circulated to the Panel by close of play on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2017, which would be discussed at the next Operations Group meeting. *[post meeting note: The DCC circulated the incident report to the Panel on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2017].*

The Chair questioned if the full report draws any conclusions on the DCC's system capacity, to which the DCC clarified that the issue lay with the partitioning of resources, not with system capacity. The Chair also questioned if the DCC plan to run another full refresh to prove the issue has been resolved, and the DCC noted that update refreshes run in the back ground, but a full refresh could be looked into.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

#### **14. Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Proving Exercise 2017**

The DCC briefed the Panel on the outcome of the DCC's Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) testing that occurred in September 2017 that was set out in the full report provided to the Panel. It was noted that the report would also be discussed at the next Operations Group meeting.

The DCC highlighted that it is obliged to perform BCDR tests at least once to prove the capability and resilience of the Primary and Secondary Data Service Provider (DSP) and Communications Service Providers (CSPs) datacentres, in accordance with SEC Section H10.11.

The Panel were informed that the two CSPs were well prepared, successfully completing failover and failback close to the Recovery Time Objective (RTO) of four hours, and taking no more than eight hours. The DCC noted that the DSP's performance was unsatisfactory, noting that it was under-prepared and failed to complete failover or fall back in a time that was close to the RTO, and has outstanding problems that need resolving. The Panel were informed that DSP plan to conduct a repeat exercise on the on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> December 2017, and that SEC Parties have been made aware of the retest.

There was discussion regarding the disaster recovery site and the DCC noted that it would be reviewing the design assumptions of the site, as it is currently thought that the site may not be reliable and may not be able to run for an extended period of time if the production environment fails. The DCC noted that it would be undertaking this as a new piece of work, and a Panel Member questioned if there should be a deadline for the DCC to submit this to the Panel. The DCC noted that another report containing updates from the retest in December 2017 would be submitted to the Panel.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

**ACTION SECP50/06:** DCC to present the Panel with results of the BCDR retest in December 2017.

#### **15. Operations Report – October 2017**

The Panel were presented with the Operations Report for October 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.

SECAS noted that in addition to the activities outlined in the report, a full review of all content on the SEC Website is currently being undertaken in preparation for the new website. SECAS noted that it aimed to have the website live by the end of November 2017, and confirmed that User Testing for the website would be covered in detail at the upcoming Spotlight on the SEC.

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

## 16. Security Assurance Status Update

SECAS provided the Panel with the monthly confidential update on the Assurance Statuses set by the Security Sub-Committee following the October Panel meeting.

The Panel **NOTED** the decisions made by the SSC on the Parties' Assurance Statuses as set out in the Confidential paper.

## 17. Smarter Markets Project Update

Jill Ashby, assigned as the lead on the SECAS Smarter Markets Project team, briefed the Panel on the activities currently being undertaken to support the project, including updates on the three key workstreams of the project: E2E Design Team, the Regulatory Design Team and the Delivery Strategy Design Team.

It was noted that the SECAS project team continued to provide valuable support to the project in the form of Subject Matter Experts (SME), who contribute to each of the workstreams by providing expertise and reviewing documentation.

It was highlighted that a suite of documents have recently been issued for review by industry as outputs from the workstreams. However, it was noted that from the ongoing SECAS review, the documents contain a number of errors, and this feedback would be provided to Ofgem.

The Panel noted that extensive work was currently being undertaken in the regulatory work-stream in advance of the consultation in May 2018. SECAS noted that while business process related work is winding down, the Regulatory Design Team have ramped up effort from the SECAS project team to support the drafting of the regulatory framework, and that there will likely be a high run rate over the next quarter.

The Panel Chair noted that the current budget includes provisions for the Smarter Markets Project up until April 2018, with draft provisions for the following regulatory year. It was also noted that if the current provisions are unlikely to be adequate then the request for support should be documented and presented for approval. SECAS noted that the January – March 2018 support estimate would be included within the Quarterly Work Package to be approved by the Board at the December meeting.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

## 18. 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 Chair presented the Panel with an update on the SMDG headlines, which were issued to Panel Member's prior to the meeting.

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

## 19. 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.

## 20. 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:

- AES Smart Metering Ltd (Other SEC Party);
- Green Running Limited (Other SEC Party); and
- Opal Gas Limited (Small Supplier).

SECAS informed the Panel that a Small Supplier, Wingas UK Limited, had had its Gas Supplier Licence revoked on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2017, and had since notified SECAS that it wished to cease to be a SEC Party, in accordance with SEC Section M8.10. The Panel **AGREED** that Wingas UK Limited shall cease to be a SEC Party as of 10<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

## 21. Any Other Business

The Panel were notified that the SSC are considering raising a modification to allow the User CIO to assess a Shared Resource provider, in order to reduce the assessment time and cost for Small Suppliers and SECAS agreed to provide the Panel with a paper an update at the December 2017 Panel meeting.

SECAS raised an item regarding the new General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) coming into action in May 2018. It was noted that SECAS were having ongoing discussions with BEIS and the DCC about raising a modification to incorporate the relevant changes. The Panel agreed that SECAS should review the Code to identify potential areas of change, and DCC and BEIS agreed to share information with SECAS to aid their work.

A Panel Member raised two items that had previously been discussed at the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) Panel meeting, including:

- An item relating to enabling non-parties to raise industry code modifications; and
- An item relating to a proposal that was presented to the BSC to introduce an Electricity Market Sandbox.

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

**ACTION SECP50/07:** SECAS to review the Smart Energy Code and identify potential areas of change in regard to the new General Data Protection Regulation, and to present a paper at the December 2017 Panel meeting outlining any findings from the review.