

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.

## MP149 'Effecting Changes to the Smart Energy Code efficiently'

### July 2021 Working Group – meeting summary

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Holly Burton	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Khaleda Hussain	SECAS
Piers Garton	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
David Kemp	SECAS
Anik Abdullah	SECAS
Remi Oluwabamise	DCC
David Walsh	DCC
Abhijit Pal	DCC
Sarah-Jane Russell	British Gas
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Julie Geary	E.ON
Robert Williams	E.ON
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davies	ESG Global
Terry Jefferson	EUA
Tom Mudryk	Gemserv
Alastair Cobb	Landis + Gyr
Ralph Baxter	Octoenergy
Andy MacFaul	Ofgem
Jonathan Coe	Ofgem
Emslie Law	OVO Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Elias Hanna	Smart ADSL

Attendee	Organisation
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Simon Willcox	Stark
Julian Hughes	TABASC Chair
Naeem Saleem	UK Power Networks
Rachel Norberg	Utilita
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Kelly Kinsman	WPD

## Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified in [MP149 'Effecting Changes to the Smart Energy Code efficiently'](#), the responses to the Refinement Consultation and intended next steps.

## Issue

- SECAS now owns the Issue Resolution Proposals (IRP) process to fix known issues within the Technical Specification documents. Identified changes to these documents are no longer carried out by the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) through designations, and now relies on the SEC modification process. All modifications must have a defined Proposer.
- SECAS cannot raise proposals to fix this, it relies on a Proposer to step forward from a Smart Energy Code (SEC) Party.
- Identifying and working with a volunteer Proposer causes delays and SECAS wants to remove the burden from SEC Parties.
- Is it appropriate for an individual to be named as the Proposer on another person's or group's modification?

## Proposed Solution

- Allow SECAS to be named as Proposer.
- Remove restrictions from the SEC Panel to raise modifications.
- Allow the SEC Panel to grant these powers to the relevant Sub-Committees for modifications within that Sub-Committee's remit, as previously suggested by the Working Group.

## Working Group Discussion

### Provision of Powers

SECAS noted that there were five respondents to the Refinement Consultation composed of differing views. All respondents noted that they supported the principle of the modification, but some Parties advised further refinement was required for them to support the solution.

One respondent noted that there had been concern raised in other industry forums regarding Code Panels being able to effectively overrule another Panel's recommendations as part of cross-Code changes (e.g. the second Panel rejecting the consequential changes required by the first).

Two Parties also questioned whether it was appropriate for the SEC Panel to have its restrictions removed on raising change. One Working Group member (GS) did not believe that the SEC Panel should be responsible for raising modifications. They felt that there was a conflict of interest as the SEC Panel is the escalation point for modifications and should not be able to make decisions on escalations relating to modifications they may have raised. They also noted this applied to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) and Change Board, who have key roles in the modification framework.

Ofgem (JC) also highlighted that there appeared to be a lack of evidence and rationale for providing the SEC Panel with this power. They further questioned whether the expectation was that a Sub-Committee would be expressly delegated with this power once, as part of their Terms of Reference (ToR) or whether that Sub-Committee would be delegated with the power upon request to the SEC Panel each time that Sub-Committee wished to raise a modification.

SECAS noted that the SEC Panel has in the past acted as a driver to raise certain modifications, noting modifications to credit cover rules and the Section D review as examples.

SECAS advised that the intention of the legal text was to give SEC Panel the ability to grant a Sub-Committee the power to raise modifications within its remit within its ToR. The legal text was written to help futureproof requirements so that the powers could be extended to further Sub-Committees as the SEC Panel determined, without the need for defining the Sub-Committee within the SEC<sup>1</sup>. SECAS noted that there was no expectation for the provision to be extended to the CSC or the Change Board and would look to amend the legal text to include this.

One respondent had questioned whether it was appropriate for the SEC Panel be given the responsibility to determine whether other Sub-Committees in the future should be given the power to raise modifications. They also felt that the modification should focus on Sub-Committees who currently have less of a voice, rather than those like the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) who are already actively involved within the change process.

SECAS advised that whilst some Sub-Committees are more involved than others within the change process, the whole industry has visibility of changes being progressed and has the chance to input. Although the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) and the TABASC are involved in the process, they do not make decisions. Their involvement is to provide recommendations to the Working Group based on their expertise to ensure that Proposed Solutions are workable and will not be detrimental to the current processes.

---

<sup>1</sup> SEC Section C6.1 allows the Panel to create new Sub-Committees beyond those already defined in the SEC. The Operations Group (OPSG) was formed using this provision.

## Governance

At the June Working Group meeting there had been broad agreement that the existing governance process for modifications was suitable for proposals raised from these new provisions.

One respondent questioned how Sub-Committees or the SEC Panel would come to a decision on whether a modification should be raised by them. SECAS advised that each forum would reach a decision in the same manner as other decisions set out in their ToR. The Smart Metering Key Infrastructure (SMKI) Policy Management Authority (PMA) and SSC both reach decisions by majority verdict.

Two Working Group members (RN and GS) raised concerns about the potential increase in workload that this could cause and questioned whether SECAS would also need an initial stage gate to raise a proposal.

SECAS advised that the work that goes into raising an initial Draft Proposal was similar to the work that would be required to gain permission to raise initially. A Working Group member (GS) highlighted that even a minimal amount of time carried out repeatedly would add up to a considerable amount of work, and this needs to be considered and addressed.

Another Working Group member (RN) commented that often the issue being raised had not been developed sufficiently and greater work to understand technical background was needed at the outset. Therefore, even the initial work could involve several hours of industry time.

SECAS (JM) raised a potential issue that Sub-Committees could be seen by Parties as an outlet to raise modifications through, rather than raising the change themselves. A Working Group member (GS) agreed and suggested noting this either in the ToR or legal text to push back anything out of the Sub-Committee's remit.

## Costs, benefits and impacts

SECAS noted that respondents were split on impacts, benefits and costs. Some Parties acknowledged the improvement in process from them not needing to be a volunteer Proposer. Whilst others noted the potential slowdown of the modification process if the impact of this change saw many modifications subsequently raised.

## Solution and approval

SECAS noted that responses were similarly split with regards the solution and approval of the modification. Some Parties felt the modification was ready for approval, whereas others felt that further refinement was required to develop the solution.

One Party noted that this should not be a standalone modification, and instead form part of the wider review of the process recently completed by SECAS. SECAS noted that the Proposer wished for this modification to remain separate to ensure it was not dependent on other modifications.

Ofgem (JC) highlighted that, if the MP149 solution was substantially the same as MP088, for example because the Working Group felt no additional checks and balances are needed, the full rationale for this needed to be included in the Modification Report.

## Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to develop legal text and update the Modification Report for further review by the Working Group.