

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’

Conclusions Report – version 1.0

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation and the recommendation of the Change Board regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

Summary of conclusions

Change Board

The Change Board voted by majority to recommend the Authority **approve** MP149. Members that recommended approval believed that the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (g)¹.

Modification Report Consultation

SECAS received seven responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Six believed that the modification should be approved. Five respondents considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (g) whereas one respondent believed the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a)². One respondent believed the modification should be rejected.

¹ Facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of the SEC

² Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers’ premises within Great Britain

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Six respondents considered that the modification better facilitated the SEC Objectives. Five considered MP149 would better facilitate SEC Objective (g) as it would improve the efficient administration of the Modification Process. One respondent believed it better facilitated SEC Objective (a) as it would improve efficiency and operation of smart metering systems.

One respondent (the Consumer Representative) noted that the previously raised modifications that relied on volunteer Proposers was clear evidence that this was an issue and was likely to continue. They believed the solution would provide improved efficiency within the Modification Process and that the Change Sub-Committee review offered sufficient safeguards.

One Network Party supported the solution but felt that there could be some guidance placed around situations where modifications could be raised using this proposed solution. Another Network Party agreed with the principle of the modification but felt that the issue did not justify allowing the SEC Panel to raise modifications in any circumstances. They noted support for a solution that defined the situations where SEC Panel would be able to raise modifications. Since there are two separate Sub-Committees (Change Sub-Committee and Change Board) that will be the stage gate for the progression and approval or rejection of any modification, SECAS agrees with the Working Group's view that this will give sufficient checks and balances within the process.

Change Board vote

Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to recommend MP149 be **approved** by the Authority.

The vote breakdown is summarised below.

Change Board vote				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	4	1	0	Approve
Small Suppliers	1	1	0	Reject
Network Parties	3	0	0	Approve
Other SEC Parties	3	0	0	Approve
Consumer Representative	1	0	0	Approve
Overall outcome:				APPROVE

Views against the General SEC Objectives

Objective (g)

The majority of the Change Board believed that MP149 will better facilitate SEC Objective (g) as the improvement will reduce the duration of modifications and will more accurately reflect the Proposer of a modification, rather than a volunteer SEC Party's name who may not have interest in the modification. This will improve the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of the SEC.

Two members believed that MP149 will not better facilitate the SEC Objectives. One member understood the rationale for the change but was not comfortable that the scenarios where the SEC Panel could raise modifications had been sufficiently explained. Another member noted concerns raised by smaller Suppliers that this modification would give a lot of power to the SEC Panel and Sub-Committees to raise modifications.

Change Board discussions

One member considered that all Code Panels struggle with this issue. They noted other proposals in the past around expanding Panels' powers to raise modifications had generally been rejected.

Another member, who voted to reject MP149, noted that while it can be a burden for a Party to sponsor a modification, it does create a clear requirement for there to be a named individual against each proposal.

Network Party members noted the consultation responses from Network Parties and the replies provided by SECAS. They welcomed the guidance that SECAS will produce, and felt that this had, on balance, provided comfort over the Proposed Solution.

An Ofgem representative noted the previous SEC modification, [MP088 'Power to raise modifications'](#), and the views given in the Authority decision letter. They noted these areas had been considered by the Working Group and were keen to hear the Change Board's views.