

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 Change Sub-Committee Meeting 27\_2505

25 May 2021, 10:00 – 10:40

Teleconference

### SECCSC\_27\_2505 – Final Minutes

#### Attendees:

Representing	CSC Member
Change Sub-Committee Chair	David Kemp (DK)
Large Suppliers	Sarah-Jane Russell (S-JR)
	Emslie Law (EL)
Small Suppliers	Chris Brown (CB)
	Daniel Davies (DD)
Electricity Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (GS)
Other SEC Parties	Alastair Cobb (AC)
Consumers	Ed Rees (ER)

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	David Walsh (DW)
	Remi Oluwabamise (RO)
SECAS	Holly Burton (HB) ( <i>Meeting Secretary</i> )
	Ali Beard (AB)
	Bradley Baker (BB)
	Harry Jones (HJ)
	Joe Hehir (JH)
	Khaleda Hussain (KH)

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The Chair welcomed members to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) meeting.

The Meeting Secretary (HB) informed the CSC that no comments had been received from the previous CSC meeting held on 27 April 2021. The CSC **APPROVED** the minutes as written.

## 2. Actions Outstanding

Action Reference	Action
26/01	CSC members to inform the Chair of any further comments on the proposed delegation of modification responsibilities by <b>5pm on Tuesday 11 May 2021</b> .  SECAS highlighted that no comments were received. The Panel has since agreed to proceed with the delegation. A paper was presented at this CSC meeting (see item 4) seeking final views and comments before asking the Panel to sign this off in June 2021. Status: <b>Closed</b>
26/02	SECAS (HB) to grant access to all Change Sub-Committee members to the new Microsoft Teams channel and to issue guidance in the week commencing 3 May 2021. Change Sub-Committee members are requested to raise any problems to <a href="mailto:sec.change@gemserv.com">sec.change@gemserv.com</a> in order to assist further.  The Teams channel has now been set up where members were granted access on 7 May 2021. An 'Introduction to Teams' can be found under the 'files' tab within the channel. Two members raised access issues which have since been resolved. Status: <b>Closed</b>
26/03	SECAS (HB) to seek potential dates via Doodlepoll to hold the next Change Sub-Committee meeting, which is currently scheduled on 1 June 2021.  Dates were sought and the CSC was re-scheduled to 25 May 2021. Status: <b>Closed</b>

## 3. Draft Proposal Report

### DP158 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Batch 5'

The CSC considered the problem statement for [DP158 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Batch 5'](#).

SECAS (KH) informed CSC members that there are 15 IRPs contained in this Draft Proposal which have been identified as non-DCC System impacting and will not require DCC System testing. These IRPs have been approved and requested by the Technical Specification Issue Resolution Sub-group (TSIRS) to be progressed as a modification for implementation into the SEC. They are text only changes to the Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS) and the Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS) to add consistency within the technical specification. There are four IRPs which SECAS believes to be security related but not security concerning, as they are text only changes to correct the issue. These will be highlighted to the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) accordingly.

IRP623 has been removed from this batch as it required changes against the GBCS Version 3.x series, and IRP631 which has been implemented in the GBCS Version 4.x series. If approved, this modification will be targeted for the next technical specification release, which is November 2021.

A CSC member (AC) clarified their understanding that this new specification sub-version would run in parallel with the current one. The Chair confirmed the understanding is that there will be a new version 4.x for SMETS and that both the current and new sub-version will remain open until the

Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) determine the old sub-version should be closed.

The CSC had no further comments.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** the Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Report Phase.

#### **DP159 'Credit Cover Review'**

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP159 'Credit Cover Review'](#).

The CSC had no comments.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** the Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process.

#### **DP160 'Certificate Signing Request forecasting'**

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP160 'Certificate Signing Request Forecasting'](#).

A CSC member (GS) noted it would be useful for the DCC to provide a DCC User guidance document to accompany the legal text at the first Working Group meeting. Another CSC member (EL) echoed this, noting there seemed to be some confusion previously with similar modification [MP116 'Service Request Forecasting'](#) in what is expected of Users. SECAS stated that it will apply the lessons learned from MP116 to MP160.

The DCC agreed that guidance for DP160 will be provided in advance of the next Working Group meeting.

The CSC had no further comments.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** the Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process.

### DP162 'SEC Changes required to deliver MHHS'

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP162 'SEC Changes required to deliver MHHS'](#).

SECAS (DK) noted the Electricity Settlement Reform Significant Code Review (SCR) is currently underway and being led by Ofgem. A key output of this will be market-wide half-hourly settlement (MHHS). This SCR has developed a target operating model (TOM) for the full solution. To deliver this, changes will be needed to the SEC and to DCC Systems; given the technical nature of these changes, Ofgem has agreed it would be beneficial that these are progressed separately under the SEC modifications process. As the issue has been discussed extensively under the SCR, further discussion is not needed under the SEC, and therefore SECAS is recommending that this modification is advanced quickly to the Refinement Process.

A CSC member (DD) noted it is highly important that the Refinement Process accounts for all the work that has been done by the Code Change and Development Group (CCDG), managed by Elexon, around the TOM. A lot of work has already been done on this, and this needs to be aligned across the different impacted Codes.

A CSC member (EL) believed that some inaccurate assumptions have been made under the SCR on how smart metering works, and the Working Group needs to be careful that smart metering is not 'broken' in trying to make this work for MHHS. SECAS (DK) confirmed that whilst it will strive to meet Ofgem's overall timetable, this should not come at the expense of making sure smart metering is not 'broken' in the process. The CSC member (EL) noted the biggest challenge here is that MHHS has been looked at primarily from a settlement perspective and has only focused on obtaining data from a Device, as opposed to thinking about how the Device operates. This has been made out of scope by Elexon so this will require SEC Parties to define this in the end-to-end solution.

One member (ER) noted that part of this is being intuitive and feeding back early to Elexon and Ofgem when issues are identified. The detailed focus is right, but any 'red flags' should be raised promptly on a case by case basis.

The DCC (DW) clarified it has engaged with the Service Providers and is aware of the issues raised. The DCC is using all possible resources to fully prepare for this change.

The CSC had no further comments.

The CSC:

- **AGREED** the issue and the impact it is having is clearly defined and understood;
- **AGREED** the Draft Proposal is ready to be converted to a Modification Proposal; and
- **RECOMMENDED** to the Panel that the Modification Proposal should proceed to the Refinement Process.

### DP163 'T3 Aerials Requirements Removal'

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP163 'T3 Aerials Requirements Removal'](#).

SECAS (HJ) highlighted the Proposer believes T3 Aerials do have a variety of problems associated just with trying to install, because of time spent on site in order to try and put the aerial in place. There are only two installations that have taken place so far which is a small sample size; however, one has not worked which means a 50% failure rate from what has happened so far. This then leads to

questions that if this was to be a long-standing process with the intention to rollout for hundreds or thousands of Devices, there is not a lot of confidence so far that this would work. There have been some suggestions about removing the requirements around the T3 Aerials in place and looking at other alternatives. The DCC has provided some feedback on the level of impact this could have. that the Communications Service Provider (CSP) for the South and Central regions has noted there is a particularly high impact that would be experienced. The DCC has cited a prior consultation and the DCC's response to it was that essentially preliminary deployment costs would be in a range of around £100m – £200m.

A CSC member (CB) noted the Industry will need to explore other options and solutions, but given MHHS, there will be an assumption that in order for all smart meters to communicate, there needs to be a better way to do this. Success to date with T3 Aerials has been limited, and are not practical in areas such as areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Another CSC member (EL) clarified, having been involved in T3 Aerials since the early stages of design, that they stopped development work due to larger issues with the proposal on how this was supposed to work. They highlighted they had to work with a sub-contractor of the DCC's Service Provider, who was defining a very manual process. These are very resource intensive and do not always seem to work. Most, if not all, new connections seem to require a T3 Aerial, and these are being seen as the easiest way forward. They questioned if T3 Aerials are being seen as part of the no Wide Area Network (WAN) issue despite not being supported by Parties. They noted several working SMETS1 meters would need a T3 Aerial, which is hard to explain to those customers.

A CSC member (ER) suggested there is a lot of risk and questions raised about liability with these aerials if something was to go wrong. It is difficult for consumers to engage if the customer is a renter or does not know the property, or even has a leasehold instead of a freehold, to then get permission to get changes done to the outside of the property. As a result of this, there should be a push for an alternative solution and others may have already been raised. They highlighted that the Office for Communications (Ofcom) is running a consultation about changing the rules to indoor repeaters for mobile signal in rural areas which is an interesting area that the CSP for the Central and South regions could be looking at to seek other options for these areas. A CSC member (EL) noted a series of workshops had been held before with landlords and partnerships, and that the outputs of these should be considered.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to fully define and understand the issue.

#### **DP164 'November 2021 SEC Release supporting changes'**

The CSC was provided with a summary of new Draft Proposal [DP164 'November 2021 SEC Release supporting changes'](#).

The DCC detailed system design associated with the [SECMP0007 'Firmware updates to IHDs and PPMIDs'](#) changes occurred after the approval of the modification and associated legal text. As part of this design process some additions and amendments have been identified as being required in order to align to the legal text with the intent of the SECMP0007 solution.

The CSC had no comments on this Draft Proposal at this stage.

The CSC **AGREED** further development is required to fully define and understand the issue.

#### 4. Change Sub-Committee Terms of Reference Review

SECAS (DK) informed the Change Sub-Committee that a key recommendation from the SEC Section D Review was that the Panel's oversight for SEC modifications should be fully delegated to the CSC. At the last SEC Panel meeting, these provisions were agreed. To support this, SECAS has also prepared updates to the CSC's Terms of Reference. Providing no comments are received, then this will be taken to Panel for final approval in June 2021. Members had no comments on the proposed provisions for delegation or the proposed changes to the Terms of Reference.

The Chair (DK) has also proposed to stagger the membership terms of the CSC which is an approach that has been successful with the other SEC Sub-Committees. Rather than having every seat up for re-election every two years, it will consist of half the seats being up for election one year, with the rest being up for election the following year. This will mitigate the risk of losing valued expertise and experience when all seats are up for re-election at the same time.

To facilitate this, CSC members were asked if half would be willing to volunteer to reduce their current membership term by one year, being up for election next year. To clarify, members can re-elect themselves for the same seat when elections take place.

The CSC:

- **ENDORSED** the recommendation that the duties set out in this paper be delegated to the CSC going forward;
- **ENDORSED** the updated Change Sub-Committee Terms of Reference for submission to the Panel for approval;
- **NOTED** that the Panel will be asked to delegate these duties to be effective at the next scheduled Change Sub-Committee meeting on 29 June 2021; and
- **AGREED** for half of the current members' terms to be reduced to one year.

**ACTION 27/01:** SECAS to reach out to members offline to see who would be willing to volunteer to reduce their term of membership for the CSC by one year, in order to stagger elections.

#### 5. Any Other Business (AOB)

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

**Next Meeting:** 29 June 2021