

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.

## MP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Part 2'

### December 2021 Working Group – meeting summary

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Charlotte Semp	DCC
David Walsh	DCC
Julie Geary	E.ON
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davies	ESG Global
Peter Hoare	Kaifa Metering
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Audrey Smith-Keary	OVO Energy
Christina Young	OVO Energy
Emslie Law	OVO Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Kelly Kinsman	WPD

#### Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the modification, reviewed the Impact Assessment and proposed next steps.

#### Scope

[MP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Part 2'](#) aims to introduce three DCC System impacting Issue Resolution Proposals (IRPs) into the Smart Energy Code (SEC). The IRPs have been discussed and the solutions agreed at the Technical Specification Issue

Resolution Sub-Group (TSIRS) before being passed to SECAS to incorporate the changes into the SEC.

IRP604 fixes a typographical error within IRP550 and so there are effectively only two changes that cause an impact on DCC systems.

IRP550 relates to a situation where Suppliers send a 'Read non-critical event and alert behaviours' to the Gas Smart Metering Equipment (GSME). Currently the GSME will not send a response to a request when there is no data to report. The change will add a default response message to show there have been no events or alerts.

IRP603 addresses a potential security weakness that allows Electricity Smart Metering Equipment (ESME) and GSMEs to share their security logs with Devices on the Home Area Network (HAN). The change will add explicit prohibition of this behaviour.

## Working Group Discussion

### Overview

SECAS presented a summary of each IRP that is included in the modification before summarising the Impact Assessment.

### Impacts

The Data Service Provider (DSP) has to record the full GBCS version from the CPL and also has to create a mapping table for every GBCS version. They do not expect changes to the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS).

Communication Service Provider (CSP) Central & South has confirmed that they will not require a Communications Hub firmware release to accommodate the changes as they either already support the change or are planned to as part of standard updates. There will be impacts upon their Device Emulators though to enable testing.

However, CSP North confirmed their Communications Hubs would need updates to disregard elements of the 'publishEvent' command from GSME with log ID of 0x04. There will also be changes needed to their testing stubs to simulate the new commands.

### Testing

SECAS provided a summary of the testing that each CSP had highlighted they needed. CSP Central & South will make Design, Build and System test changes to the HAN Device Emulator and will test both Toshiba and WNC Single Band Comms Hubs (SBCH) and Dual Band Comms Hubs (DBCH) operating on GBCS 3.2 and 4.x firmware. The functional testing will be limited to one cycle of testing in Physical Integration Testing (PIT), and the subsequent System Integration Testing (SIT) is expected to take 3 weeks.

CSP North will test Single and Dual Band Communications Hub variants and perform PIT with physical meters, Prepayment Meter Interface Devices (PPMIDs) and HAN Connected Auxiliary Load Control Switches (HCALCS). They have confirmed they will require two cycles of PIT testing, taking four weeks per cycle and then SIT will also follow the same structure.

Working Group members queried why CSP N required two cycles of PIT. The DCC (CS) confirmed they had continually pushed back to CSP North on the testing level they deem necessary and associated costs. CSP North has stated they require two cycles of PIT in case an issue is missed during the first cycle. A Working Group member (EL) questioned whether SEC Parties should incur double the costs because CSP North was not able to have confidence in their own testing through a single cycle. The DCC agreed and are continuing to escalate this issue within CSP North. The DCC also noted that they are expecting revised costs for the November 2022 SEC Release as a package of works. This is expected in the next two weeks and should provide a sizeable reduction in testing cost as they will be shared amongst the modifications in scope. The DCC also commented that they considered the Design, Build and PIT costs to be higher than expected too.

## Implementation

SECAS presented the costs of the modification, being £2,633,973 to implement the change, with a further £1,573pa incurred for application support. CSP North would expect to reduce costs as part of a full November 2022 SEC Release as testing costs could be shared. However, CSP South and Central would not reduce costs as these have already been realised as part of their firmware management policy. The full implementation would expect to take eight months to deliver and is aimed to be delivered as part of the November 2022 SEC Release. The Working Group acknowledged the high costs for this modification and the need for a business case to justify implementation.

## Case for Change

SECAS highlighted that the Proposer believed the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a) and that there would be a benefit for consumers of reducing a known security risk. However, it was also noted that SSC had classified that as a low risk. Working Group members did not provide any contrary views to this.

One Working Group member (MR) queried whether the PPMIDs actually do display the log upon request and whether this was an actual issue. SECAS confirmed that the issue had been ratified by TSIRS but whether it justified the costs to fix was a question for SEC Parties through this Modification Process.

SECAS highlighted that these issues are identified as a part of the DCC System that is not present or not working and raised at TSIRS. TSIRS then develop a technical solution but do not consider the business case. The solutions are provided to SECAS for incorporation into the SEC. Up until this point the business case and justification for the change is not considered. SECAS therefore asked the Working Group to fully consider the business justification for incorporating these IRPs at these costs and to feed this into the Modification Report Consultation and Change Board vote.

Another Working Group member (RB) asked whether a lack of response from SEC Parties would be perceived as supportive or opposition to the change. SECAS noted it was not possible to infer Parties preference either way without a response, but any written commentary would be included if submitted, commenting it did not have to be a formal response using the Modification Report Consultation documentation. Another Working Group member (GS) who is also a Change Board representative confirmed that the absence of a response could not be inferred one way or other and was therefore to be inferred as neutral. SECAS suggested the member could raise this with their Change Board representative if they wished to.

## Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS will present the final Modification Report to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) for approval; and
- Subject to approval, SECAS will issue the Modification Report Consultation.