

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.

MP193 ‘Incorporation of Category 3 Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC – Batch 6’

March 2022 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Anik Abdullah	SECAS
David Kemp	SECAS
Khaleda Hussain	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
Tom Mudryk	SECAS
Rainer Lischetzki	SECAS
Elizabeth Woods	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Tom Rothery	DCC
Emma Johnson	British Gas
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Julie Geary	E.ON
Nigel King	E.ON
Daniel Davies	ESG Global
Terry Jefferson	EUA
Martin Bell	EUA
Peter Hoare	Kaifa Metering
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Elias Hanna	Smart ADSL
Gordon Hextall	Security Sub-Committee (SSC)
Matt Alexander	SSE Networks
Audrey Smith-Keary	SSE - OVO
Emslie Law	SSE - OVO
Robert Johnstone	Utilita
Karen Jacks	Vantage Meters
Gemma Slaney	WPD

Overview

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

Overview

SECAS provided an overview of the modification, noting that there were five Issue Resolution Proposals (IRPs) and one Change Resolution Proposal (CRP) within scope.

These IRP/CRPs are defined as 'Category 3', which means there is no impact to the DCC System, nor do they require DCC System testing. The IRPs may impact manufacturers and Device behaviours and therefore a business case for implementation needs to be assessed as part of the modification.

Working Group Discussion

IRPs in scope of the modification

SECAS provided an overview of each IRP/CRP in turn and noted the intent of the solution for each of these, asking the Working Group to consider impacts to their organisation.

SECAS noted that the only benefits to consumers from these IRP/CRPs was from CRP630 that would lead to more data being able to be shared with the HAN Connected Devices.

SECAS also noted that the modification was targeting a November 2022 implementation if a decision could be obtained by the end of June 2022. SECAS asked Device Manufacturers whether this was possible for them.

SECAS presented the next steps for the modification, highlighting that the modification would be sent for Refinement Consultation to gain views of industry.

The Working Group had no comments.

IRP Process

A Working Group member (EL) commented that the Working Group was not the appropriate forum to assess the impacts of these IRPs. They noted that the IRPs are very technical in nature and discussed at the Technical Specification Issue Resolution Sub-group (TSIRS) in great depth. They felt that those who attend the Working Group would find it very difficult to accurately assess the impacts of these changes on their business.

SECAS (KD) acknowledged this and noted that although the Working Group may not be able to comment on the Technical Solution, a business case still needs to be developed to support implementation. They provided the example of [MP078 'Incorporation of multiple Issue Resolution Proposals into the SEC - Part 2'](#) that was recently rejected by the Change Board having been in the Refinement Process for two years and incurring costs for the DCC Impact Assessment. It was suggested these costs and time could have been better spent if the business case analysis was carried out at an earlier stage.

A Working Group member (TJ) noted that while IRPs are discussed at great depth by the TSIRS, that group has no mechanism to implement the changes. The SEC modifications provide this, while also

ensuring the full implications are understood. The Working Group should be careful about asking 'do we need this' as that question has already been discussed in detail by the TSIRS.

Another member (RB) agreed the Working Group would not be the right group to comment on these, so queried if the Working Group could give an informed view on the change, or whether there was a more appropriate group that could. A further member (GS) noted the SEC modification process is needed for these but queried if a further step could be added for IRP modifications where the costs are passed back to the TSIRS to comment. The TSIRS could advise if the IRP is a minor fix or resolving a fundamental issue, and therefore if the change is cost-effective, much better than the Working Group could.

The DCC (TR) questioned whether the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) was a more appropriate forum to provide information with regards the issues and impacts of the IRP/CRPs. SECAS (KD) confirmed that all modifications involving IRPs are presented to the TABASC and multiple stages of the modification. They are also presented separately to the Device Manufacturers at separate meetings for comment.

One Working Group member (GS) suggested that the Working Group could come up with a list of business case questions that the TSIRS could incorporate into the IRP process to provide a bit more information about the scale of the issue. They also suggested that additional questions could be added to the Refinement Consultation to gain views. SECAS (AB) suggested that wider questions on how IRPs should be managed would be outside the scope of this modification and therefore would be better completed separately. An item can be added to the next Working Group meeting agenda to consider this further.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to issue the MP193 Refinement Consultation; and
- SECAS to review the IRP process and present suggested improvements to the Working Group.