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.

Paper Reference:	**SECP_78_1303_14**
Action:	**For Discussion**

Prioritising SEC modifications

1. Purpose

Due to the significant number of modifications being submitted in recent months and the high number of open modifications, we have developed a mechanism to prioritise proposals in order to better manage any peaks in workload. This paper presents our approach and proposed prioritisation for the Panel's endorsement.

2. Rationale for prioritisation

There are currently around 50 open modifications, around double the number that were open last Summer. Twenty of these have been raised in the last three months, and we anticipate further modifications being raised in the coming months.

As much as possible, we endeavour to progress every proposal as swiftly as possible. However, there are times where spikes in workload create constraints in SECAS, DCC or industry time and resource. This means it is not possible to progress every modification swiftly without sacrificing the quality of the assessment. In such situations, we need an objective approach to determine which modifications should be given priority.

We have developed this approach in collaboration with the DCC, who will be applying this to DCC Change Requests as well. This will ensure the whole change portfolio is prioritised in a consistent manner.

3. Proposed methodology

The method we have used is modelled on the Eisenhower Matrix, which is used to prioritise activities based on their importance and their urgency. Under this approach, we will measure the scale of the expected merits of each change, to determine 'importance', and the identified 'urgency' of the change.

The prioritisation scoring will be used to compare one modification's merits against another. This will allow us to understand if one change is more important or urgent than the other, allowing them to be prioritised against each other. This will result in us identifying the modification's overall priority *relative to other modifications*.

This method will be dynamic, with the prioritisation for a modification being reassessed as new information is received throughout its lifecycle. Where we believe a modification's priority needs changing, we will inform the Panel via the timetables update paper.

3.1 Importance

To determine the 'importance' of a modification, we have scored each proposal against five key delivery criteria below. These scores are based on whether the change is expected to have a major, moderate, minor or no improvement or impact in each area, compared to the current arrangements.

A weighted average of these scores is calculated to derive an overall view of the scale of the expected improvements or impacts arising from the change. We assessed the relative importance of each area using the paired comparison mechanism, and the weightings we derived are shown below.

Delivery criteria	How much will this change … compared to the current arrangements?	Weighting
Legal & regulatory compliance	Ensure that Parties (including the DCC) meet the obligations of all relevant laws, regulations and licence obligations	30%
Operational performance	Deliver performance improvements enhancing speed, quality, costs, flexibility and dependability	15%
Cost benefits	Realise financial benefits compared to the cost of the change and the impact of doing nothing	10%
Consumer benefits	Meet or enhance consumer and end user needs and expectations through offering better services	15%
Security impacts	Deliver or enhance the smart metering security arrangements or reduce the risk of a security incident arising	30%

3.2 Urgency

To determine the 'urgency' of a modification, we have considered several factors, including (but not limited to):

- whether the change is linked to a specific date (e.g. when overarching legislation goes live);
- whether change is needed quickly to stop the identified issue from escalating significantly, and the size of the detrimental impact that would result if no change is made; or
- whether cut-off dates for inclusion in the next SEC Release are drawing near and the importance of the modification being included in that release.

From this, we have derived a view of whether there is significant, moderate, minimal or no urgency around progressing the change swiftly.

3.3 Priority

The importance and urgency of each change are then plotted on the following matrix to determine the modification's overall relative priority:

URGENCY	Low			High
High	Medium	High	Critical	Critical
	Medium	Medium	High	Critical
	Low	Medium	High	High
Low	Low	Low	Medium	High

IMPORTANCE

4. Results

The results of our assessment for each open modification are summarised in the table at the end of this paper. This results in a relative priority of ‘Critical’, ‘High’, Medium’ or ‘Low’ being derived for each modification.

5. Next steps

We invite any views and comments from the Panel on our approach and proposed priorities.

If the Panel is supportive of this approach and the proposed priorities, we will list the identified priority of each modification in the Modifications Register. Going forward, we will use these priorities to determine which modifications should be given priority during times of resource constraint, which will be reflected in the timelines we propose to the Panel each month.

6. Recommendations

The Panel is requested to:

- **ENDORSE** the proposed approach to prioritising modifications; and
- **AGREE** the proposed prioritisation of the open modifications.

David Kemp

SECAS Team

6 March 2020

Proposed prioritisation for all open modifications

URGENCY \ IMPORTANCE	Low		High
High	DP098 MP099 MP106	MP093 DP096 DP114	SECMP0007 SECMP0067
	MP078 MP090 DP117	MP077 MP092 DP100 DP110 DP111 DP116	SECMP0046 SECMP0056 DP094 MP104
	DP107	SECMP0024 DP095 MP101 MP102 MP103 MP105 DP108 DP109 DP115 DP118	MP080
Low	SECMP0012 SECMP0015 SECMP0066 MP083	SECMP0010 SECMP0013 SECMP0028 SECMP0032 SECMP0037 SECMP0038 MP082 MP085 DP112	DP113

This document has a Classification of **White**