

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.

Meeting TABASC_15_1602, 16th February 2017

10:00 – 16:00, Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) Final Minutes

Attendees:

Category	TABASC Members
TABASC Chair	Julian Hughes
Large Suppliers	Emslie Law
	Ashley Pocock
	Stephen Lovell
	Rochelle Harrison
Other SEC Parties	Tim Boyle
	Tony Field (Alternate)
Gas Networks	Leigh Page (via teleconference)

Representing	Other Participants
BEIS (Secretary of State)	Seamus Gallagher
DCC	Stuart Scott
SECAS	Alys Garrett
	Kayla Reinhart
	David Barber (part)
	Samuel Browne (part)

Apologies	
Large Suppliers	Tim Newton
Large Suppliers	Grahame Weir
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna
Electricity Networks	Alan Creighton

1. Minutes and Actions Outstanding

The draft minutes from the January 2017 TABASC meeting were agreed as final. All actions were marked as completed or on target for completion. The following updates were provided:

Action Reference	Update
TABASC09/06 SECAS to produce a proposal for an enduring TAG function for TABASC to review.	SECAS informed the TABASC that initial discussions on User Testing Principles had occurred at the TAG meeting on 9 th February 2017. A joint workshop with TAG and TABASC will be set up in early March 2017. Action ONGOING .
TABASC13/01 DCC to provide updated DCC internal changes slides to include relative timeframes to TABASC.	The DCC provided an update in relation to the DCC internal changes under agenda item 3. The DCC will provide further information on the list of internal changes and any candidate release at a future TABASC meeting. Action ONGOING .
TABASC13/04 SECAS to request views from the SSC and SMKI PMA on specific areas of the BAD relevant to them.	Following TABASC feedback, SECAS to request views from the SSC and SMKI PMA on specific areas of the BAD relevant to them once the next drop of content occurs in March 2017. Action ONGOING .
TABASC13/06 SECAS to take into account the minor edit to wording on risk 11 and develop questionnaire to be issued to Users and other relevant Parties.	Minor edits to Risk 11 were addressed and the questionnaire will be developed to be provided at the TABASC March 2017 meeting for discussion. Action ONGOING .
TABASC14/01 The DCC to provide the TABASC with an update on the communication methods in relation to the DCC internal changes.	The DCC provided an update in relation to the DCC internal changes under agenda item 3. Action CLOSED .
TABASC14/02 SECAS to develop a workflow of a modification pathway to rapidly resolve Technical Specification defects.	A paper including a workflow of a modification pathway was provided at the TABASC February 2017 meeting and discussed under agenda item 7. Action CLOSED .

<p>TABASC14/03</p> <p>SECAS to update the Modification Status Reports to highlight Modification Proposals that specifically relate to the TABASC.</p>	<p>An updated paper was provided at the TABASC February 2017 meeting.</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>
<p>TABASC14/04</p> <p>SECAS to set up a joint workshop with the TAG and the TABASC to discuss User Testing 'principles'.</p>	<p>SECAS to set up a joint workshop following initial discussions at the TAG meeting on 9th February 2017.</p> <p>Action ONGOING.</p>
<p>TABASC14/05</p> <p>SECAS to provide the Confidentially and Disclosure Agreement for TABASC Member signature prior to the February 2017 TABASC meeting.</p>	<p>SECAS has provided the Confidentially and Disclosure Agreement for TABASC Member signature prior to the February 2017 TABASC meeting.</p> <p>Action CLOSED.</p>

2. BEIS Update

BEIS informed the TABASC of BEIS highlights, consultations and conclusions that have been published or are to be published in the coming months:

- Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 1 (SMETS1) has now been introduced into the Smart Energy Code in a limited capacity through the designation of SEC v5.4 on 9th February 2017, through the Technical Specification Applicability Matrix;
- The DCC is due to provide its proposed LC13 plan for Release 2 on 12 May 2017. The DCC must consult on the plan in advance and include a summary of and response to stakeholder comments on the plan; and
- The government response to a consultation on local Consumer Access Device (CAD) pairing outcomes was published in February 2017. Most respondents supported some form of local CAD pairing 'in principle'. However, respondents also expressed concerns around implementing local CAD pairing through the existing ZigBee standard. Due to the concerns around complexity, timing and privacy, it was concluded that local CAD pairing should not be introduced for the time being. It was noted that BEIS recognises the goal of positive customer experience and the importance of effective remote CAD pairing in the absence of local CAD pairing.

BEIS provided an overview of the discussions from the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG) meeting. BEIS noted that there was discussion on the scope of Device Language Message Specification (DLMS) conformance testing due to a minor defect in the green book which has been replicated in the GBCS. It was noted that BEIS are working with the DLMS User Association to ensure no change is required to the GBCS as this would entail an uplift to all remote service requests and Meters. It was noted that this was logged as a risk at the TBDG. Although the device would not fully

comply with the DLMS standard it was considered unnecessary to change from the current GB specification.

The TABASC suggested developing a policy or principle statement to set out the TABASC approach to maintaining alignment with the international standards used within the GB Smart Metering specifications e.g. ZigBee and DLMS. It was noted that there may be a number of reasons to uplift to the next version of the standard including: a requirement for a Modification Proposal to be implemented, to ensure close alignment with the standard and/or to move forwards with the industry and keep up with changing standards and technology.

The TABASC noted that it should not have a principle to automatically impose an uplift in a standard on a modification if one is available due to potential cost implications. The TABASC noted that it should already be inherent that the modification process considers whether an uplift in standard is needed to support the modification. It was noted that TABASC will assess whether an uplift to the technical standards are required during the review of the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture.

The TABASC discussed that as a principle they should keep a watching brief on the DLMS and ZigBee Standards to ensure they are aware of any amendments or issues being discussed through the user associations in order to be able to assess impacts and take any relevant action. It was noted that a potential way of doing this would be for SECAS to obtain membership to the relevant user associations. BEIS noted that they do not have formal membership but they do have communication channels through technical liaison agreements. SECAS informed the TABASC that they will assess the options including full membership and technical liaison agreements, any implications and costs and provide an update at the March 2017 TABASC meeting.

The TABASC Chair also noted that he would draft a proposal for a TABASC statement, on the approach to continued alignment with the international standards.

The TABASC **NOTED** the verbal update.

ACTION TABASC15/01: The TABASC Chair to draft a proposal for a TABASC statement, on the approach to continued alignment with the international standards.

ACTION TABASC15/02: SECAS to investigate communication channels for accessing information to enable a watching brief on the ZigBee and DLMS standards and to report back to the TABASC.

3. DCC Update

The DCC noted that potential release dates for the internal changes discussed at previous meetings have not been confirmed.

The TABASC noted in the January 2017 meeting that having a single place to capture the internal changes would be beneficial to ensure that stakeholders are aware of the solution and the implementation timescales and suggested the SEC website would be a suitable place. The TABASC also requested that this information was also made available for defect fixes as they become available. The DCC confirmed these will be updated at a high level for Release 1.4 and that a full list is currently being developed to be made available at a future TABASC meeting. It was noted that any internal changes that block operational progress may be actioned as a defect rather than a change.

In relation to the DCC internal changes, the DCC informed the TABASC that there are two internal changes that they intend to put into Release 1.4 with information about the change contained in release notes, including change description and history. The DCC noted that information on internal changes and any impacts will also be communicated through monthly Design Release Forums.

A TABASC Member questioned whether contingent capacity was being built in to each Release to allow for additional defect fixes or urgent changes if required. The DCC informed the TABASC that provisions are in place to introduce additional changes in Release 1.3, however prioritisation may need to take place if capacity is exceeded. The DCC noted the timeframes for maintenance fixes are being looked at internally. A schedule of outage period will be provided by the DCC at the March 2017 TABASC meeting.

The TABASC **NOTED** the content of the verbal update.

ACTION TABASC15/03: The DCC to provide the TABASC with a description of the planned up-and-coming maintenance release outage periods.

4. Sub-Committee Update

The TABASC Chair provided the TABASC with an update on the other SEC Sub-Committees most recent activities.

The TABASC Chair noted the following TABASC related items from the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) this month:

- The TABASC Chair noted that there was discussion about a potential risk that modified firmware could be put on devices in transit from the manufacturer. The conclusion was that there was a low probability but high impact of this occurring and as such they will continue to monitor the situation.
- The SSC discussed a potential Modification Proposal to get input prior to formally raising the proposal into the process in relation to adding additional functionality to the existing UTRN functionality defined in SMETS (now formally raised as SECMP0031). It was noted that the proposal would change the UTRN from being non-critical to critical command, due to the additional functionality being able to disconnect supply. The SSC recommended that the proposal should not be progressed as proposed as it would put at risk the security of every Meter. The TABASC recognised the concern the SSC identified with SECMP0031 and highlighted concern in relation to resources and effort being utilised on a modification that has been recommended to not be taken forward due to security concerns.

The TABASC questioned the effectiveness of their feedback and the influence they could have on the Modification Proposal at an early stage of the process if there was major concern in relation to a Modification Proposal. SECAS noted that the WGs are taking into account the Sub-Committee's feedback and noted Ofgem's Code Administration Code of Practice (CACOP) principles, which sets out processes Code Administrators are committed to in terms of the code Modification process.

The TABASC questioned whether their feedback given at the January 2017 TABASC, specifically on SECMP0030 – Demand Management of DCC Systems, was included in the Initial Modification Report issued to the February 2017 SEC Panel meeting as requested by TABASC as it appeared to not have been. SECAS noted that they would feedback to the Modification Team that any TABASC feedback should be included within the report and highlighted whether the proposer took the feedback on board.

The TABASC Chair noted there were no specific TABASC related items to highlight from the Smart Meter Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority's (SMKI PMA) this month.

The TABASC **NOTED** the content of the verbal update.

5. Business Architecture Document Project Update – January 2017

SECAS provided the TABASC with the monthly update on the Business Architecture Document (BAD) Project, focussing on the activities undertaken in January 2017. A high level dashboard set out the project status and high level risks. The BAD project and Business Process Model status' to date has delivered to time and budget, with the next drop of content expected in March 2017. SECAS noted that the Business Process Modelling status is Amber due to rework being done to the navigation which may impact Drop 1 and Drop 2 Functional Areas – until this has been accepted by the TBEC attendees the status has been set to Amber. SECAS also noted that due to this rework, there is a risk that the modelling content for Drop 3 may not be ready for the March 2017 TABASC meeting, however would be available shortly after for review.

A Technical and Business Expert Community (TBEC) workshop to discuss the Service Management Functional Area to support the development of the process descriptions in this area is scheduled for 28th February 2017. SECAS informed the TABASC of the need for wider input from outside of the TBEC for attendance.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the Business Architecture Document Project Update – January 2017.

ACTION TABASC15/04: SECAS to recirculate original TBEC Workshop invitation and new Request to Participate email seeking TBEC involvement.

6. Business Architecture Document – Regulation Associations

The current Business Process Model (BPM) contains the relevant process diagrams to supplement the process description in the Business Architecture Document (BAD). SECAS noted that mapping obligations within the BPM is required. SECAS requested the TABASC to consider the following two options for mapping obligations within the BAD BPM.

- Option 1: includes only the document clause reference; or
- Option 2: includes clause reference and full legal text.

The TABASC discussed the two options and agreed option 1 to be the most feasible option. This decision was based on consideration of the audience of users, user efficiency, and the cost and time required for the maintenance of that function. Further discussion was held on the configuration management of the SEC and tools that could be used to support that function to enable ease of reference and ability to link to certain clauses. SECAS agreed to consider tools that could be used to improve accessibility of SEC drafting linked from the BAD model.

The TABASC **DISCUSSED** the two options and **AGREED** option 1 as their preferred option.

ACTION TABASC15/05: SECAS to assess the configuration management of the SEC and tools that could be used to support that function.

7. Draft TABASC Work Package April – June 2017

SECAS provided the TABASC with an overview of the activities and associated resource requirements for the SECAS core team and project resource for the period 1st April – 30th June 2017. SECAS provided at budget driver level, a breakdown of the SECAS core team activities and at a project level, a breakdown of the SECAS Technical Expert activities planned for the period of this

work package in relation to the TABASC. SECAS confirmed that they would provide further information on the paper to include the previous quarter's forecast.

A TABASC Member queried the Draft Budget item for the effectiveness review of the End-to-End Technical Architecture. It was noted that since the drafting of the budget the scope of the review has changed and this will be taken into account when responding to the consultation feedback and approving the final Budget.

The TABASC **DISCUSSED** the contents of the TABASC Work Package to be recommended to the March 2017 SECCo Board.

ACTION TABASC15/06: SECAS to reissue the paper to include the activities undertaken in last quarter for comparison following the TABASC's request.

8. Specification Defect Process Development

It was discussed at the January 2017 TABASC meeting that there may be a need for a mechanism for resolving specification defects as there may be instances during operation, particularly early operation, where defects within the Technical Specifications or the Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS) are identified. Following the discussions at the January 2017 TABASC meeting, SECAS developed and presented a series of Specification Defect Resolution Process flow diagrams. The process flow diagrams covered the following three aspects:

- Flow diagram 1 – Process for determining whether a defect requires a modification;
- Flow diagram 2 – Process for agreeing the utilisation of the new path; and
- Flow diagram 3 – Process for Defect resolution.

The TABASC considered the questions set out in the paper and provided the following feedback for each flow diagram process.

Flow diagram 1

SECAS walked the TABASC through the draft process for determining whether a Specification Defect requires a modification. It was noted that for the purpose of the flow diagram an issue has been identified. The TABASC discussed that the defect will be reviewed by the following roles:

- SECAS as a critical friend role will review the issue and clarify any questions;
- The TABASC technical expert input;
- Relevant Sub-Committee review; and
- Issue Resolution Sub-group (IRS), if established

SECAS requested feedback from the TABASC regarding whether the TABASC should have an approval step in order to refer the discussion of an issue by the TBEC or move straight to TBEC review. In the interest of reducing timeframes, the TABASC suggested that the TABASC Chair should make the initial determination on the use of TBEC to discuss an issue. In addition, the TABASC Chair with assistance of the SECAS's technical experts could determine the defect's urgency. SECAS technical expert's role should be to assess and propose options for solutions to go to TBEC. If further explanation is required, this could be passed straight back to the proposer without the need for TBEC discussion. The TABASC noted the meaning of a defect will need to be clearly defined as part of any modifications to support the introduction of the process. In addition, the TABASC commented that a

clear resolution is required for each defect before the group reviews and considers any interactions or impacts on the Technical Architecture.

The BEIS representative suggested that, where applicable, the BEIS Issue Resolution Process should be replicated or utilised for consistency.

SECAS noted that the issue form is currently in place on the SEC website and that once an issue is raised, this will be recorded in an issues log also on the SEC website, to allow sight of the issue and any explanation or resolution.

Flow diagram 2

SECAS informed the TABASC the process for agreeing the utilisation of the new path. SECAS noted that the SEC Panel can step in at this point if needed, recognising that the prior steps have been taken to ensure the criteria for a path 5 process is met.

Flow diagram 3

SECAS informed the TABASC the process for defect resolution. SECAS noted that the potential new 'path 5' would not require modifications going through this route to undergo refinement and Working Group discussion, as the solution should have been fully considered prior to the new path 5 being used. However, it was noted that following the change going into the new path 5 a DCC impact assessment will be required. The DCC representative queried what the expectations were around DCC analysis on such changes, indicating that to avoid challenges arising that any modification should go through a Preliminary and Full Impact Assessment. The TABASC raised concerns around the DCC cost impact and the time taken to provide the analysis by the DCC and asked for consideration to be given on whether ROM costs could be used to progress the modification rapidly. SECAS noted that the Panel has discussed wider concerns around DCC timescales, and some Panel Members were considering potential SEC changes to put in place extra provisions or timescales around the delivery of impact assessments. The TABASC recognised that consultation time may need to be relatively quick if the defect is considered significant impact but affecting few parties. If the issue has a significant impact on Users or Device manufacturers further time would be needed, extending the consultation timeframe for industry input. The length of the consultation could be considered on a case by case basis with appropriate timescales being set.

It was agreed that the draft Modification Report will be presented to the TABASC for consideration before the Modification Report Consultation. It was also agreed that following the Modification Report consultation, if the views are mixed, the TABASC should see the Report again before the path 5 change goes to Change Board vote. The timeframes around the Authority decision stage (up to 25 Working Days) will be looked at by BEIS internally with the interest of a shortened turnaround time for urgent defects. The TABASC agreed to alter the decision process step from assuming that Authority approval would not be needed, to Authority approval being required for these types of changes.

Question and Assumptions for consideration

Criteria for new path:

The TABASC discussed the criteria for a defect being progressed via the new path 5 modification. The need to define what a Technical Specification Defect was expressed, with SECAS and the TABASC chair noting that typically path 5 would be used for defects identified during the implementation of approved changes of Modification Proposals. The TABASC did not add any additional proposed criteria to determine a defect and therefore initiate the path 5 process. It was noted that the criteria will be further developed by the SECAS technical experts and the TABASC Chair based on a benchmark of activity including assessing whether the issue can undergo the regular modification process.

Consultation timescales:

The TABASC informed SECAS that it is not feasible to expect a minimum consultation timescale for the new path. This decision was based on the level of sensitivity of the defect and whether it involves any consequential changes. It was noted that a teleconference may be a solution to reduce the consultation timescales, if a decision needs to be made in extremely reduced timescales.

Expedited DCC timescale:

The DCC confirmed that they have the capacity to support and resource this new path. The DCC will utilise standby resources to perform impact assessments in a timely manner. However, it was noted that there are implications, including an increase in cost and a knock-on effect may occur.

The TABASC agreed for SECAS to further develop options to provide rapid handling of specification defects. It was again noted that the timetables would need to be reduced and it may be necessary to operate a prioritisation scheme to resolve the most urgent issues.

SECAS agreed to further develop the process flow diagrams to capture the TABASC discussions and to consider a worked example. The updated process flows would then be circulated for further comment.

The TABASC **AGREED** to feedback on the updated process flows to be circulated by SECAS prior to consideration by the SEC Panel.

ACTION TABASC15/07: SECAS to amend the process flow diagrams following the TABASC's discussions. The updated process flow diagrams will be provided to the TABASC for comment prior to being fed back to the March 2017 SEC Panel for information.

ACTION TABASC15/08: SECAS to provide an example of a defect being processed to the TABASC for their information.

ACTION TABASC15/09: BEIS to provide feedback on authority decision timescales for urgent defects.

9. Modification Proposals for Discussion and Feedback

The TABASC were provided with an overview of the following four Modification Proposals are currently undergoing DCC Preliminary Assessment (PA) and required TABASC input and feedback:

- SECMP0012 – Channel selection to support Shared HAN solutions
- SECMP0019 – ALCS Description Labels
- SECMP0023 – Correct Units of Measure for Uncontrolled Gas Flow Rate
- SECMP0025 – Electricity Network Party Access to Load Switching Information

The TABASC were invited to review and provide any additional comments on the above Modification Proposals to the Working Group (WG). The TABASC discussed the modification solution in line with the TABASC Principles to assess Modification Proposals.

SECMP0012 – Channel selection to support Shared HAN solutions

The TABASC discussed SECMP0012 and raised concerns around providing the WG with feedback since the outcome of Alt Han forum solution discussions is currently unknown. It was noted that industry benefit and economic and technical feasibility will need to be assessed as part of the solution. The TABASC discussed the 'no regrets' regime and noted that the scale of costs is required

to be assessed. It was agreed that pre-empting the modification is not beneficial for the WG and the solution must be defined before the TABASC can provide feedback. The TABASC noted that the Alt Han group should engage with the WG to define the solution. SECAS indicated that the Alt HAN Forum has been kept informed.

SECMP0019 – ALCS Description Labels

The TABASC noted that SECMP0019 would proceed as a Path 3: Self-Governance modification since there is no material changes involved. It was noted that the proposed solution would have TABASC being responsible for establishing and maintaining a list of ALCS/HCALCS labels and their associated descriptions. The TABASC discussed the details of how the list will be governed. The TABASC questioned whether or not a solution involving changes to the DCC systems are required. SECAS advised that the outcome of the PA would help inform whether a non DCC impacting solution should be taken forward. The TABASC will agree to wait the outcomes of the PA before determining if any feedback to the WG is required.

SECMP0023 – Correct Units of Measure for Uncontrolled Gas Flow Rate

The TABASC noted that no further feedback was required to be provided to inform the WG for SECMP0023 at this time. SECAS noted that the SEC Panel set expectation from the DCC for no further delays in relation to the DCC PA being delivered to the WG.

SECMP0025 – Electricity Network Party Access to Load Switching Information

The TABASC noted that no further feedback was required to be provided to inform the WG for SECMP0025 at this time.

The TABASC agreed the new focused structure for the consideration of Modification Proposals going forward was appropriate and should continue.

The TABASC **AGREED** feedback to be provided, if required, on the four modifications for consideration by the WG.

10. TABASC Activity Planner

SECAS provided the TABASC with an updated Activity Planner outlining the activities anticipated until December 2017. SECAS noted future plans to restructure the TABASC Activity Planner to ensure they are effective in driving the activity rather than a retrospective exercise. The TABASC requested SECAS to consider including a high level timeline and milestones, including release dates of the modifications relevant to the TABASC in the restructuring.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the Activity Planner.

11. TABASC Risk Register

The TABASC were provided with a paper documenting the TABASC risks, as well as the risks and issues included in the SEC Panel Risk Register. The TABASC were informed that the Panel agreed all the amendments to the SEC Panel Risk and Issue Register. The TABASC noted that a review of operational risks would be discussed at the March 2017 meeting.

The TABASC **NOTED** the contents of the Risk Register.

12. Any Other Business

No items were noted this month under this section.

There were no further items and the Chair closed the meeting.

Items for Information

13. Modification Status Report – February 2017

The monthly Modification Status Report was provided to the TABASC for information to update them of the status and progress of Modification Proposals going through the SEC Modification Process.

14. DCC Monthly Performance Measurement Report

The DCC Monthly Performance Measurement Report was, and will continue to be, circulated at each TABASC meeting.