

SDAG Minutes #8

Solution Design Advisory Group (SDAG)

Minutes of Meeting #8

Date / venue: 2 July 2013, BIS Conference Centre

Attendees

Name	Company
Colin Sawyer (Chair)	DECC
Charlotte Middleton	DECC
Andrew Campbell	Npower
Jonathan Wheelwright	British Gas
Simon Trivella	British Gas
Chris Shelley	BEAMA
Andrew Monks	SSE
Colin Rowland	SSE
Paul Saker	EDF Energy
Ash Pocock	EDF Energy
Adrian Rudd	EON
Alastair Manson	Energy UK
Nigel Nash	OFGEM
Jay Adams	Utilita
Jeff Cooper	EUA
Nigel Orchard	ESTA
Alan Creighton	ENA
Graham Smith	Scottish Power
Ian Matthews	Scottish Power
Jane Franklin	AMO
Julian Hughes	DECC
Peter Morgan	DECC
Mike Bennett	DECC
Terry Underwood	DECC
Tim Bailey	DECC
Tim Hall	DECC
Elmaz Lyus	DECC

SDAG Minutes #8

1. Minutes and Actions from previous meeting

1.1. The minutes from the previous meeting #7 was agreed by SDAG members.

Actions from Previous Meetings:

Action ID	Action	Due Date	Owner	Status
SDAG_2.11	<p>Billing reads: Npower agreed to inform DECC if they have any residual concerns with billing cycle orchestration & push/pull comments once they have read the Technical Architecture document</p> <p>Update: AC agreed to provide DECC with information on where processes are misaligned and a list of the risks associated. Complete</p> <p>Update: DECC were to respond to the information provided by AC. PH to follow up</p> <p>Update: AC accepted the offer of a 1:1 session to discuss this action in greater detail. Meeting to be arranged</p> <p>Update: Andy Armstrong from DECC E2E team has emailed Andrew Campbell. 17/07/13</p>	02.07.13	AC PH	Closed Closed
SDAG_2.15	<p>Outage reporting: DECC to talk to Alan Creighton of the ENA to discuss Outage Management requirements and confirm requirements from the ENA and ensure alignment within the CSP schedule 2.1</p> <p>Update: Alan Creighton agreed to write to the Chairman on service levels by 28.03.13.</p> <p>Update: clarification on device states following power outage is documented in the ALC ELPM</p> <p>Update: AC and CS agreed to discuss this matter separately and AC would be sent a copy of the HCALC model. Meeting on the 11th July</p>	28.03.13	Alan C	Ongoing
SDAG_3.01	<p>DECC agreed to issue product descriptions to SDAG Members when they had been completed</p> <p>Update: Following agreement of PDs submitted by bidders, DECC would issue to SDAG members</p>		CS	Ongoing
SDAG_3.02	<p>DECC agreed to clarify the timetable and prepare the process for GB security extensions.</p> <p>Update: Agenda item 5</p>	02.07.13	PM	Closed
SDAG_4.02	<p>HHT Interface: It was agreed that the description of the Hand Held Terminal interface would be sent to SDAG Members as soon as it was available for review.</p> <p>Update: Paper sent and workshop on 5th July</p>	02.07.13	JH	Closed

SDAG Minutes #8

SDAG_4.09	<p>Documentation Road-map: DECC agreed to prepare a documentation road-map (to be finalised when DSP delivery timescales are agreed) - this would include documents that will come from DCC and its service providers to allow DCC users to understand when key design documentation was to be issued.</p> <p>Update: DECC agreed to amend the Key Design document to include columns identifying the enduring ownership, and when it will be delivered in design stage (when known).</p> <p>Update: The joint industry wide Level 1 Draft plan was discussed at the meeting including the revised delivery schedule.</p>	02.07.13	CS	Closed
SDAG_5.01	<p>Design Phase Milestones. It was agreed that the design phase of the DSP and CSP would be discussed at a future SDAG meeting.</p>	24.07.13	CS	Ongoing
SDAG_6.02	<p>SDAG members were invited to provide evidence that the gas enable function was a safe process at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Update: SDAG members advised that the evidence was being collated and report would be issued in the near future</p>	02.07.13	ALL	Ongoing
SDAG_6.03	<p>A final version of the PPMID DDS was complete it would be issued to SDAG members for information.</p> <p>Update: The DDS was undergoing legal review at DECC and would be issued to SDAG members in early June 2013.</p> <p>Update: The legal review took longer than estimated and DECC are in the process of a consistency review. Once completed will be sent out to members.</p>	02.07.13	PM	Ongoing

Actions from Meeting #7

Action ID	Action	Due Date	Owner	Status
SDAG_7.01	<p>The consolidated comments log on CHTS DDS created from SDAG members had not been recirculated. It was agreed that these would be sent out to all members asap.</p> <p>Update: Sent</p>	02.07.13	CS	Closed

SDAG Minutes #8

Action ID	Action	Due Date	Owner	Status
SDAG_7.02	The email from the Information Commissioners Office describing the responsibilities for IHD data was to be circulated to the members Update: Sent	02 07 13	CS	Closed
SDAG_7.03	The options for local pairing of CAD had not been discussed with all SDAG members. It was agreed that the proposal would be reissued to members and responses would be returned to DECC by 31 May 13 [DN: subsequently extended to 7 June 2013] Update: Issued to all SDAG for review on 28 May 2013.	28 05 13	TB	Closed
SDAG_7.04	DECC agreed to confirm the number of CAD that could be connected to the comms hub. Update: Three (discussed at meeting)	02.07.13	CS	Closed
SDAG_7.05	DECC agreed to propose a solution to SDAG in order to provide more information on HHT functionality before the next SDAG meeting. Update: DECC to hold workshop on 5 th July to discuss	02.07.13	CS	Closed
SDAG_7.06	GBCS: the outline timetable for the review of the GBCS was to be issued to SDAG to assist in resource planning. Update: Covered within agenda item No.9 AOB by Peter Morgan	02.07.13	CS	Closed

Actions from Meeting #8

Action ID	Action	Due Date	Owner	Status
2.6	Process to Support MOP working - As no conclusions were made bar to all agreeing that an 'option' should be made available, the Chair requested that the Group consider the options presented and email DECC with any particular opinions to assist further discussions at the next SDAG meeting.	23.07.13	All	Open

SDAG Minutes #8

Action ID	Action	Due Date	Owner	Status
3.2	<p>Parse and Correlate - Following the 'Encryption/Decryption support' slide to which the main issue respondents had was that the requirements document did not adequately outline how encryption of sensitive values be supported, it was agreed to facilitate a workshop to give all the opportunity to discuss and feedback specific comments on the design. ACTION DECC</p> <p>Update: DECC emailed to members to canvass for facilitation style and attendees. Following interest shown, a workshop was arranged.</p> <p>Update: Session has taken place and key decisions from meeting communicated to SDAG and attendees on 17.07.13</p>	15.07.13	DECC - Terry Underwood	Closed
3.7	<p>Parse & Correlate: Volumetrics and Scalability – The mechanism for calculating the 34 transactions per second stated volumetric and support for higher volumes was not clear. The group was informed that the 34TPS was an approximate average of the largest supplier's expected transactions. The Group questioned whether the 34TPS be different and should it be scaled to peak transaction numbers. It was agreed for this to also be considered within the workshop. ACTION ALL</p> <p>Update: A position on volumetrics was agreed at the workshop held on 15th July and investigated subsequently. The outcome is reflected in the minutes of the workshop sent to attendees and SDAG members on 17th July.</p>	15.07.13	ALL	Closed
4.4	<p>Service Management – workshop feedback: It was agreed that the slides would be updated to reflect members' views. ACTION DECC</p>	24.07.13	Tim Hall	Open
4.6.3	<p>Prepayment – workshop feedback: Confirm requirement to re-set the 'floor value' of the UTRN sequence number at CoS – No update at present. ACTION DECC</p>	24.07.13	DECC	Open

SDAG Minutes #8

Action ID	Action	Due Date	Owner	Status
4.6.4	Prepayment – workshop feedback: Arrange further briefing for small suppliers – Delayed due to procurement. ACTION DECC (CERB's James Biott)	?	DECC – James Biott	Open
4.6.5	Prepayment – workshop feedback: Circulate updated PPM Issues Log – ACTION DECC (CERB's James Biott)	24.07.13	DECC James Biott	Open
8.4	Privacy PIN: There was some concern from the Group in allowing activation of the PIN locally, however did not want to withdraw that option from the consumer. The Group agreed options for the consumer needed further discussion. ACTION DECC TIM BAILEY to discuss within discussions with consumer groups.	24.07.13	DECC – Tim Bailey	Open
8.6	Privacy PIN - options for setting protected data/functions - The Group agreed that an option between the third and 5 th Option would be preferable. Following Tim's meeting with consumer groups, feedback to members of the discussion to assist members with further consideration of the options and provide DECC with a firmer view. ACTION DECC AND MEMBERS	24.07.13	ALL	Open
9.1	SMETS2 export consumption – Some members have seen the AMO document covering situations where a twin element meter also has export, and the rates appear inconsistent. AMO suggested that modifications to SMETS might be required. ACTION DECC – Peter Morgan to write to AMO.	24.07.13	Peter Morgan	Open

2. Process to Support MOP Working

- 2.1. Mike Bennett from DECC provided a presentation on ways in which meter operators could install meters for multiple suppliers in close succession without assigning individual meters to specific customers / suppliers in advance (i.e. to delay meter personalisation until installation). Mike summarised the current requirements as being:
- Supplier public credentials are loaded onto meters prior to deployment - currently defined as Supplier's KA and DS
 - Meter Operators installing on behalf of multiple Suppliers

SDAG Minutes #8

- Efficiencies available by assigning meter to Supplier at point of install
 - this is particularly an issue “out of area”
 - Affects both small Suppliers and Big 6
- 2.2. The Group were then taken through the Meter Operator Options, a grid that demonstrated four options, DSP certs on meters; MOP operating on behalf of supplier; MOP certs on devices; and MOP operating as supplier. The context, pros and cons were discussed for each. It was highlighted that the DSP certification for MOP installed meters would give the necessary flexibility; MOP operating as Supplier would mean the MOP accessing DCC Services with a Supplier role code.
- 2.3. The group were then taken through the High Level Install and Commission process (with DSP credentials). The diagram demonstrated that there would be additional steps created which would probably not be suitable for a mass rollout approach. Further questions were raised such as who puts the credentials on? (the Supplier via SR to DCC on instruction from the MO) What happens when there’s a fault? (managed according to current error responses and the service management model) .
- 2.4. Impacts – The proposals put forward may lengthen the install process and increase costs, but also addresses the question of how to deal with emergency meter replacement. This approach provides a solution but the ‘additional’ step does add time but only 30 seconds.
- 2.5. The risks were discussed:
 DSP compromise
 - Bogus credentials
 - Bypass checks
 - Commissioning availability
 Performance (volume of installs) could be affected
- 2.6. As no conclusions were made bar to all agreeing that an ‘option’ should be made available, the Chair requested that the Group consider the options presented and email DECC with any particular opinions to assist further discussions at the next SDAG meeting. **ACTION GROUP MEMBERS**

3. Parse and Correlate Feedback

- 3.1. Terry Underwood informed the Group that the latest version of the parse and correlate requirements (V0.7a) was circulated to members on the 1st July and that the presentation was to provide an overall view of the requirements to assist feedback to DECC. The presentation also provided the key issues that came from the comments received (from 10th May circulation) and DECC’s preliminary position on each.
- 3.2. Following the ‘Encryption/Decryption support’ slide to which the main issue respondents had was that the requirements document did not adequately outline how encryption of sensitive values be supported, it was agreed to facilitate a workshop to give all the opportunity to discuss and feedback specific comments on the design. **ACTION DECC**
- 3.3. **Flexibility** – DECC proposed to provide an ‘open source code set’, a standard configuration. This received a diverse range of comments and it was agreed to discuss this at the planned workshop.

SDAG Minutes #8

- 3.4. **Support for multiple message versions** – It was recognised that multiple message versions would need to be supported and that effective change control arrangements will need to be established.
- 3.5. **Java** – The majority of members' are happy with Java.
- 3.6. **Support and Warranty** – Concern was expressed that support was not aligned with business needs. The software resides in members' domain and support should be aligned with the wider DCC Service Management regime and associated severity levels.
- 3.7. **Volumetrics and Scalability** – The mechanism for calculating the 34 transactions per second stated volumetric and support for higher volumes was not clear. The group was informed that the 34TPS was an approximate average of the largest supplier's expected transactions based on the demand estimation work. The Group questioned whether the 34TPS be different and should it be scaled to peak transaction numbers. It was agreed for this to also be considered within the workshop. **ACTION ALL**
- 3.8. **Security, testing and CPA** – Concern that the proposed testing is not enough to provide the necessary security assurance. DECC informed the group that it will not come under CPA and that any concerns should be mitigated by functional testing and third party code reviews; DCC Service Users' IT domains would provide additional layers of security; and an additional requirement has been added to include a means for DCC Service users to validate the integrity of the delivered version of software.
- 3.9. All agreed to discuss their outstanding issues at the planned workshop.

4. Feedback from Workshops – Service Management; Firmware; and Prepayment

- 4.1. **Service Management** Workshop update by Tim Hall. Tim provided feedback to members regarding the Service Management workshop to which DCC Service Management System approach; Service Desk Principles; and the Incident Management Process flows (6 flows) were discussed.
- 4.2. In regards to the four Service Desk Principles, the third 'Initial investigation to be done by the party that received the failure message' was debated. At a previous workshop some members aired the view that the investigation should be carried out by the DCC. Tim H said that through discussions at the workshop attendees had agreed that whoever received the message first should investigate.
- 4.3. Other points:
 - 4.3.1. Excellent diagnostics would be needed to avoid visits to site.
 - 4.3.2. The CSP will provide the Comms Hub diagnostics – members asked if the supplier would have access? This may depend on the type of WAN technology employed.
 - 4.3.3. Service interface would be on a standardised fashion and the DCC would agree this with the CSP providers, mandating via its contracts. Members said that the DCC would need to influence what would be presented by the CSP to the members.
 - 4.3.4. Members stated the importance of providing machine to machine links to the DCC Service Management System so that incidents could be raised with the DCC directly from Suppliers' service management systems.

SDAG Minutes #8

- 4.4. It was agreed that the slides would be updated to reflect members' views. **ACTION DECC**
- 4.5. **Firmware Management** Workshop update by Colin Sawyer. Colin took the Group through the agreed actions from the workshop and said that it would be beneficial for the Group to discuss changes to responsibilities.
- 4.5.1. IHDs that are not supported in the current baseline – DECC would consider further analysis of implications of including firmware updates to IHDs
 - 4.5.2. Ensure energy suppliers are informed of CH firmware updates – This is not currently specified in service contracts.
 - 4.5.3. Analyse involvement of gas suppliers in firmware update of GPD – DECC will investigate how this would be viable within the requirements.
 - 4.5.4. ESTA raised a number of concerns regarding deliverability of firmware updates, in particular whether anyone would be in a position to deliver? The Group agreed that it could be delivered. The Firmware upgrade capability was set in the July 2011 consultation and the Group agreed that the process to do the 'updates' is possible but the next step is for industry to formulate the process.
- 4.6. **Pre-Payment Workshop** update by Colin Sawyer. Colin took the Group through the agreed actions from the workshop;
- 4.6.1. Analysis whether, on invalid top-up, the 'invalid' supplier could look up the registered supplier (via DCC) and provide details to consumer.
 - 4.6.2. Confirm requirement for DSP to 'MAC' the UTRN – not required, the supplier will be sole party involved in generating the UTRN.
 - 4.6.3. Confirm requirement to re-set the 'floor value' of the sequence number at CoS – No update at present. **ACTION DECC**
 - 4.6.4. Arrange further briefing for small suppliers – Delayed due to procurement. **ACTION DECC (CERB's James Biott)**
 - 4.6.5. Circulate updated PPM Issues Log – **ACTION DECC (CERB's James Biott)**

5. GB Security Extensions - Update

- 5.1. ZigBee update provided by Colin Sawyer:
- 5.1.1. SEP 1.3 MRD written, reviewed by SSWG and awaiting imminent submission to ZA
 - 5.1.2. SSWG has written to ZA confirming its support for the SEP 1.3 approach – concerns were raised at the length of time that has passed since the letter was sent. DECC confirmed that detailed planning was taking place.
- 5.2. DLMS update provided by Peter Morgan
- 5.2.1. DLMS use case work underway – following a resource constraint which has been resolved
 - 5.2.2. GB security requirements submitted to DLMS UA - Requirements and solutions discussed with DLMS UA

SDAG Minutes #8

- 5.3. EDF raised concerns on the dependencies between the two standards, ZigBee and DLMS; DECC replied that the working assumption is that this is covered by ZigBee testing, the tunnelling functionality of ZigBee SEP and the DLMS conformance testing.

6. ALCS and HCALCS Update

- 6.1. DECC provided the Group with an update:
- 6.2. ALCS and HCALCS use cases are currently being drafted (final draft by end of August/early September)
- 6.2.1. The use cases are a check that current DLMS and ZigBee functionality supports original SMETS2a requirements and the additional minor features arising from the ALCS workshop
- 6.3. On completion of use cases and associated reviews
- 6.3.1. SMETS will be updated to clarify ALCS and HCALCS operation (eg on loss of supply to meter)
- 6.3.2. HCALCS DDS will be drafted

7. Q&A on SMETS2 CONDOC Response

- 7.1. Charlotte Middleton provided the Group with a presentation setting out the highlights of the SMETS2 Consultation Part 2 Government response. In particular the Group was made aware of the key decisions
- 7.1.1. Keypads – decision not to mandate on meters
- 7.1.2. CAD – support local and remote pairing. More work on support services
- 7.1.3. EED - general requirement on ES in licence conditions that consumers must be provided with consumption data over the meter interface or internet – will add capability to record data in SMETS 2. Comes into force by 5 June 2014.
- 7.1.4. 868MHz: Part 1 noted HAN strategy allows for the inclusion of an 868 solution when available. Part 2:
- ES have clear incentives to develop an 868MHz-based solution.
 - ES will be required to report progress on their HAN strategies (including 868) as part of their annual reporting to DECC.
- 7.2. The Group had particular comments regarding the ‘certified products list’. CAD/IHDs are type 2 devices and the customer can purchase an IHD independently, will these independently brought devices, e.g. from Argos, be placed on the list? Alan Creighton from the ENA said that there were no plans to place such independently brought products on the list. However, there was a concern surrounding consumer confidence in devices which is not addressed at this point within the technical requirements. Alan said that work on CAD pairing locally and remotely was being addressed to provide the required assurance.
- 7.3. Next steps
- 7.3.1. Will reflect changes in a version of SMETS 2 for successful bidders and would be shared with SDAG – not expecting other significant changes

SDAG Minutes #8

- 7.3.2. Continue to develop the GBCS – use cases will be issued to successful bidders and would be shared with SDAG
- 7.3.3. SEC drafting – consultation in autumn
- 7.3.4. Notify SMETS 2 and GBCS May 2014
- 7.3.5. Introduce SMETS 2 into the regulatory framework as soon as possible after that
- 7.3.6. There will be a limited period when SMETS 1 meters can be installed after this date – this particular point generated a short discussion.

8. Privacy Pin

- 8.1. Tim Bailey provided the Group with a presentation on the options for setting the Privacy Pin and protected functionality behind the PIN.
- 8.2. Following the Information Request (IR) sent to industry, two issues have been highlighted
 - 8.2.1. Capability – the 'How' the PIN is set and turned off
 - 8.2.2. When set – what functions on the user interface does it protect?
- 8.3. For setting the PIN two options were presented, to locally set or to remotely set. The responders to the IR supported both options to be made available. This would allow suppliers to use a combination of remote and local PIN setting in line with their privacy and risk assessments.
- 8.4. There was some concern from the Group about allowing activation of the PIN locally; despite this there was consensus that the capability should be included to allow suppliers to offer this where they chose to do so. The Group agreed options for the consumer needed further discussion. **ACTION DECC TIM BAILEY** to discuss within discussions with consumer groups.
- 8.5. Five options were presented for setting protected data/functions
 - 8.5.1. Total configurability – no support from the Group
 - 8.5.2. Partial configurability – some support but PPM Functions would not be protected
 - 8.5.3. No configurability – Private meter screens protected but PPM functions not protected – comment as 8.5.2
 - 8.5.4. No configurability – Private meter screens and PPM functions protected when PIN is set – The WAN being down would cause problems, as the PPM consumer could not get back on supply – The Group commented that this would be too complicated
 - 8.5.5. When a PIN is set, all functions and data (with the exception of certain data) is protected except for the 'add credit' function.
- 8.6. The Group agreed that an option between the third and 5th Option would be preferable. Following Tim's meeting with consumer groups, feedback to members of the discussion to assist members to further consider the options and provide DECC with a firmer view. **ACTION DECC AND MEMBERS**

SDAG Minutes #8

9. AOB

- 9.1. SMETS2 export consumption on twin element meters– Some members had seen the AMO document detailing a BAU issue relating to export on twin element meters. The issue relates to a twin element meter with Microgeneration installation, where one element is importing on a higher rate while the second element is exporting at a lower rate. A potential solution possible in SMETS is that half hour values could be used to help compensate the consumer. An alternative solution, that would require changes to SMETS, would be the addition of an additional register that could “net” any export / import across the two elements. There was broad agreement that the first approach is a good solution. **ACTION DECC** – DECC to write to AMO with formal response.
- 9.2. Update on GBCS informal and formal review process – The informal review process has been completed to which 200 comments were received, none were marked as red. The analysis of the response is to be provided. A SDAG review will commence on the 26 July, allowing three weeks for comments. DECC will carry out a further formal review prior to EC notification in 2014.
- 9.3. Update on Technical and Security Architecture documents – Julian Hughes informed the Group that the documents will be finalised by the 14th August 2013.
- 9.4. Firmware – Nigel Orchard of ESTA raised his concerns on deliverability and said that he did not agree with the firmware workshop minutes. That he had listed 36 issues from the workshop, 13 of which he had classed as red that would need to be resolved.
- 9.5. PPM – Nigel said that he did not agree with the minutes of the workshop.
- 9.5.1. In response to Nigel’s concerns, members stated that they were happy that firmware would be needed. There might be challenges with implementation, but it was needed. They had seen the requirements issued to the DSP/CSP and were also content with these.
- 9.5.2. Nigel voiced further concern in the need for confidence in deliverability and requested that that a review be undertaken against original decisions that brought DECC and industry to this point and a review of PPM, looking at alternatives, questioning Government decisions. He also informed the Group that he has written to Baroness Verma stating his concerns and low confidence.
- 9.5.3. Charlotte said that DECC has always provided an open and transparent engagement process with industry, especially through its consultations and providing all necessary information to this Group. Once correspondence is received, DECC will respond.
- 9.5.4. Kay Houghton voiced her concern regarding MAPs control over firmware updates, as the updates would be carried out on their assets, would MAPs be able to instruct the suppliers and who carries any liability? She also said that they would not be able to stop a supplier putting a security update as all updates would be done through the DCC, this would not be an issue for MAPs as long as there was no liability. Demonstrating the importance of the process for technical assurance and the change management process. She then went on to ask who would keep the meters compliant, DECC responded that it would be the Supplier.

SDAG Minutes #8

- 9.5.5. Colin gave apologies to the Group that the SDAG Issues log had not been circulated as per request from its previous meeting. An updates version will be sent before the next meeting.

10. Date of Next Meeting

- 10.1. 24th July 10am, the BiS Conference Centre, 1 Victoria Street.