

## Smart Meter Design Group (SMDG) – Meeting Note

Note of discussion and actions  
from SMDG Meeting No. 2

From

Paul Newman  
(Technical secretariat)

Date and time of  
Meeting

28 September 2010

Location

10:00-16:00  
Ofgem, 9 Millbank,  
London

### 1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Adrian Rudd, David Fletcher (part), Peter Morgan, Paul Newman, Neil Barnes (part), Dora Guzeleva.

1.2. SMDG members:

AMO	Tom Chevalier
BEAMA	Dave Robinson
British Gas	Steve Briggs
EDF Energy	Ashley Pocock
ENA	Alan Claxton
ENA	Andrew Howard
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Jason Stevens
Eon-UK	Steve James
ESTA	Kris Szajdzicki
First Utility	David Wurtzler
Gemserv	Anthony Campion
Good Energy	Chris Welby
ICOSS	Steve Mulinganie
Intellect UK	Robert McNamara
RWE Npower	Chris Harris
SBGI	Mike Buss
Scottish Power	Ross Mackie
SSE	Paul Clark
Utilita	Phillip Michael Kettless

### 2. Apologies

2.1. SMDG members:

Consumer Focus	
Ofcom	
DECC	

### **3. Introductions**

3.1. Round table introduction of each SMDG member.

### **4. Review of actions**

4.1. Ofgem reviewed the actions from the previous SMDG meeting. These have been captured in the actions list at the end of this meeting note.

### **5. Programme Update**

5.1. Neil Barnes (Head Rollout Policy) discussed with the group what the Rollout team is working on and where in the process it is. He highlighted that the rollout team would not be setting up working groups in the same way as SMDG/DCG. It would instead be looking to communicate with stakeholders separately and will be considering information from the Consultation responses which should be submitted on the day of the meeting (28<sup>th</sup> September).

5.2. The group stated that there should be clear responsibilities for each of the sub groups. The group want to know where issues are going to be dealt with especially regarding rollout. Ofgem confirmed that there is joint working between the teams and Rollout issues will be forwarded to the rollout team.

5.3. The scope of sub group 3 was discussed as to whether it should include rollout issues. It was suggested that the sub group had decided that it would note and delegate rollout issues to the rollout team. A member of the rollout team is to join sub group 3 for its next meeting.

5.4. Dora Guzeleva (DCG lead) discussed with the group how the DCG and its sub groups were progressing. Information on all of these meetings had been published within the stakeholder engagement section of the website.

### **6. Sub group update**

6.1. Ofgem presented progress of sub group 1. Sub group 1 have produced its first deliverable which was to be presented to the group and published with the meeting material.

6.2. Ofgem updated on progress of sub group 2. Sub group 2 have produced a gap analysis on governance.

6.3. Progress of sub group 3 was then discussed. Sub group 3 have produced a substantive issues list which has now been broken down into what is a technical design issue and operational or commercial issues. The group will concentrate on these technical design issues within small working groups looking at possible options. The issues outside of the scope of the sub group will be passed to the relevant team within Ofgem.

### **7. Ways of working**

7.1. It was suggested that more information around the SMDG meetings and its sub groups need to be available on the Ofgem website. Ofgem confirmed that the information would be available shortly.

7.2. The group wanted to know what is Ofgem's role in the sub groups. On request of SMDG Ofgem had facilitated the groups. The group agreed that it wanted Ofgem to continue, but should be more proactive in its facilitation. The chair explained that a deliberate

hands off approach had been initially employed, however more asserted leadership would now be applied.

- 7.3. It was suggested that Ofgem has not set out what is expected of the group in enough detail. This was particularly apparent in sub group 2 (Governance) where the group wants more of a focused scope so that stakeholders can seek further ownership.
- 7.4. It was raised that the sub groups have may not been considering non domestic. It was suggested that these issues need to be raised in the sub group meetings. Ofgem suggested that further work from members can be done regarding extra documentation for circulation or setting up separate specific working meetings. It was suggested non domestic could be raised as an agenda item for all meetings to make sure that issues are covered.
- 7.5. There was a suggestion that there should be a standing agenda item to review meetings so that issues can be raised and meetings improved going forward. This was agreed and will be added as a standing agenda point.

## **8. Review of working group deliverables**

- 8.1. BEAMA presented the sub group 1 deliverable to the group which will also be published as part of the SMDG meeting information. It was suggested that substantive comments should be raised in the meeting and any spelling / grammar comments can be submitted by email separately. This document needs to be agreed and circulated to the Programme Review Board (PRB) on Friday 1<sup>st</sup> October for consideration.
- 8.2. The group discussed “last gasp” and how best to deal with it. The group agreed that it was important to convey the cost and issues around last gasp to the consumer groups. It was suggested that a document containing the options and their benefits needs to be considered. The group felt that whether a solution is available that can be developed. The group felt that this issue needs to be passed out to the wider community to see if there are other options. SMDG recognise this is an issue. As a priority it will investigate other options through the Community of Technical Experts (CoTE) etc. This section of the sub group 1 deliverable will be updated to incorporate this into the document.
- 8.3. The group discussed the functional requirement that the 12 months data storage should be taken outside the meter. The group felt that it needed quantifying and other options that can satisfy consumer needs be included. The group decided that the wording needed to be changed to reflect these views.
- 8.4. The group viewed that an aspirational figure needed to be included in the wording for HAN interface update rates. Under 10 seconds was agreed by the group as the figure that should be proposed.
- 8.5. The group proposed that the power consumption functional requirement needed to include more information on what meters are using today for context. This section will reference the BEAMA presentation on this issue.
- 8.6. The group proposed further information around tamper switching was needed and will be included by Ofgem.
- 8.7. The group discussed trickle disconnection and load limiting. The group viewed that this issue needed to be taken back to the technical issues sub group for further discussion and noted in the sub group 1 deliverable paper. It was agreed that a paper needed to be produced on this issue and circulated to the group.

## **9. Confirm ToR**

- 9.1. The ToRs for the SMDG and sub groups are being finalised and will be circulated by Ofgem shortly.

## **10. Risks and Issues**

- 10.1. Ofgem confirmed that an issues log will be amalgamated from issues raised at all 3 sub group meetings. This will be circulated and then it will be for SMDG members to submit new issues and to add further information around those already captured using the risks and issues template.
- 10.2. It was suggested that the HAN needs further clarity. It was suggested that a workshop under sub group 3 would be useful. This was to be raised at the next sub group 3 meeting. The best approach to invitees and content should be included. ERA offered to be the lead on this in advance of the next sub group 3 meeting.
- 10.3. It was suggested that the risk around the HAN is related to the number (types and volume) of devices that attach to it. Utility robust HANs were discussed in this context.
- 10.4. The group felt that the input of Consumer Focus (CF) is vital to make sure that any issues were considered now and not at the end of the programme. There was general agreement that CF needed to be involved at the discussions as options were debated.

## **11. Community of Technical Experts (CoTE) nominations**

- 11.1. The CoTE letter has been circulated to all members and been published on the Ofgem website. Expressions of interest were welcome and will be logged by the Programme.

## **12. Items of discussion from SMDG members**

- 12.1. BG thought it would be helpful to come up with some objective criteria whilst looking at solutions that will be presented over the next two weeks at sub group 1. This will be added to the agenda for sub group 1 and would be fed back into the SMDG.
- 12.2. BEAMA had suggested that it would be hard to come up with a technical specification without seeing the solutions that are already in existence. The group agreed that solutions should be presented.
- 12.3. Both ERA and ESTA diagrams showing meter type breakdown in the domestic and non domestic sectors were discussed with the group. The group discussed how the physical sizes and load of the meter can produce different issues and proposed that the issues should be captured in the sub group meetings.

## **13. Any other business**

- 13.1. Ofgem suggested that the National Measurement Office (NMO) would be a worthwhile member of sub group 2. The group agreed that this was sensible and an invitation should be sent.
- 13.2. It was then suggested that British Standards Institute (BSI) should also be included. The group felt that the standards making community were adequately represented by members of the sub groups.
- 13.3. It was suggested that it would be worth the Programme being represented at the European Standards Smart Metering Co-ordination Group.

- 13.4. It was agreed by the group that a list of all the standards groups that could influence the process should be formulated. SMDG would then consider how best to influence each of these groups.

## 14. Review of meeting

- 14.1. The group agreed that the meeting was constructive and positive. Having a deliverable to discuss and structure the meeting was useful and it was felt that there was good group participation.
- 14.2. It was felt that further discussion with Consumer Focus is needed to debate some of the major items.

## 15. Actions

<b>Publish SMDG contact details</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Amend sub group ToR including future proofing etc. and circulate</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Finalise (including DCG ToR comments) and circulate SMDG ToR final draft</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Confirm sub group meeting venues and circulate</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Consider and submit risks and issues that will affect the SMDG</b>	<b>All SMDG</b>	<b>On going</b>

<b>Combine issues captured during the sub group meetings and circulate an overall risks and issues log</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Confirm the scope for each sub group along with a map of all meeting dates</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Amend agendas to include – “Non domestic” and “Review of meeting”</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>29<sup>th</sup> September</b>
<b>Circulate ICG link to the group</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Propose text for last gasp to be included in sub group 1 deliverable</b>	<b>Ashley Pocock - EDF</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Propose text for 12 month data to be included in sub group 1 deliverable</b>	<b>Chris Harris – RWE npower</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> October</b>

<b>Amend sub group 1 deliverable document in line with comments made at SMDG meeting. Comments were submitted on section 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 and 4.5</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Circulate Maxine Frerk's letter trickle disconnection</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Propose paper on Trickle disconnection and load limiting for circulation to the SMDG group</b>	<b>Jason Stevens - ERA</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Add HAN issues to the sub group 3 agenda</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>11<sup>th</sup> October</b>
<b>All HAN agenda items and useful documentation to be circulated to sub group 3</b>	<b>All SMDG</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Circulate paper on the HAN</b>	<b>Kris Szajdzicki - ESTA</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Circulate a list of standards groups that could influence the programme</b>	<b>Kris Szajdzicki - ESTA</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Consider content for the HAN workshop</b>	<b>Jason Stevens - ERA</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Consider participation at European standards groups and compile list of standards bodies that could affect the programme</b>	<b>All SMDG</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>
<b>Consider approach to engage consumer reps</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> October</b>

## **16. Date of next meeting**

21<sup>st</sup> October 2010 – 9:30-15:00, Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, SW1P 3GE.