

Smart Meter Design Group (SMDG) – Meeting Note

Note of discussion and actions from SMDG Meeting No. 4	From	Paul Newman (Technical secretariat)
	Date and time of Meeting	11 November 2010 10:00-16:00
	Location	Ofgem

1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Adrian Rudd, Peter Morgan, Dora Guzeleva (Part), Paul Newman, Robert Thornes (DECC).

1.2. SMDG members:

AMO	Tom Chevalier
BEAMA	Dave Robinson
British Gas	Steve Briggs
Consumer Focus	Zoe Mcleod
EDF Energy	Ashley Pocock
ENA	Alan Claxton
ENA	Andrew Howard
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Jason Brogden
Eon-UK	Steve James
ESTA	Alan Jones
Good energy	Chris Welby
ICoSS	Steve Mulinganie
Intellect UK	Robert McNamara
RWE Npower	Chris Harris
SBGI	Gary Cottrell
Scottish Power	Ross Mackie
SSE	Paul Clark
Utilita	Bill Bullen

1.3. SMDG members that couldn't attend:

First Utility	
Gemserv	
Ofcom	

2. Introductions

2.1. Round table introductions from each member.

3. Review of previous actions / meeting note

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

4. Confirm ToR

- 4.1. Ofgem suggested that the ToR for the group should remain unchanged. This is to make sure that the ToR does not become too prescriptive. The ToR will remain open so that it makes sure all issues can be covered if deemed necessary.

5. Programme update

- 5.1. Adrian Rudd discussed the Security Technical Experts Group (STEG). The group met and had a successful meeting. It was agreed that the group had the right attendees. The group will next meet in early December.
- 5.2. ENA suggested that they have also been asked to set up a working group to look at security. They suggested that it would be important for both groups to communicate going forward.
- 5.3. Dora Guzeleva discussed the work DCG is continuing. DCG are currently analysing the data information that has been submitted from stakeholders. The groups work is coming to an end and will be finished in December. Dora has suggested that November will be used to carry on the analysis of the information. Some dates will be kept for DCG meetings where further information may be needed.
- 5.4. One area that overlaps between SMDG and DCG is ownership of the WAN module. The DCG group have proposed that this is owned by the service provider.
- 5.5. The group raised health issues around wireless communication. There has been work done in USA on this issue and it needs to be considered. The group proposed that it should be raised with the rollout team for consideration.
- 5.6. The group wanted The Programme to know that they didn't want a gap in progress to appear and are prepared to carry on the work despite the meetings winding down. Ofgem will consider this offer and will let group members know if there is a need for further work to be done offline.

6. Review of working group deliverables

- 6.1. Ofgem presented the three different deliverable documents for the three sub groups. It was assumed that all SMDG members had read the documents and only substantive issues should be raised for consideration.
- 6.2. Sub group 1 deliverable 2 –The paper was discussed.
- 6.3. The group wanted to know whether the sub group had considered future proofing. It was confirmed that there were not any major issues raised around future proofing whilst creating the paper. It was also confirmed that the next stage of use case development will consider future proofing in more detail.
- 6.4. It was suggested by the group that future proofing needs to be considered in particular around security. The group were worried the STEG did not have enough time to produce the work that is needed. Ofgem confirmed that they have a security team working on the security framework at the moment. This activity will continue alongside the STEG work.
- 6.5. Sub group 1 are also considering a series of papers for SMDG that will look at issues such as last gasp etc. The group are currently finalising their conclusions and these will be raised at the next SMDG meeting in December.

- 6.6. The group raised consumer benefits and whether these are considered in the sub groups. It was suggested that an overarching set of consumer principles could be agreed for suppliers to take forward. It was also suggested that the papers should be raised at CAG where it will be up to the consumer bodies to decide if the benefits meet consumer needs.
- 6.7. The group suggested some changes to section 2 which will be removed. Ofgem will take this change back to sub group 1.
- 6.8. Sub group 2 deliverable 1 – The paper was discussed.
- 6.9. Interoperability was discussed by the group as a major issue that needs consideration. EDFE explained that they are looking at an interoperability study which could lead to a test bed exercise.
- 6.10. The group felt that the next step for sub group 2 would be to decide which specifications are covered by existing assurance and then concentrate on how the rest will be approached. It was suggested however that if any specifications are not covered by MID it will be difficult to set up any assurance separately.
- 6.11. The group agreed that this deliverable takes precedence over the governance piece. The group then suggested that sub group 2 should continue to consider the timelines for each of the assurance issues and identify interim solutions. The group also wanted to make sure that component traceability needs to be considered. The group will produce a short product plan for the sub group to specify what should be done next.
- 6.12. Sub group 3 deliverable 1 – The paper was discussed.
- 6.13. The group were interested in the timeframes associated with the group / paper going forward.
- 6.14. The group were also aware that security will be an important part of HAN selection. It was suggested by some members that some work has been done by security experts which will already cancel out some HAN solutions.
- 6.15. Ofgem asked what issues maybe falling through the gaps. The group confirmed that a combined list of issues has been produced between Ofgem, AMO and ENA. AMO suggested that the main restraint is time and resource which means that all the issues cannot be fixed by Christmas. It was suggested by the group that only the main / most important issues should be considered first and issues will be looked at by priority.
- 6.16. The group would like to see which of the issues are critical. Ofgem will get the rollout team to consider this and communicate this back to the group.
- 6.17. Ofgem asked whether any issues have been missed from the deliverable paper. The group have been invited to consider this and feedback thoughts.
- 6.18. Dynamic load switching was raised as an issue by the group that needs to be considered. This issue will be discussed by sub group 3 and a paper will need to be written.
- 6.19. The group proposed that sub group 3 should revisit the issues spreadsheet and consider where the gaps are. The group would then ask sub group 3 to look at the possible solutions and time frames.

7. Items of discussion from SMDG members

- 7.1. End to end Smart Metering System components and interfaces – ERA circulated a paper to the group for consideration which will be published alongside this note.
- 7.2. De-mystifying DLMS – ERA circulated a paper to the group for consideration which will be published alongside this note.

8. Non Domestic – Substantive points for discussion

- 8.1. The group felt that there needs to be some specific case studies carried out in this area to identify and resolve Non-domestic issues.
- 8.2. The group suggested that Non-domestic issues may need some further work that could be amalgamated into a separate workshop.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. It was suggested by the group that small suppliers who are not included in the SMDG groups feel uninformed. It is important for the information discussed by the group is accessible to all stakeholders. Ofgem were doing its best to ensure that material is published swiftly but stated that an approval process for certain documents was required to prevent risk of challenge.
- 9.2. HAN workshop – Venue and speakers agreed. The list of attendees is being reviewed and presentations have been organised.
- 9.3. Funding for trials – The programme cannot currently fund trials. Any technology trials will hopefully be carried forward through sub group 2 and will be done by stakeholders with financial or product assurance interests. The group will consider trails further after the HAN workshop.
- 9.4. Sub group 2 questions – Sub group 2 have raised a selection of questions to SMDG to finalise what work they should be doing going forward. SMDG have proposed that sub group 2 should come back with option papers. SMDG members will discuss any issues with their sub group 2 members offline.

10. Review of actions

- 10.1. The actions from the meeting were discussed and agreed as shown below.

11. Review of meeting

- 11.1. The group suggested that it is important for issues to be discussed

12. Actions

Completed actions

To update the SMDG ToRs	Ofgem	Completed – ToRs will stay unchanged
--------------------------------	--------------	---

To consider how best to capture the information for the technical specification.	All	Completed – Referred to SG1
Paper of end to end SMS including components and interfaces (via sub group 1) Translation / DMLS	ERA	Completed
Rollout team workplan for upcoming events.	Ofgem	Completed – presented to the group
To confirm logistics arrangements around HAN workshop (Venue, catering, attendee list)	Ofgem, ERA, BEAMA	Completed
Raise issue of end to end testing to sub group 2 assurance group	Ofgem	Completed
To consider end to end compliance standards with Ofcom (security)	Ofgem	Completed
Circulate security presentation slides	Ofgem	Completed
Refer prepayment issues to sub group 1 – Paper for next SMDG meeting	Ofgem	Completed

Ongoing actions

To consider a combined DCG and SMDG meeting to discuss ERA interface paper.	Ofgem	Set up after 11th November
Look to publish combined list of operational rollout issues.	Ofgem, AMO, ENA	To be published on 12th November
To review deliverables with regards to pilot testing and the sub groups.	Ofgem	After 19th November
To decided how best to take HAN issues forward in sub group 3	Ofgem	After 19th November

To finalise and publish the scope map of all working groups associated with the Programme	Ofgem	To be published on 12th November
To finalise and publish the risks and issues log.	Ofgem, Sub groups	19th November

New actions

Circulate workshop slide to the group confirming locations, scope and attendee list (in particular 25th November x 2 workshops)	Ofgem	12th November
Follow up rollout workplan	Ofgem	2nd December
Draft and circulate a product plan for sub group 2s continuing work	SG2	
Consider which are the critical operational issues and circulate	Ofgem	
Consider any technical issues that are missing from sub group 3 deliverable paper	All SMDG	
Circulate Dutch specification submission to the group	Ofgem	
Raise possible technology health concerns (EMS) to consumer protection team	Ofgem	
Check status of EDRP trails and report back to the group	Ofgem	
Confirm future workshops to the group	Ofgem	
Ensure consumer related issues are discussed at the non domestic workshop	Ofgem	
Ownership of interfaces to be added to ERA interface paper	ERA	

Publish interfaces and DLMS paper	Ofgem	
--	--------------	--

13. Date of next meeting

2nd December 2010 – 10:00-16:00 – Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London, SW1P 3GE