

Smart Meter Design Group (SMDG) – Meeting Note

Note of discussion and actions from SMDG Meeting No. 5	From	Paul Newman (Technical secretariat)
	Date and time of Meeting	02 December 2010 10:00-16:00
	Location	Ofgem / Dial in

1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Adrian Rudd, Peter Morgan (Part - Dialled in), Dora Guzeleva (Part), Paul Newman, Shaun Scullion (Part).

1.2. SMDG members:

AMO	Tom Chevalier	Dialled in
BEAMA	Dave Robinson	
British Gas	Steve Briggs	Dialled in
Consumer Focus	Zoe Mcleod	Dialled in
EDF Energy	Ashley Pocock	Dialled in
ENA	Alan Claxton	Dialled in
ENA	Andrew Howard	Dialled in
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Jason Brogden	
Eon-UK	Steve James	Dialled in
ESTA	Tony Taylor	
Gemserv	Anthony Campion	
ICoSS	Steve Mulinganie	Dialled in
Intellect UK	Robert McNamara	
Ofcom	Richard Moore	
RWE Npower	Chris Harris	
SBGI	Gary Cottrell	
Scottish Power	Ross Mackie	Dialled in
SSE	Paul Clark	
Utilita	Andrew Beasley	

1.3. SMDG members that did not attend:

First Utility	
Good energy	

2. Introductions

2.1. Round table introductions from each member. Due to the adverse weather conditions it was proposed that a dial in facility should be available.

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 Terms of Reference (ToR)

4.1. The group did not have any issues to discuss around the ToR.

5. Programme update

Rollout Update – not provided

DCG progress update

5.1. Ofgem provided an update on DCG progress. DCG Sub-groups are being re-organised to allow further work to move forward. Sub-group terms of reference are being re-drafted and some further meetings have already been scheduled. The Sub-group areas of work will be;

- Sub-Group 1: Scope of DCC and its design
- Sub-Group 2: Commercial interoperability issues
- Sub-Group 3: Various components of the SM code.

5.2. Ofgem stated that there would be a high-level programme planning session at the ICG on 8th Dec which should filter through to the SMDG, however the SMDG prime task would likely remain the development of a technical specification.

Security Technical Experts Group

5.3. Ofgem provided feedback from the Security Technical Experts Group (STEG) first meeting on 5th Nov. The meeting was well attended and a good discussion was had on general points around smart meter security but a detailed review of the IS1 risk assessment could not take place until the STEG's terms of reference and rules of information exchange were established and proposed. That has now happened and it is hoped that the second meeting on 9th December will allow a full review of the IS1 assessment and more substantive discussion.

HAN workshop

5.4. Ofgem provide feedback from the HAN Workshop on 19th November. In summary:

- feedback, throughout the day and following the event, has been very positive – participants were encouraged by the progress (of the programme and of product development), and evidently keen to continue to work collectively, at pace;
- post workshop, we are now in a better position to evaluate HAN requirements against available technologies;
- the task now is to take the work forward through the development of a mixed approach to the different aspects and challenges that smart metering requirements will place on the HAN.

5.5. Ofcom also provided brief feedback from the BIS/Ofcom workshop on 29th Nov where technical solution providers on the communications were invited to provide their views.

5.6. SMDG sought Ofgem's view on the next steps following the BIS/Ofcom Workshop. Specifically what are the likely outcomes and processes, do Sub-Groups 1 and 3 have sufficient direction to take the work forward and is there enough clarity on the scope of services that the HAN needs to support?

5.7. Ofgem confirmed that at this stage the Programme was not favouring particular solutions, but it was recognised that Industry might migrate towards a 'solution of choice' for the HAN. Two key points were; the testing and piloting work under SG1 (who are currently developing a workplan following the workshop) and, reconciling respective UK and EU positions on control of domestic devices via the HAN.

5.8. Work is progressing in Sub-group 1 on HAN Use Case development and the Technology Strategy Board may support bench-testing with some available, but

limited, funding. On the EU side. Ofgem suggested inviting Centrica's David Johnson (co-chair of the EU Smart Metering Standards Co-ordination Group – SM-CG) to brief the SMDG on the EU standardisation situation.

- 5.9. Ofgem suggested there was some further work to do in identifying and analysing risks around this piece and the Use Case work would provide a good start to that. Also, SMDG needed to think about a dedicated session to examine the 'end-to-end' system.
- 5.10. Ofgem said that the next EU SMCG meeting was not scheduled until June 2011 with EU standards unlikely to be available soon.. It seemed unlikely therefore that on current progress EU standards publication would align with the programme's needs.
- 5.11. SMDG was comfortable at this point that SG1 could deliver the HAN work, but emphasised their need for visibility of SG1's workplan by their next meeting.

Data Use workshop

- 5.12. Ofgem provided feedback from the Data Use workshop on 25th Nov.
- 5.13. There was a good exchange of views from attendees. Two particular points emerged strongly; availability of data at the meter and the fact that Industry did not really put forward convincing arguments for the use of data. Ofgem suggested, and CF concurred, that some on the supply side appeared receptive to the arguments from the consumer groups. Ofgem is seeking a second session before Christmas with the same Group to try and achieve a better understanding between suppliers, DNOs and consumers.
- 5.14. ICoSS believed that suppliers / DNOs had not yet fully laid out what data they would want with a supporting rationale. CF thought that the key point was what data was needed now and in the future, and questioned whether the work currently being done by ERA could provide an answer; the SMDG suggested that it could.
- 5.15. CF mentioned that an earlier Request For Information had identified micro-businesses as being subject to particularly high levels of charge for accessing data. The SMDG noted CF's comment.

6. Review of working group deliverables

- 6.1. SG1 Last Gasp – SMDG asked Ofgem what the Consumer Advisory Group view of this issue was. Ofgem replied that their general view was firstly, that last gasp was necessary to substantiate the 'smart' descriptor for smart meters and secondly that there was a need to think to the future.
- 6.2. From Ofgem's perspective, they felt there was a need to provide the functionality without being prescriptive at this stage as to how it should be achieved as alternatives to last gasp at the meter were available. Ofgem were working with consumer groups and DECC on last gasp costs and benefits but at the moment, without the benefit of an architecture or specification, the available cost data was too broad-based for a detailed analysis.
- 6.3. SMDG discussed the various different options to achieve last gasp functionality as envisaged by the Prospectus or alternatives that may provide some diluted but acceptable alternative. They concluded that at this stage of the programme the paper was as good as it could be in facilitating a decision on last gasp and it was now for the Programme and DECC to continue their analysis in consultation with consumer groups.
- 6.4. SMDG hoped that they would be allowed to share and if necessary challenge the analysis when it was concluded. SMDG also asked Ofgem to communicate to DECC that

they (DECC) should not restrict their analysis to last gasp at the meter but to also examine possible alternatives that had been proposed by the SMDG and SG1.

- 6.5. SG1 Data storage – The group proposed that all the papers should not be attributed to the specific organisations. Ofgem will make sure company names have been removed.
- 6.6. It was suggested that the paper could be circulated for general comment from external stakeholders including those companies that are named specifically in the paper.
- 6.7. Data Storage: The group discussed how much granularity was needed on the meters. Whether it should be 13 months of half hourly data or whether the data is less granular as time passes. One member suggested that data should be analysed from the SME market where this kind of system is already in use. It was also suggested that the energy data aggregation companies should be consulted to get their opinion.
- 6.8. IHD Messaging: The group discussed 2-way communications between the IHD and the WAN module. It was suggested that the minimum specification IHD (£15) does not include this functionality. Suppliers are however looking to circulate IHDs that will be above the minimum specification to help differentiate them from competitors so maybe this does not create an issue.
- 6.9. One member raised the concern of any barriers being put up for customers that want to swap suppliers / payment types. This needs to be considered when deciding on the IHD functionality.
- 6.10. It was acknowledged that this is one of the most important issues and that further consideration will be needed especially to cover the interim period before DCC.
- 6.11. Ofgem confirmed that another prepayment workshop has been arranged and will look to discuss a lot of the issues raised.
- 6.12. ERA suggested that they have been re-starting work around prepayment and use cases etc. ERA will make sure that they feed in their findings into the process.
- 6.13. One member raised safety issues which they felt should be considered. In the Smart world people's ability to re-enable supply without being at the meter raises concerns. SMDG have suggested that this issue be passed onto one of the sub groups to consider.
- 6.14. Account balance on the IHD – Some members are worried about any confusion with customers if a real time cost is presented on the IHD. They suggested that as long as there is an understanding that the figures communicated are not completely accurate then compensation requests should be averted.
- 6.15. One member felt that there needs to be some further research into consumer habits to find out exactly what consumers' aspirations are.
- 6.16. One member felt that the numbers associated with text messages in Appendix B needs validating to make sure that the business case is accurate.
- 6.17. SG2 Review: Identified options for assurance – One member of the group felt that the risks needed to be mapped against the options. There needs to be an assurance profile which is associated with these risks.

- 6.18. It was suggested that a higher level paper needs to be drafted especially to look at the risks and identify pinch points. SG2 is drafting the next deliverable paper which will look to address the groups concerns.
- 6.19. SMDG has proposed that SG2 should be reconvened and should look at risk profiling and mapping it against the solutions. SMDG has suggested a product description needs to be written up to help advise the group.
- 6.20. The group proposed that assurance needs to be confirmed around the technical specification to ensure financiers, consumers and makes sure that all kit is interoperable. Without assurance kit will differ and won't work together.

7. Joint SMDG/DCG meeting – SMS end to end interfaces and protocols

- 7.1. DLMS paper – This paper has been circulated to SMDG and DCG groups for consideration. Ofgem has proposed to organise a joint meeting in late December. DCG and SMDG members are invited to let The Programme know who would like to attend (one from each).
- 7.2. It was suggested that DLMS needs to be further considered to find out whether it is a viable option. There appear to be no other products going through Europe at the moment so it is important to make sure DLMS works. Other issues that need to be considered are security and how difficult DLMS implementation will be for gas.
- 7.3. ERA was asked whether they could produce a basic Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) on DLMS against other proprietary products.
- 7.4. One member of the group felt that DMLS needs to be considered against what our future needs may be especially as it was produced some time ago.
- 7.5. One member felt that Internet Protocol needed to be considered. It was suggested that this will be added to the agenda for the joint SMDG / DCG.

8. Items of discussion from SMDG members

- 8.1. Modularity – One member raised the definition of modular. They suggested that the HAN and WAN could be modular but there have not been any definitions of what this means. Ofgem has confirmed that this has not been defined yet because that would involve more detail than was being discussed in the sub groups. Flexibility has been deliberately included in the design requirements. The group proposed that this issue needs to be taken on by SG3 and have a paper produced. The benefits could mean universal interoperability but could lead to problems around security.
- 8.2. One member felt that it would be difficult to decide on the interfaces between the different bits of kit until it is decided what each bit of kit actually does. This issue should also be taken into SG3 for consideration.
- 8.3. Some members felt that there needed to be some consideration of module size. Work to see how "fat" the meter could be and how "thin" the WAN could be and vice versa would be beneficial.
- 8.4. Review cycles – One member felt that review cycles needed to be reviewed as some papers have taken a month to confirm. It was suggested that explicit deadlines need to be set and groups made aware when certain deadlines are not going to be met.

9. Non Domestic – Substantive points for discussion

- 9.1. Zoning – One member raised a selection of issues around zoning which need to be considered by one of the sub groups. It was suggested this be picked up by SG3.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. Planning – There is ambiguity around Ofgem being the delivery partner and what is going to happen to the SMDG groups.
- 10.2. The group wanted to understand what resource may be needed after Christmas and what will they be looking at. This will enable everyone to prepare.
- 10.3. One member of the group requested a list of high level decisions that will be made in the prospectus. This will help enable SMDG members to understand what decisions are being made along the critical path.
- 10.4. Consumer engagement – It was raised again that consumer engagement in the sub groups is not as high as others. The contribution of consumer groups is imperative to help inform the proposals from the sub groups. It was suggested that the consumer groups could share the responsibility amongst themselves or for suppliers to attend their meetings.
- 10.5. ICG – It was suggested that the paperwork from the meetings needs to be updated.

11. Review of actions

- 11.1. The actions from the meeting were discussed and are shown below.

12. Review of meeting

- 12.1. Teleconference – The group felt that it generally worked well.
- 12.2. Sub groups papers – The submission of papers and subsequent work actions for sub groups worked well for SMDG.

13. Actions

- 13.1. EDRP trials – This action could not be discussed at the meeting but has been added to the note. The EDRP trials ended in September 2010. The final analysis has started and the final report should be completed in March 2011. It is hoped to publish a short progress report in December.

Completed actions

To consider a combined DCG and SMDG meeting to discuss ERA interface paper	Ofgem	Meeting will be organised in December - Completed
Look to publish combined list of operational rollout issues.	Ofgem, AMO, ENA	Completed

To finalise and publish the scope map of all working groups associated with the Programme	Ofgem	Completed
Circulate workshop slide to the group confirming locations, scope and attendee list (in particular 25th November x 2 workshops)	Ofgem	Completed
Draft and circulate a product plan for sub group 2s continuing work	SG2	Completed
Consider any technical issues that are missing from sub group 3 deliverable paper	All SMDG	Completed
Circulate Dutch specification submission to the group	Ofgem	Completed
Raise possible technology health concerns (EMS) to consumer protection team	Ofgem	Completed
Check status of EDRP trails and report back to the group	Ofgem	Completed in minute
Confirm future workshops to the group	Ofgem	Completed
Ensure consumer related issues are discussed at the non domestic workshop	Ofgem	Completed
Ownership of interfaces to be added to ERA interface paper	ERA	Issue will be considered in DCG / SMDG meeting – Completed
To review deliverables with regards to pilot testing and the sub groups.	Ofgem	Paper submitted by SG2 - Completed
To decided how best to take HAN issues forward in sub group 3	Ofgem	SG3 are considering - Completed

Ongoing actions

To finalise and publish the risks and issues log.	Ofgem, Sub groups	The log has been completed
--	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

		and will be published soon
Follow up rollout workplan	Ofgem	Still to be written up
Consider which are the critical operational issues and circulate	Ofgem	Still to be circulated
Publish interfaces and DLMS paper	Ofgem	Papers have been received and will be published

New actions

SG1 to provide their (HAN) workplan to SMDG 3 days before their 16th December meeting	SG1	13th December
Invite Centrica's Dave Johnson to brief the SMDG on the EU's smart metering standards work	Ofgem	10th December
To examine what data items stakeholders would prefer to be made available with a supporting rationale.	ENA / ERA	16th December
Remove company names from deliverable papers	Ofgem	By 16th December
Circulate data storage paper to COTEs / members for comment	Ofgem, ESTA	By 16th December
Feedback IHD keypad costs to the group	Utilita	By 16th December
Raise safety issues around re-enablement of supply with SG3	Ofgem	6th December
Raise zoning issue with SG3	Ofgem	6th December
Take consumer issue around accurate account balancing to The Programme	Ofgem	By 16th December

Raise modularity issue with SG3	Ofgem	6th December
Investigate text message figures in Appendix B of IHD paper to make sure accurate	Intellect	By 16th December
Compile a CBA for DLMS against other proprietary products and a do nothing option	ERA	By 16th December
Circulate DCG workshop slides on modularity	Ofcom	By 16th December
Follow up consumer engagement with CAG or possibility of supplier representation at their meeting	Ofgem	By 16th December
Organise DCG / SMDG combined meeting	Ofgem	By 16th December
To consider representatives for the combined DCG / SMDG meeting and raise any additional agenda items	All SMDG	By 16th December

14. Date of next meeting

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