

Smart Meter Design Sub Group 1 (SMDSG1) – Meeting Note

Note of discussion and actions from SMDSG1 Meeting No. 3	From	Paul Newman (Technical secretariat)
	Date and time of Meeting	30 September 2010 10:00-16:00
	Location	PA Consulting, 123 Buckingham Palace Road, London

1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Peter Morgan, Paul Newman, Janet Townsend-Stojic.

1.2. SMDSG1 members:

AMO	James Evans
BEAMA	John Parsons
BEAMA (Part)	Howard Porter
British Gas	Andrew Pearson
EDF Energy	Nick Solocombe
ENA	Alan Creighton
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Viktorija Namavira
Eon-UK	Andy Simpson
ESTA	David Spalding
First Utility	David Wurtzler
Gemserv	Anthony Campion
ICoSS	Andrew Green
Intellect UK	Jeremy Willsmore
RWE Npower	Gary Coverson
SBGI	Jeff Cooper
Scottish Power	Grahame Wier
SSE	Neil Green
Utilita	Phillip Michael Kettless

2. Apologies

2.1. SMDSG1 members:

Consumer Focus	
Good Energy	
Ofcom	

3. Introductions

3.1. Round table introductions from each member.

4. Review of actions

4.1. The group discussed the actions allocated the previous week. Actions that were still outstanding were confirmed and a new deadline set.

5. SMDG feedback

5.1. SMDG discussed last gasp and suggested an action on the SMDSG1 group. This action was to develop an options paper for last gasp both inside and outside the premise. This paper will then be used for discussions with consumer bodies.

5.2. SMDG discussed 12 month data storage and suggested an action on the SMDSG1 group. A paper should be produced to look at costs and options.

5.3. SMDG discussed IHD messaging and its implications. The group suggested a cost benefit analysis on this messaging process was needed and put an action SMDSG1.

5.4. FITs was discussed by the SMDG and decided that an action should sit with SMDSG3 to look at this issue and develop options to remove the ambiguity.

5.5. Legality of trickle charge and load limiting was discussed by SMDG. It was decided that an action should sit with SMDSG1 to develop an options paper setting out robust definitions and solutions in the area of trickle charge and load limiting (supply into premises) and how they could be used for fuel poor and demand side management.

5.6. SMDG discussed the HAN as it is a key component of interoperability. SMDSG3 have been given an action to organise a HAN workshop with input from SMDSG1.

5.7. It was suggested that short summary papers of around 2 pages with easy to read / numbered paragraphs should be produced for all sub group deliverables.

6. Capture of Technical Specifications and other sources of information

6.1. The group discussed round the table existing technical specifications. Some members that had specifications suggested that they would try and circulate these documents to the group pending legal sign off.

6.2. It was raised by BEAMA that they would like to invite Howard Porter (BEAMA) to present some recent developments to the group regarding their member's technical specifications on the day of the meeting. The question was put to the group who agreed. It was emphasised that in future all invitees must be agreed before hand by members of the group (i.e. not on the day of the meeting).

6.3. The various technical specifications discussed are captured below:

6.4. ERA - Dutch NTA and KEAMA analysis document; ESMIG Standards gap analysis; German OMS specification; OPEN meter specification.

6.5. First Utility - Onstream product specification.

6.6. EDFE – French Smart Metering specification (In French).

6.7. BG – Its public domain technical specification.

6.8. BEAMA discussed the different options that their members have suggested will become available (Secure, Itron, Echelon, Arqiva).

6.9. ESTA – Iskra technical specification.

6.10. SP – Have technical specification from L&G.

7. Options for evaluation of Technical Specifications

7.1. BG presented options for evaluation criteria. These have been published alongside the meeting information.

7.2. It was noted that until a decision has been made regarding the functional requirements then it will be difficult to go forward with a technical specification. The group want to know from SMDG what is the ultimate decision making process and timescale.

7.3. The group developed the following evaluation criteria which will then be able to assist members with self assessment of technical specifications (The principal of self assessment was agreed for commercial sensitivity reasons).

- Functional requirements – Does the technical specification meet it now? If not what are the timescales.
- Costs - It was suggested this could be difficult to evaluate. It was decided to look at costs in terms of products already in the market, comparative / indicative costs. As a minimum a yes/no indication will be given on the impact on the IA.
- Gaps / conflicts – Current / expected standards within EU / international. Governance arrangements and process to make open if not already open.
- Security – An indication of any security assessment undertaken / proposed. This will be considered by the separate security group e.g. against existing security standards.
- Architecture options – Extent to where several architectures are facilitated and what the different options are. How will these be able to work together?
- HAN, WAN interface – HAN and WAN interface technologies and protocols.
- Openness – 3 levels of openness: Protocol layer openness; single source issues for components and governance arrangements.
- Compatibility with interim arrangements – WAN issues

7.4. Overall deliverable will contain the following: Executive summary; Summary table of technical specifications evaluated against criteria; Single page diagram containing the architecture(s) that have been evaluated; Supporting pages of evidence for the evaluation.

7.5. It was suggested that we need to define the different architectures that could be incorporated into the SMS. This is because there are different types of modular sections that can be incorporated into the meter or not. This will also impact on the cost of the meter and the scoring it will receive against the criteria.

7.6. The group agreed that weighting needs to be added to the criteria. Members to think about weighting to discuss at the next meeting.

7.7. The group agreed that there needs to be a 1st run of the evaluation process with scope for follow up to address the range /quality of different answers.

7.8. The group suggested that the evaluation criteria should be published to allow a wider audience to respond.

7.9. The group developed an initial plan for how to achieve the deliverable. This is indicated in the table below.

7.10. Early release of the functional requirements was discussed by the group to make the evaluation process reflect the recent changes discussed. Any early release will have to be agreed by Ofgem.

7.11. The group will come back next week with indications as to what is achievable in terms of evaluation in the time available.

6 October	Assess criteria weightings (All), Select CoTE (Ofgem), 1 st draft of questions (Ofgem), Clear definition of what a technical specification is (Ofgem), Feedback on whether this is a suitable process (All), Options on architecture (ERA) Indications of how long the first run will take (BEAMA)
13 October	Where do functions reside in the architecture (SBGI), Start first run (All), Participants for first run (All)
20 October	TBC – Identify favourable combinations, Emerging issues
27 October	TBC - Second run, draft document
3 November	Draft document completed ready for SMDG

8. Review of actions

8.1. The group reviewed and agreed the actions from the day.

9. Review of meeting

9.1. Nothing specific was raised as to how the meeting was run or its contents.

10. Any other business

10.1. Action item from previous meeting - SBGI presented to the group a short piece on suggested wording of data granularity functional requirement for the gas meter.

10.2. Action item from previous meeting - SBGI presented revised wording for the detection of gas flow on re-enablement of gas supply via the valve. It was noted that this could incur extra cost. SBGI agreed to undertake a CBA to justify inclusion.

10.3. An additional discussion raised the question of whether the gas valve could be used as the safety valve and whether this has been assumed in the IA benefit "cost of serve".

10.4. It was suggested that there needs to be emphasis in the questionnaire to recognise non domestic exceptions such as the gas valve.

11. Actions

Produce a last gasp options paper	Andrew Pearson – BG – (20 th Oct)
Produce a SMS data storage paper of options (12-13 months data)	Viktorija Namavira - ERA, Jeff Cooper - SBGI, John Parsons – BEAMA – (13 th Oct)
Look at cost benefit analysis of IHD messaging	Gary Coverson – Npower, Alan Creighton – ENA – (20 th Oct)
Produce a Trickle charge options paper	ERA from SMDG meeting (13 th Oct)
Circulate Technical specifications where appropriate	All SMDSG1 (publish/circulate if appropriate)
Submit agenda and structure suggestions to the SMDSG3 regarding a HAN workshop	John Parsons – BEAMA, Jeff Cooper – SBGI (Take to SMDSG3 Monday)
Confirm how architectures will be decided upon.	Ofgem (Done)
Circulate European definitions documents on openness	Howard Porter – BEAMA (to be received)
Clarify who can undertake this evaluation exercise	Ofgem (Done)
Circulate clean set of evaluation criteria	Ofgem (Done)
Circulate first draft of questionnaire	Ofgem (Done)
Circulate minimum DCC service levels	Ofgem (to be circulate)
Highlighting where functionality challenges in the allocation or split of functional requirements by component	John Parsons – BEAMA, Jeff Cooper – SBGI - (13 th Oct)

Circulate European slides on MID2.0	Phillip Michael Kettless – Utilita (Circulate again)
Conduct a CBA on option B regarding the gas valve	Jeff Cooper – SBGI (20th Oct)

12. Date of next meeting

6th October 2010 – 10:00-16:00, BIS conference centre, 1 Victoria Street, London.