

Smart Meter Design Sub Group 2 (SMDSG2) – Meeting Note

Note of discussion and actions from SMDSG2 Meeting No. 3	From	Shaun Scullion (Ofgem)
	Date and time of Meeting	19 October 2010 10:00-16:00
	Location	BIS conference centre, London

1. Present

1.1. Ofgem: Janet Townsend-Stojic, David Fletcher, Shaun Scullion.

1.2. SMDSG2 members:

AMO	Colin Fraser
BEAMA	Dave Robinson
British Gas	Andrew Pearson
EDF Energy	Steve Mannering
ENA	Jack Walles
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Alastair Manson
ERA	Mark Powell
ESTA	Kris Szajdzicki
Gemserv	Jill Ashby
Intellect UK	Stefan Jensen
RWE Npower	Hazel Ward
SBGI	Mike Buss
Scottish Power	Graham Smith
SSE	Mark Knight

2. Apologies

2.1. SMDSG2 members:

Consumer Focus	
First Utility	
Good Energy	
Ofcom	
ICoSS	
Utilita	

3. Introductions

3.1. Round table introduction of each SMDSG2 member.

4. Review of previous actions

4.1. The group discussed the actions from the previous meeting. The following are still outstanding and will be reported on at the next meeting.

Circulate 'interoperability without standards' case study	Neil Lamonby - Intellect
--	---------------------------------

Column E options paper on enduring and short term risks and issues	Antony Campion - Gemserv
Circulate SP positioning paper	Ofgem
Check assurance needs of SG1 (interoperability) and DCG (DCC arrangements / prepayment). Present issues back to the group.	Ofgem

5. Review of Assurance Options Definition

5.1. As per the action from last meeting, Gemserv presented a short paper (not distributed) on possible options for the approach to SMS assurance. In summary these were:

1. '*Existing Arrangements*' approach (assumes ex-post solution to problems/issues):

List of existing bodies with potentially applicable standards that *might* be exploited in some way and other instruments that *might* potentially be applied, wholly or in part, to achieve SMS assurance (not an exhaustive list);

- ISQCR
- BSC
- HSE
- NMO
- MID
- IEEE

Existing proprietary standards *might* also be applicable mandatory or voluntary, e.g. certification standards for Apple 'Apps'. Existing (metering product) manufacturers *may* also be applicable, e.g. on product compatibility, design, safety etc.

With this approach though there may be a necessary and significant reliance on a large voluntary element to assurance, specific assurance measures may also be difficult to measure and a structured assurance regime may not exist (e.g. in terms of regular intervals for re-certification / accreditation).

2. '*Self-certification*' approach (i.e. as existing, up to a point).

a) Light touch

In this case, assurance or otherwise would usually be by means of a formal sign-off or undertaking by an individual of suitable seniority (CE, for instance, rather like signing-off annual accounts) that the product in question is compliant with a relevant standard. MOCOPA might be the closest existing process here.

b) Medium

A questionnaire or similar might be used listing minimum compliance aspects such as: sub-contractors, component parts, in-service testing, H&S etc on a 'tick in the box' basis. Would probably need to be reinforced by stipulating an annual return.

c) Intensive

Sampling process, perhaps 1/3 phased annually (so whole specification is checked every 3yrs) with *independent* assurance function and audit (spot check) aspect (by DCC/SCC perhaps). Able to demand additional info if not satisfied. This model may not keep pace with technological developments though.

3. '*Independent certification*' approach (employing a range of techniques to certify requirements compliance). The certification body might have a problem adding value though and it would require access to a broad range of skills.

4. '*Technical reference / advice service*' approach (verifying functionality and specification compliance).

a) Self-declaration around what benchmark tests suppliers are using.

b) Examine the whole system end-to-end: QMS, project management, testing, on-site visits, manufacture, third parties, supply etc. This would probably be a costly model and need at least annual checks. Would also probably mean a significant overhead for customers and significant admin for suppliers and DCC.

5.2. The Group thanked Gemserv for the analysis and asked that the paper be distributed to the group.

6. Review of Assurance Gap Table

6.1. Ofgem led an examination of the latest version of the Assurance Assessment table (previously distributed). The group discussed each entry in turn, validating each data entry or making agreed amendments to data entries.

6.2. Before the examination, some points were made by individual members of the group:

1. The approach (to the Group's first deliverable) was questioned and it was suggested that the Assurance Assessment table group should be extended to incorporate the following:

- Firstly, clearly establish the group's scope in terms of the SMS elements and ensure a common understanding of it.
- State what the lifecycle for each of these SMS elements is and what events impacting each of these elements are of interest to the group (e.g. upgrade, change of supplier).
- State what the consequence of failure for each of these SMS elements are.

2. Discussions about 'added value' aspects of the SMS should not distract the group from its focus on the governance and assurance arrangements for a *minimum* SMS specification. The group all agreed that it would not be feasible to devise assurance and governance arrangements for every scenario.

3. The group should be careful not to focus too much on the domestic sector and neglect those sectors outside of domestic.

6.3. Following a short discussion on the above points, data entries around Commercial Interoperability and Data Privacy and Security aspects were agreed to be removed from examination and an action taken (see action).

7. Review of Technical Assurance positioning Paper

7.1. A paper by Scottish Power paper "*Smart Technical Assurance*" was available at the meeting to the Group but was not discussed in any detail due to time constraints.

8. Achieving the Group’s Deliverable

8.1. Ofgem reminded the Group that its deliverable *Draft Arrangements and defined options for short term and enduring technical assurance* (document) was due on 5th November. A Group-sponsored paper for the SM Programme Board was required, which would lay out the Group’s philosophy and approach to an SMS assurance regime and also highlight the salient issues arising from the Group’s work to date. ERA (AM) agreed to present the paper on the Group’s behalf and produce a summary narrative to the paper and a short introductory slideshow. Prior to that, the Group are to review the revised Assurance Assessment Table and send any further comments to Ofgem in good time to be considered and, if appropriate, incorporated.

(Any other agenda items not covered due to time constraints).

9. Any Other Business

9.1. Revision to IEC 61010 Standard.

ESTA briefed the group on EU developments concerning the IEC 61010 standard. In brief, the previous exclusion of electricity meters is removed in the latest revision which means that (unless electricity meters get their own standard) the SMS will have to comply with 61010 (which now requires a disconnect switch for the user) or, if not, to go through a risk assessment to achieve a CE marking. This would (the risk assessment option), in ESTA’s opinion, mean inconvenience for the Industry and is an issue for the SM Programme but was workable. An amendment is proposed to negate the disconnect switch requirement and another option being pursued is to lobby Senelec not to approve the revised standard. ESTA would send a short briefing on this issue to the Group.

10. Review of meeting

10.1. The Group agreed the meeting had been worthwhile and productive and that the key objective for the next meeting would be to draft and agree the supporting narrative for the deliverable (the bulk of which would be the Assurance Gap Table).

11. Actions

11.1. Actions carried forward

Circulate ‘interoperability without standards’ case study	Neil Lamonby - Intellect
Column E options paper on enduring and short term risks and issues	Antony Campion - Gemserv
Circulate Scottish Power paper on technical assurance positioning	Ofgem
Check assurance needs of SG1 (interoperability) and DCG (DCC arrangements / prepayment). Present issues back to the group	Ofgem

11.2. New Actions

Distribute the Assurance Options Definition Paper to SG2	Jill Ashby, Gemserv
Investigate and report back to SG2 on whether Ofgem Markets section has any existing provisions on SMS items being	Ofgem

covered under regulated / non-regulated assets which might have a bearing on SMS commercial interoperability issues.	
All SG2 to review the latest revision of the Assurance Gap Table and send any further comments to Ofgem by 26 Oct.	All SG2
Produce a short supporting narrative and introductory presentation for the Group's first deliverable.	ERA (AM)
Distribute to SG2 a summary brief on the implications for the Group's work of the current revision to IEC 61010 – to be incorporated if appropriate into the Group's paper to Programme Board in Nov.	ESTA

12. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 2nd November 2010 – 10:00-16:00. BIS Conference Centre, 1 Victoria Street London SW1.