ofgem E-Serve

Minutes

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

Note of discussion and actions from SMDSG1 Meeting No. 11	From	Paul Newman
	Date and time of Meeting	24 November 2010 10:00-16:00
	Location	Ofgem, 9 Millbank London SW1

1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Peter Morgan, Shaun Scullion.

1.2. SMDSG1 members:

Sarah Gratte	Gemserv
BEAMA	Dave Robinson
British Gas	Gareth Williams
EDF Energy	Bob Gibbs
ENA	Alan Creighton
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Simon Harrison
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Alistair Manson
Eon-UK	Mark Powell
RWE Npower	Gary Coverson
SBGI	Jeff Cooper
Scottish Power	Grahame Weir
SSE	Neil Green
Utilita	Phil Kettless
AMO	James Evans

Apologies

1.3. SMDSG1 members:

Consumer Focus	
Good Energy	
Ofcom	
ESTA	
First Utility	
ICoSS	
Intellect	

2. Introductions

2.1. None required.

3. SG1 Draft deliverable 3

3.1. Ofgem sought the Group's view on whether they believed it was still achievable to produce their deliverable 3, "Draft Technical interoperability issue areas" by the due date of 30 Nov, and if not, whether they should propose that the SMDG on 2 Dec be cancelled (and the deliverable presented to the next scheduled SMDG on 16 Dec

instead)? The Group proposed that there was insufficient time to produce the deliverable for 30 Nov but that the SMDG on 2 Dec should proceed, but with the omission of their agenda item. The Group proposed that it was feasible to produce their deliverable in time for the SMDG meeting on 16 Dec. Ofgem would take the Group's view back to the Programme.

4. Review of actions

4.1. Actions

Add amendments to last gasp paragraph and circulate (Action carried forward from last meeting).	**Ofgem**	**Completed. BG (GW) distributed. One comment back from ENA which was incorporated and new text proposed at meeting 11.**
To re-distribute the paper "SMD Use Cases v0.2" to SG1. All SG1 to review the paper and send back comments: • **Are there any other local / remote actors (devices) which would warrant incorporation into the document?** • **Which of the Use Cases, in their opinion, needs more detailed articulation?** • **Which of the Use Cases, in their opinion, needs to be marked as a priority Use Case?** • **Generally any other comments (omissions) in the document.** **ERA when distributing will provide prompts and guidance to assist the Group to make pertinent comments.**	**ERA / SG1**	**Outstanding. ERA (AM) will tidy up the paper and re-circulate. the paper**
To provide an update for the SG1 meeting on 24 Nov as to how it is intended for the Group to tackle the SM Use Case development work (effort, people, dates)	**ERA (AM)**	**Completed. On meeting 11 agenda.**
To email to ERA (SM) the names and contact details of people in their organisation who they believe would have the expertise and (full) availability to contribute to the SM Use Case development work.	**All SG1**	**Completed – but names may still be forwarded.**

To review the tariff requirements for gas, non-dom, domestic and electricity to ensure that all aspects have been covered.	**All**	**Completed. On meeting 11 agenda.**
To distribute last gasp, data storage (& other relevant) papers that went to the last SMDG meeting to SG1	**Ofgem**	**Completed. On meeting 11 agenda.**
To distribute to ERA, SBGI the 'Product Description' template that has been previously used for SG deliverables.	**Ofgem**	**Completed. Emailed 24/11/10**
To raise with CAG the EDFE question re whether the SoDR should specifically state that the IHD will display the meter register (i.e. that consumers should have the facility to see their meter reading at the IHD)	**Ofgem**	**Superseded. Now awaiting new EDFE action (below).**
Distribute to SG1 the risks and issues logs as presented to SMDG.	**Ofgem**	**Outstanding. Now due for SG1 meeting 12.**

5. Review of HAN workshop

5.1. Ofgem and ERA provided a summary of the HAN Workshop on 19 Nov;

- A positive event, good feedback and only a small amount of feedback around the event logistics and structure / objectives. Attendees equally positive that the programme has the right direction of travel.
- General acceptance of the realities of the situation
- 'Pay to play' testing - the concept was positively received by solution providers. If we define a testing regime then solution providers will demo/test their solutions.
- There were some people who apparently didn't realise that the workshop was aimed at smart metering rather than home automation
- Next steps – distribute presentation(s) and delegate list and a 1 page summary of the event (see action).

6. HAN requirements and use case review

6.1. The Group discussed ERA's paper (previously distributed) "SMDG Use Cases – Next Steps".

6.2. The Group's previous experience with Use Case work indicated an elapsed time for the work measured in years rather than weeks. ERA replied that the Group would not intend to develop all Use Cases to a detailed level, but only to a level sufficient to achieve interoperability. The fact that there were now many examples of Use Cases out there, and the intensive approach that the Group would take to completing the work, should mean that the task was achievable within the available time. The first task

however, would be to propose what level of detail was required for interoperability for each use case.

6.3. In terms of the Group's deliverable for the Use Case document , ERA viewed the structure as: an overview of the Use Cases and, an identification of which Use Cases needed more detailed definition – referring back to the RAG status proposed by the Group against each functional requirement. The Group were in line with ERA's view of the broad structure of this component piece of work.

6.4. Given the time constraints, the Group also proposed to schedule dates and set a structure/agendas for the UC work as extra SG1 meetings but without recourse to the full Group. The group discussed the target of having the first (priority) Use Cases available on or before 3rd Dec, and the effort involved in producing these. This work should enable a realistic plan for the rest of the work to be constructed (with an aim to have the plan of work available by 8th Dec).

6.5. The Group proposed that four further full days to carry out the Use Case work (two days are already scheduled) before Dec 24th would be required. Even with these 6 days the Group proposed, that a significant amount of 'out-of-meeting' work by those Group members volunteering for this activity would be required in order to meet the Group's deadline.

6.6. The Group asked if the Use Case work could reflect functionality that was still pending a decision from the Programme. It was proposed that those functions would be covered fully, or in part, by the Use Case work as they presently saw it.

6.7. ENA made a point that it was important to consider consistency during the Use Case work (citing an example of over-voltage alarms using consistent algorithms).

7. Tariffs

7.1. *Update with respect to Gas and non-domestic*. The Group discussed tariffs, with a particular emphasis on Gas. ENA had drafted a paper, which they hope to share shortly, on Network Operators' tariff requirements. The Group proposed to provide more time to seek views on non domestic and gas-specific requirements before receiving and sharing the ENA document.

7.2. The Group discussed where its eventual paper on tariffs would sit within the component parts of the detailed design requirements. It was proposed that the tariffs paper plus the table of data items could form a part of the detailed functional requirements or, alternatively, could fit into the Interoperability paper. As the Use Cases work progressed there may be ad-hoc papers that flow from that work, one of which may be a paper on gas tariffs. The Group broadly proposed that it was close to reaching an initial view on electricity tariffs but more debate was need on non domestic and gas tariffs.

7.3. SBGI confirmed that the impact assessment gas meter supported one single time-of-use tariff.

8. Technical Interoperability Paper

8.1. *Review of proposed changes.* The Group discussed what their 'Interoperability' deliverable should look like. A broad structure was proposed:

- How can we achieve interoperability (here bringing out a definition of interoperability as distinct from interchangeability)

- What are the challenges to achieving interoperability?

- How do we overcome the challenges to interoperability?
  -Comms and interfaces
  -Installation and maintenance
  -Security
  -Key component functionality (incl tariffs and logical architecture)

The Use case work would hopefully drive out other important elements of the deliverable (e.g. Pre-Pay, data mirroring at the examples of key component functionality).

8.2. On the above basis, BG proposed to compose a 'straw man' interoperability paper for the Group to discuss (see action).

8.3. Ofgem said that there had been a question from the DCG Group around the services requirements. The Group believed that DCC service definitions would fall out of the Use Case work and that would hopefully answer DCG's question.

8.4. Ofgem said that they expected to have a first draft of the revised Functional Requirements during w/c 29th Nov.

8.5. Utilita informed the Group that ELS and IDIS Groups were both working on interoperability.

9. Delivering Detailed Design Requirements

9.1. The Group discussed the structure of their deliverable due on 24th Dec, *Draft outline proposals for format and scope of technical specifications (Detailed Design Requirements)*, and the resourcing and timeline for its completion. The proposed structure is shown below:

Chapter 1 – Description of the detailed design requirements

Chapter 2 – Detailed timeline for delivering the detailed design requirements

Chapter 3 – Ways of working and resource arrangements

Chapter 4 – Risks and Issues

9.2. BG and ERA volunteered to prepare Chapters 1, 2 and 3. An initial draft will be reviewed at meeting 13.

10. Any other business

10.1.   (BEAMA) BEAMA informed the meeting that at the SMI Conference on 2nd Dec the ELS SMIP documentation would be made public.

10.2.   (Ofgem) Non-dom and other mainstream issues – this was covered in item 9.

11. Review of actions from meeting

11.1. Action carried forward

To re-distribute the paper "SMD Use Cases v0.2" to SG1. All SG1 to review the paper and send back comments: • **Are there any other local / remote actors (devices) which would warrant incorporation into the document?** • **Which of the Use Cases, in their opinion, needs more detailed articulation?** • **Which of the Use Cases, in their opinion, needs to be marked as a priority Use Case?** • **Generally any other comments (omissions) in the document.** **ERA when distributing will provide prompts and guidance to assist the Group to make pertinent comments.**	**ERA / SG1**	**Outstanding. ERA (AM) will tidy up the paper and re-circulate. the paper**
To raise with CAG the EDFE question re whether the SoDR should specifically state that the IHD will display the meter register (i.e. that consumers should have the facility to see their meter reading at the IHD)	**Ofgem**	**Superseded. Now awaiting new EDFE action (meeting 11).**
Distribute to SG1 the risks and issues logs as presented to SMDG.	**Ofgem**	**Outstanding. Now due for SG1 meeting 12.**

11.2. Meeting actions

To provide text of the question to CAG around whether the SoDR should specifically state that the IHD will display the meter register.	**EDFE (BG)**	**30/11/10**
Send around to SG1 the BEAMA (HP's) presentation from the HAN Workshop + the workshop delegate list + a short summary of the workshop.	**ERA**	**26/11/10**
Re-iterate to SMDG the importance of an early 'end-2-end' session featuring SM and DCC Groups and ask SMDG if/when such an event is planned. Report back to SG1.	**Ofgem**	**30/11/10**

To schedule and notify of further (4) dates for the Use Case work to relevant SG1 members.	**ERA**	**By 29/11/10**
To develop and distribute a 'straw man' interoperability paper for discussion at SG1 meeting 12.	**BG**	**30/11/10**
To distribute the table of data items to SG1 for their information	**BG**	**30/11/10**
Complete Product Descriptions Template for the component parts of the Detailed Design Requirements	**SBGI, ERA, Ofgem**	**1/12/10**
To provide to SG1 a short piece on the 'resources and governance' chapter of the Detailed Design Requirements deliverable.	**ERA**	**30/11/10**
To provide to SG1 a high level plan for the 'Jan – July timeline' chapter of the Detailed Design Requirements deliverable.	**ERA**	**30/11/10**
To schedule further meetings of SG1 – 20th Dec and 12th and 19th Jan	**Ofgem**	**3/12/10**

12.   Risks & issues

12.1.   The Ofgem action to provide to SG1 the risks and issues as presented to SMDG is still outstanding.

12.2.   Ofgem invited the Group to identify any risks or issues. None were identified by the Group at the meeting, though BEAMA did re-iterate the point raised at the previous meeting about six months being an unrealistic time for manufacturers to get from 'technical specification available' to 'product available'. Ofgem said that this was more relevant to their project / programme risk registers and BEAMA should raise it by sending an email to the programme.

13.   Review of meeting

13.1.   The group felt the meeting was productive and, given their discussions on the remaining work for the Group to do, they proposed that additional meetings would be required. Ofgem took an action to schedule the meetings in Dec and Jan.

14.   Date of next meeting

Wednesday 1st December 2010 – 10:00-16:00 – Ofgem, 9 Millbank, London SW1.