

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

Note of discussion and actions from SMDSG2 Meeting No. 4	From	Paul Newman (Ofgem)
	Date and time of Meeting	2 November 2010 10:00-16:00
	Location	BIS conference centre, London

### 1. Present

1.1. Ofgem: Janet Townsend-Stojic, David Fletcher, Paul Newman.

1.2. SMDSG2 members:

BEAMA	Dave Robinson
British Gas	Andrew Pearson
EDF Energy	Steve Mannering
ENA	Jack Walles
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Alistair Manson
Eon-UK	Neil Taylor
ESTA	Kris Szajdzicki
Gemserv	Jill Ashby
Intellect UK	Neil Lamonby
RWE Npower	Hazel Ward
SBGI	Mike Buss
Scottish Power	Graham Smith
SSE	Mark Knight
NMO	David Moorhouse

### 2. Apologies

2.1. SMDSG2 members:

AMO	
Consumer Focus	
First Utility	
Good Energy	
ICOSS	
OfCom	
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 two outstanding will be reported on at the next meeting.

## 5. Drafting of the deliverable

- 5.1. Alistair Manson presented a paper that looked to combine the group's thoughts on appropriate assurance for smart metering systems to be deployed at premises in GB in the Smart Metering Implementation Programme.
- 5.2. This paper will form the main SMDSG2 deliverable. The group discussed further changes to the paper live during the meeting.
- 5.3. The group then discussed the comments that had been submitted regarding the refined assurance assessment spreadsheet. Changes to the spreadsheet were made to the document live at the meeting.
- 5.4. The spreadsheet lists a number of actions. These will be included in the deliverable word document to ensure they are not missed. Ofgem will follow up relevant members/owners.
- 5.5. Alistair Manson (ERA) agreed to make the final changes to the main SMDSG2 deliverable in advance of circulation to SMDG. Dave Robinson (BEAMA) agreed to present the group's findings at SMDG.

## 6. Any Other Business

- 6.1. The group discussed technical issues regarding installation of a meter at a pre-mandated smart meter premise. The group proposed that this issue should be passed to SMD SG3 for consideration.
- 6.2. The group suggested that it is important that issues being passed to other groups are being considered. There have been instances where assumptions have been made in other groups which are not completely true. It was suggested that DCG should be informed about the assurance assumptions of the group so that everyone has the same assumptions. Ofgem will also look at how the lines of communication between the groups can be improved.
- 6.3. Accreditation bodies – The group was asked if accreditation bodies were an issue that needed to be considered. The group felt that this should be added to the risk and issues log.
- 6.4. The group would like to ask the SMDG for further clarification on the next SMDSG2 deliverable. This will be added to the SMDG agenda as AOB. The group discussed what the proposed scope of the group's next deliverable should be. The group suggested a range of questions that will be presented to SMDG at their next meeting for clarification. The group has been tasked to think about the questions posed in advance of the next meeting and come prepared with relevant assurance proposals (on the assumption that SMDG agrees with the proposed scope and questions).
- 6.5. The group suggested that there may be a need to review the SMD SG2 ToR as there is an inference that other deliverables are required which are not part of the deliverable set.
- 6.6. The group suggested that the scope of the SMDSG2 deliverable should be discussed by SMDG before another meeting occurs. It was agreed that the next meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> November be moved to 30<sup>th</sup> November instead.
- 6.7. List of questions defining the scope of the second deliverable "Draft Governance Options for functional requirements catalogue and technical specification document" and area found in 10

## 7. Actions

### 7.1. Actions carried forward

<b>Distribute the Assurance Options Definition Paper to SG2 in time for it to be added to the SG2 deliverable as an appendix.</b>	<b>Jill Ashby - Gemserv</b>
<b>Investigate and report back to SG2 on whether Ofgem Markets section has any existing provisions on SMS items being covered under regulated / non-regulated assets which might have a bearing on SMS commercial interoperability issues.</b>	<b>Ofgem (response is awaited to request for info placed)</b>

### 7.2. New Actions

<b>Revise the SMDSG2 deliverable for submission to SMDG Include assurance options paper as appendix Include assurance spreadsheet with deliverable</b>	<b>Alistair Manson – ERA, Dave Robinson – BEAMA to present</b>
<b>Issues to be raised with SG3 - Whether there are any technical issues relating to installation of a meter at a pre-mandated smart premise.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>
<b>Confirmation of how information will be communicated between expert groups.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>
<b>Add the capability of accreditation bodies to the risks and issues log</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>
<b>Clarify the scope of the SMDSG2 next deliverable</b>	<b>SMDG</b>
<b>Review SMD SG2 ToR</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>
<b>Circulate and consider the scoping questions presented to SMDG and come prepared to discuss assurance proposals at the next meeting.</b>	<b>Ofgem / All SMDSG2</b>
<b>Confirm arrangements for moving 9<sup>th</sup> November meeting to 30<sup>th</sup> November</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>

## 8. Review of meeting

- 8.1. It was suggested that the time could be used more effectively if participants carried out some background preparation for the deliverable 2 questions followed in advance of the meeting, and that break out groups considered specific questions during the day before feeding back at the end of the day.

## 9. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2010 – 10:00-16:00 - PA consulting, 123 Buckingham Palace Road, London, SW1W 9SR

## 10. Appendix questions for SMDG agreed at the meeting

10.1. Are these the questions SMDG wants SG2 to answer (if not what should the questions be)?

- What docs can we assume will apply; and in what depth / form?
- What drivers for change should we consider (e.g. govt policy; flawed function; technical innovations; other standards; information governance; evolution of DCC functions; network structures/ smart grids)? (timeframe for these to have an impact)
  - For example if there were no changes to functional spec for 20 years then no group would be needed; if only international standards were used only the relevant standards committee would be responsible.
- What type of governing principles will be required? Is the Smart Energy Code the overarching reference?
- Who will the owner be? Who will control change? Who will ensure it will remain fit for purpose?
- Who will carry out governance; what bodies are likely to be formed which will give guidance to the implementation (e.g. Central Design Authority but not a Smart Energy Panel; SG2 style group)?
- Should there be an interim governance body (answer the 'what did you mean questions')?
- What is the form of a Design Authority?
- What is the process for setting up the Governance body?
- How will governance be carried out?

10.2. Does SMDG want options for these or a specific recommendation?

10.3. Which other groups are considering aspects of governance? What are they?

10.4. The following is later work (beyond the next deliverable) that is likely to need a mechanism and specialist expertise that is different to SG2 and therefore currently not in scope. Does SMDG agree?

- Impact of functional requirements catalogue and technical specifications on existing regulatory frameworks and industry systems and processes;
- Dependence on definition of DCC
- Dependence on detailed technical specification

10.5. SMDG is asked to give SG2 a steer on any current thinking of governance bodies that may be relevant.