

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

Note of discussion and actions from SMDSG1 Meeting No. 14c

From  
Date and time of Meeting  
Location

Paul Newman  
19<sup>th</sup> January 2011  
10:00-15:00  
PA Consulting, 123  
Buckingham Palace  
Rd, London SW1

### 1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Peter Morgan, Alex Campbell, Shaun Scullion.

1.2. SMDSG1 members:

BEAMA	Dave Robinson
Utilita	Phil Ketless
British Gas	Andrew Pearson
ENA	Alan Creighton
ERA	Simon Harrison
SBGI	Jeff Cooper
Gemserv	Sarah Gratte
AMO	James Evans
E.oN	Geoff Huckerby
RWE npower	Gary Coverson
EDF Energy	Bob Gibbs
Scottish Power	Grahame Weir

1.3. In attendance.

Astutim	Patrick Mitchell
---------	------------------

### Apologies

1.4. SMDSG1 members:

ESTA	
SSE	
Consumer Focus	
Ofcom	
First Utility	
ICoSS	
IntellectUK	

### 2. Update on the SM Design project next steps

2.1. Ofgem gave an update on the next steps for the SM design project:

- The first PDOG meeting planned for 14th January was postponed due to lack of preparation time and further consultation on the next steps for the SMDG being

required. It is anticipated to occur either Friday 21st January or (more likely) 28th January. Ofgem would keep the group informed of any decisions;

- The SMDG meeting on 27th January should provide a firm steer on the next steps for the SM design project;
- The SMDG on the 27th January will also discuss nominations for PDOG membership made by the (SG1) group. SG1 members should ensure that they provide any further nominations for PDOG membership to Ofgem by no later than Tues 25th January. Ofgem would keep the group informed of any decisions.

### 3. Review of actions

#### 3.1. Actions from meeting 14b.

<b>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)</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Pending</b>
<b>Ofgem to clarify in what form and when Technical Specifications can be released for wider consultation.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Complete.</b>
<b>The Group to nominate themselves or others to Chair, or be a member of, particular Working Groups;</b>	<b>SG1</b>	<b>Complete.</b>
<b>The Group to individually convey their thoughts on the 'Next Steps' presentation and their engagement with the proposed structure to their respective SMDG colleagues.</b>	<b>SG1</b>	<b>Complete.</b>
<b>Ofgem to distribute their 'Next Steps' presentation to SG1.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Complete.</b>
<b>Ofgem to document the planning session ('wall chart') output from Sg1 meeting 14b and distribute to SG1.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Complete.</b>

- 3.2. With respect to the second action, Ofgem said that they would endeavour to distribute, with appropriate caveats, the revised Statement of Design requirements (SoDR) to the SMDG and their community early the following week.

#### 4. SESIG HAN update.

- 4.1. Patrick Mitchell of Astutim provided a short presentation to the group on the SESIG HAN Communications Project (associated report: "*UK Smart Meter System Architecture Initial Review for SMDG*" SESIG HAN Communications Project ~ Dec 10).
- 4.2. The Smart Energy Special Interest Group (SESIG) has been allocated resources by the BIS Dept-sponsored Technology Strategy Board (TSB) to run a number of projects during its first year of operations (up to the end of March 2011). One such project is focussed in the area of local communications.
- 4.3. At the suggestion of the SESIG Steering Board this project has been given a flexible remit to support the SMDG HAN activity by providing skilled independent communications resource and applying this to best effect to address and move forward priority issues defined by the SMDG. SMDG invited the SESIG to comment (report) on the existing Smart Meter System (SMS) architecture.
- 4.4. The resulting report (above 4.1) summarily concluded that the current SMS architecture is somewhat interpretive and it would be useful if a confirmed technical architecture existed. The report also defined options for high-level SMS architectures for consideration.
- 4.5. The broad conclusions of the report were endorsed by the (SG1) group as being consistent with their own thinking from the start, but in mitigation the group said that their remit only allowed them to make recommendations, and not to design solutions, including architecture.
- 4.6. The group thanked Patrick for the presentation and responded / questioned:
  - (to Ofgem) how does / would the SESIG work fit with the proposed Design Working Group structure? And how could the PDOG and Working Groups best exploit the work and expertise of the SESIG?
  - (to Ofgem) at what point will a firm decision on architecture have to be made?
  - is (Ofgem) aware of any potential TSB funding for the *SM Design project's* HAN work?
  - that the SMS design work must be informed and aligned with current EU SM Working Group developments ("mapping" work especially), particularly in the area of the application data layer.
- 4.7. In response to the group's points, Ofgem and Astutim responded:
  - Ofgem said they would initially need to analyse documents such as SESIG report from a security-based perspective to be clear on the associated risks – and to be sure to capture those risks. From that (security) perspective, such pieces of work as the SESIG report were very useful in identifying and managing design risks;
  - Astutim thought that they would be well-placed to provide both technical expertise and an independent view of technology in the home, e.g. setting qualifying criteria for radio solutions, to the Working Groups in an ad hoc manner or perhaps to establish some such similar function as a discrete Working Group;
  - Ofgem said that there was potential TSB funding for HAN work, but they believed any funds were designated for defining test regimes not for actual testing;

- On the work of the EU SM Working Groups, Ofgem said that they were well aware of the data item mapping work going on and that it was mostly DLMS / PPM related, and that they were also aware that a number of EU countries were doing work on PPM. All of this work should, in Ofgem's view, be of overall advantage, not disadvantage, to the Programme. Also, L+G's Thomas Schaub, a leading light in EU SM standards and interoperability development, and a member of the DLMS/COSEM UA Management Committee, had attended and presented to the recent joint SMDG/DCG meeting hosted by Ofgem.

4.8. SBGI proposed that the SESIG paper's content, in particular the proposed architecture diagrams, could be used to augment the SBGI 'Strawman' paper presented to meeting 14 of the group (i.e. "Defined Options for Technical Interoperable Components (DOFTIC)"). This suggestion was endorsed by the group.

## **5. PDOG deliverable review**

5.1. Ofgem led a discussion of the proposed Planning, Drafting and Operations Group (PDOG) deliverables.

5.2. Ofgem updated the group on internal Ofgem discussions on the 'Next Steps' (for SM design work) proposals previously presented to the group:

- Current thinking is that there will be three Working Group (WG) "Sponsors" from the Programme, each providing oversight to a number of WGs;
- Sponsors will be sufficiently technically competent to have an understanding of the work of the WGs they oversee;
- Sponsors will generally only attend WG meetings by exception;
- A suite of simple standard templates is being produced by the Ofgem team for use by the WGs, Sponsors and the PDOG to help project-manage the design work;
- As previously suggested by the group, Ofgem will endorse the programme being the editor (pen-holder) for the Extended Statement of Design Requirements (ESoDR) product, but the ESODR working group will be chaired by industry. The ESODR WG will have overall responsibility for producing the deliverable under oversight of the programme. This approach is in line with the other WGs;
- The Ofgem team are currently soliciting volunteers from the SM Security Technical Experts Group (STEG) to join specific Working Groups to provide security input. A representative from the Security team will sit on the PDOG.

5.3. The group raised the following points in response:

- If no minutes are taken by the WGs, then how will those not attending remain informed? Ofgem said that they anticipated that WGs would be keeping appropriate records, though perhaps not formal minutes.
- There was a risk that the ERA could appear to be somewhat over-represented as they had proposed representatives for every WG. Ofgem said that composition of the WGs had not yet been decided and they would bear in mind the mix of organisational representation in the WGs when making proposals to the SMDG.
- The 'big six' energy suppliers were well-represented by nomination but there appeared to be a lack of small supplier representation on the WGs. Ofgem said that this was a concern, but the smaller suppliers, as represented on the SMDG Sub-

Groups, had had equal opportunity to be involved in the WGs. Again, Ofgem would bear the point in mind when making proposals on WG composition.

- There may be a conflict if STEG representatives on WGs were from the same organisation as some other WG members. Ofgem said that they would take potential conflicts into account when considering the STEG responses (to the invitation to be involved with WGs).
- Was there a possibility of the STEG “over-engineering” security at the expense of technical design? Ofgem said they were confident that this wouldn’t be the case, and the SM risk assessment, which was itself an iterative document, would provide a good reference guide for balancing security requirements against technical design. Ongoing, it was unclear who would own the risk assessment but Ofgem thought that the proposed Smart Energy Code may be a suitable vehicle for assigning future security responsibilities.

## 6. Planning, Drafting and Operations Group (PDOG) planning

- 6.1. Ofgem led a group discussion on PDOG and WG work-planning; high-level timeline for deliverables, meeting schedules etc.
- 6.2. Ofgem maintained their view that the WGs should be proactive and largely autonomous in planning their work and scheduling their meetings (though with the proviso that WG meeting dates should be scheduled in advance). Ofgem said that the programme was available to support these activities, as might the PDOG and SMDG be, but that help should be by exception.
- 6.3. Ofgem considered that the WGs themselves were best-placed to organise their own work schedules and meeting arrangements as they could then take into account the particular factors applying, e.g. the dispersal of WG members.
- 6.4. ERA informed the group that they had elaborated the draft high-level Gantt chart of SM design activities included with the first Project Initiation Document (PID) draft (i.e. the group’s deliverable four to SMDG) and they would share that timeline with the group to assist planning going forward.
- 6.5. Ofgem said that they would issue a draft PID to the WGs to complete which would require, *inter alia*, the entry of milestones for each WG. Ofgem could then use this data to construct an initial overall plan for the design work.
- 6.6. SBGI provided a previously-prepared table which attempted to map the work to complete one component of the Technical Specification deliverable - *Defined Options for Technically interoperable components (DOFTIC)* – with the proposed deliverables of the WG’s (table: “*SBGI Architecture group Proposals.xls*”).
- 6.7. Ofgem led a flipchart session to attempt to describe in outline the structure of the ESoDR:
  - Functional Requirements suggested chapters
    - Physical
    - Safety
    - Security
    - Tariffs
  - Splitting Functional Requirements by component (contentious areas)
    - Data comms – not Use cases but more detailed requirements on how the system will deal with some messages (interfaces) – possible Appendix which defines an interface)
    - Application layer definitions (possibly as Appendix)

- Access mechanisms
  - PPM
  - Local access
- Data Model
  - List of data items
  - Attributes
- Glossary of Terms
- Assurance
  - Test requirements
  - Link to Normative References
  - Use case (to explain how it operates)
  - Security implications?
  - Data Items
  - Expanded narrative – clarity

6.8. The group gave broad support to Ofgem’s position that there was not yet a requirement to establish a dedicated WAN Working Group, as that area remained within Data Comms Group’s responsibility.

6.9. ERA provided a table of their proposals for (ERA) Working Group resources to the Group. The group were generally content with the ERA’s resource proposals at this stage. ERA would distribute the table to the group.

## 7. Any other business

7.1. None.

7.2. Non-domestic and other non mainstream issues – None raised.

## 8. Risks and issues

8.1. No new risks or issues were identified but the group expressed some concern about the further delay to establishing a structure for new ways of working for the design groups. This exacerbated the project’s existing risk of not completing their work to schedule (i.e. by July 2011).

## 9. Review of meeting

9.1. All proposed the meeting was productive, but the group further emphasised the risk of delay in establishing the new structure.

9.2. One of the group asked Ofgem to ensure that Sub-Group2 (Governance) were represented on the PDOG. Ofgem confirmed that this would be the case.

## 10. Review of actions from meeting today

10.1. Actions

<p><b>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)</b></p>	<p><b>Ofgem</b></p>	<p><b>Pending</b></p>
---	---------------------	-----------------------

<b>Ofgem to receive and collate nominations from SG1 for the proposed Working Groups</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>28<sup>th</sup> Jan 2011</b>
<b>Ofgem to inform SG1 of progress in establishing a date (and format) for the first meeting of the PDOG.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> Jan 2011</b>
<b>Ofgem to keep Patrick Mitchell of Astutim informed of HAN Working Group development.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Ongoing.</b>
<b>To use the SESIG report to SMDG on SM Architecture to augment the "<i>Defined Options for Technical Interoperable Components (DOFTIC)</i>" paper.</b>	<b>SBGI</b>	<b>11<sup>th</sup> Feb 2011</b>
<b>To distribute the expanded Detailed Design Requirements PID Gantt chart on PDOG and WG activities to SG1.</b>	<b>ERA</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> Jan 2011</b>
<b>To distribute their proposals for Working Group Resourcing to the Group.</b>	<b>ERA</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> Jan 2011</b>
<b>To discuss and decide the 'pen-holder' role on the SMDG for the four main components of the Technical Specification</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>31<sup>st</sup> Jan 2011</b>