

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

Note of discussion and actions from SMDSG1 Meeting No. 14

From  
Date and time of Meeting  
Location

Paul Newman  
13<sup>th</sup> December 2010  
10:00-16:00  
Ofgem, 9 Millbank  
London SW1

### 1. Present

1.1. Ofgem – Peter Morgan, David Fletcher, Shaun Scullion.

1.2. SMDSG1 members:

IntellectUK	Chris Shire	
BEAMA	Dave Robinson	
British Gas	Gareth Williams	
EDF Energy	Bob Gibbs	
ENA	Alan Creighton	
Engage-consulting (ERA)	Simon Harrison	
ESTA	David Spalding	
SBGI	Jeff Cooper	
SSE	Neil Green	
Utilita	Phil Kettless	
AMO	James Evans	
Scottish Power	Grahame Weir	
Utilita	James Rivers	

### Apologies

1.3. SMDSG1 members:

E.ON	
RWE npower	
Consumer Focus	
Good Energy	
Gemserv	
Ofcom	
First Utility	
ICoSS	

### 2. Introductions

2.1. None required.

### 3. Review of actions

3.1. Actions from meeting 13.

<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>Distribute to SG1 the risks and issues logs as presented to SMDG.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Completed.</b>
<b>To arrange suitable SG1 liaison with the SM Data Privacy and Security Workstream to ensure that their respective products are properly aligned.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Completed. From Jan 11 a STEG member will be attached to SG1.</b>
<b>To check with the relevant ETSI representative on WAN standards</b>	<b>ERA</b>	<b>Completed.</b>
<b>BEAMA / SBGI to solicit their members with a view to quantifying (via a cost range) the additional cost of providing the level of tariff complexity illustrated in BG's paper. Subsequently to provide that quantification to SG1 (note: <i>after</i> the updated BG paper is made available).</b>	<b>SBGI / BEAMA</b>	<b>20/12/10</b>
<b>(Re OP.5) to see if this can be clarified by reviewing EN62054-21 and reporting back to SG1.</b>	<b>SBGI / BEAMA</b>	<b>20/12/10</b>
<b>SBGI to add some text on field installation and maintenance to the 'Interoperability' Product Description and re-issue it.</b>	<b>SBGI</b>	<b>Completed.</b>
<b>To revise the document "Interoperability Issues v0.3.doc" in line with SG1 meeting 12 review comments and issue a final version to SG1.</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>Completed.</b>
<b>Re functional requirement ES10 (The smart metering system shall support measurement of other power quality data including: voltage, frequency and sag and swell information, harmonic distortion) to distribute to the Group their paper on Voltage Alarm Requirements.</b>	<b>ENA</b>	<b>Completed.</b>

<b>To further revise the Catalogue Appendix 2 and the supporting narrative in line with the Group's proposed positions and to re-distribute to the Group</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>Completed.</b>
--	--------------	-------------------

#### 4. HAN requirements and use case workshops progress review

4.1. ERA reported back from the Use Case (UC) Workshops, of which four had been held to date with two planned for w/c 13<sup>th</sup> Dec:

- good progress is being made by the UC Groups, which have remained focussed on the task;
- the Group are now producing draft detailed UCs down to a level of interoperability which they believe will be suitable for manufacturers;
- Pre-pay, Meter Settings and Meter Reading all have draft UCs;
- on current progress so far, the Group may have as much as 80% of the planned UCs completed by end-Jan;
- Alistair Manson is working on a timeline for the Group's work and will share with SG1;
- The use cases can be found here: <https://sites.google.com/site/smdgucwg/>

4.2. The UC work would not necessarily drive out all the required data items to an 'engineering' level and a definitive data items list was still required which will expand on the list already produced by BG for the Group. The Group discussed what granularity of data items would be required over and above what had already been produced by BG, and how the UC outputs would map to those data items, and how both would then map to the selected communications protocols. ENA provided a view on what they thought the DNOs would require in terms of data items detail. ENA emphasised the importance of prescriptively describing the data items to prevent misinterpretation (i.e. [data item name] [data item descriptor] as a minimum).

4.3. ENA also said that, from a DNO perspective, they would like to know who would be defining the 'overall' Use Cases (i.e. inside/outside of the premises). Ofgem said that there was a joint meeting scheduled on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> Dec between DCG and SMDG to specifically examine the DLMS /COSEM standard in detail and that was the sort of question that meeting might seek to address (SH of ERA volunteered to attend that 20<sup>th</sup> Dec meeting on behalf of the group).

4.4. The Group proposed an approach to move the discussion on, i.e.:

- As the UC work progressed it would produce outputs on the data items which could use elements of BG and other's work already done;
- The UC work will be mapped to the revised functional requirements;
- ERA will continue the discussion with the UC group's manufacturing reps to get their view on what manufacturers might require;
- The 'Applications Data Layer Working Group' mentioned in the PID under item 5 may be the right forum to take this (mapping) work forward.
- Alistair Manson would add some appropriate activities to his timeline to reflect the group's discussion. These activity timelines could be refined with the benefit of the early UCs.

## 5. Review delivering detailed design requirements deliverable

- 5.1. The Group reviewed the draft Product Initiation Document (PID) for the group’s fourth deliverable “Draft outline proposals for format and scope of technical specifications” (document: “SMDG Detailed Design Requirements PID 0\_4.doc”).
- 5.2. The group asked where variants would feature. The revised Functional Requirements would include a paragraph stating that variants remained to be defined.
- 5.3. ERA took an action to revise the document in line with the group’s comments and to re-issue the document to SG1. In the interim, the group took a collective action to consider the ‘risks and issues’ section of the PID and provide any thoughts to ERA, with the benefit of the SMDG risks and issues register which was available at the meeting.
- 5.4. The group proposed that Ofgem provide the SMDG with an early sight of the document prior to its scheduled presentation to SMDG in January in order that the SMDG could validate the scope, format and content of the deliverable.

## 6. HAN definition process

- 6.1. ERA led a review of their HAN paper produced on behalf of the group (document: “ERA HAN Definition Process.docx”). It was too early for the group to draw any conclusions or make any decisions from the paper but the next (HAN) steps were summarised as:
  - Establish HAN working group;
  - Define data items and other requirements activities (UC Group);
  - Design/define HAN evaluation criteria;
  - Decision points – Application Layer, Physical Solution (wired or wireless);
- 6.2. Ofgem / ERA mentioned the recent HAN workshop where organisations that operated in the mobile and wireless space were represented. One particular organisation was mentioned as a potential technology collaborator for laboratory and field-testing. Ofgem took an action to distribute a recently published General Electric White Paper on wireless communication technology options for smart grid enabled devices.

## 7. Any other business

- 7.1. (AMO) Asked if there was anything from the forthcoming non-domestic meeting that the group might need to consider. The group thought that there was probably not, but AM of ERA was attending and would report back to the group.

## 8. Review of actions from meeting 13

- 8.1. Actions carried forward

<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>
<p><b>BEAMA / SBGI to solicit their members with a view to quantifying (via a cost range) the additional cost of providing the level of tariff</b></p>	<p><b>SBGI / BEAMA</b></p>	<p><b>20/12/10</b></p>

<b>complexity illustrated in BG's paper. Subsequently to provide that quantification to SG1 (note: after the updated BG paper is made available).</b>		
<b>(Re OP.5) to see if this can be clarified by reviewing EN62054-21 and reporting back to SG1.</b>	<b>SBGI / BEAMA</b>	<b>20/12/10</b>

## 8.2. Meeting actions

<b>To distribute the Use Case slides presented at SG14 and the STEG slides on SMIP Interfaces and High-level Architecture to SG1</b>	<b>ERA</b>	<b>17/12/10</b>
<b>To clarify whether there might be further consultation on the group's revised Functional Requirements (SoDR Appendix 2) before July.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>17/12/10</b>
<b>To provide advance notice to BSI Convenors in preparation for the review of the group's Normative references document.</b>	<b>ERA</b>	<b>20/12/10</b>
<b>To distribute all (11) SG3 papers to the SMDG to SG1.</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>17/12/10</b>
<b>To review and provide comments to Ofgem on the SMDG risks and issues register.</b>	<b>SG1</b>	<b>20/12/10</b>
<b>To provide to ERA any thoughts on the risks and issues section of the Detailed Design Requirements PID.</b>	<b>SG1</b>	<b>15/12/10</b>
<b>To provide SMDG with an early sight of the group's deliverable 4 - <i>SMDG Detailed Design Requirements PID 0_4.doc</i>. All SG1 to brief their SMDG rep in advance.</b>	<b>Ofgem / SG1</b>	<b>16/12/10</b>
<b>Distribute the General Electric White Paper on HAN solutions to SG1</b>	<b>Ofgem</b>	<b>16/12/10</b>
<b>Insert the Evaluation Criteria table into the HAN selection paper (as an Appendix) to SMDG</b>	<b>ERA</b>	<b>16/12/10</b>

<b>Summarise the implications of the 11 SG3 docs on the tech spec delivery for a paragraph/table in the PID (e.g. the “so what”)</b>	<b>BG</b>	<b>20/12/10</b>
<b>To provide a ‘Strawman’ document providing an initial view of potential documentation required to deliver the Product Description for Interoperable Component Requirements and Defined Options as referenced by the PID.</b>	<b>SBGI</b>	<b>16/12/10</b>

## 9. Risks & issues

9.1. The SMDG risks and issues register was made available at the meeting but not beforehand and was referred to in item 5. The group took an action to review the register individually by the next meeting (see action).

## 10. Review of meeting

10.1. The Group felt the meeting was productive. Also, BG re-iterated their earlier point that they thought it important for the group to get SMDG’s advance view on the group’s deliverable four to ensure that they were on the right track with it before formally submitting the document.

## 11. Date of next meeting

11.1. Monday 20th December 2010 – 10:00-16:00 – Gemserv, 10 Fenchurch Street, London EC3.