This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

MP092

'New Planned Maintenance Methodology'

Modification Report

Version 1.0

15 December 2020

Corporate member of Plain English Campaign
Committed to clearer communication
592

About this document

This document is a Modification Report. It sets out the background, issue, solution, impacts, costs, implementation approach and progression timetable for this modification, along with any relevant discussions, views and conclusions.

Contents

This document also has four annexes:

- **Annex A** contains the redlined changes to the Smart Energy Code (SEC) required to deliver the Proposed Solution.
- **Annex B** contains the full Data Communications Company (DCC) Preliminary Assessment response.
- **Annex C** contains the full responses received to the Refinement Consultation.
- **Annex D** contains the results of the trial that were presented to the Operations Group in December 2020.

Contact

If you have any questions on this modification, please contact:

Emmanuel Ajayi

020 8132 4134

emmanuel.ajayi@gemserv.com

1. Summary

This proposal has been raised by Darren Robbins from the DCC.

In February 2019, the DCC noted to the SEC Panel that the method for delivering Planned Maintenance releases was sub-optimum. The Panel agreed to a derogation of existing SEC conditions to allow the DCC to a trial a new approach regarding the delivery of Planned Maintenance. The results of the trial were presented to the Operations Group (OPSG) in November 2019 where it agreed the changes were an improvement. The SEC Panel subsequently granted an extension of the derogation for the Planned Maintenance trial to allow for the changes to be made to the SEC.

The new approach focused on how to differentiate between a High or Low Impact maintenance period. In order to fully assess changes and to ensure that the correct maintenance window is selected, the DCC used a Change Risk Calculator. The risk methodology involves core services, customer impact, complexity and downtime. It also amended the timings with which Planned Maintenance was scheduled and implemented.

The DCC confirmed there are no DCC System change costs required to implement this change following the trial. All SEC Parties will be impacted by this modification as the timings for Planned Maintenance will change. As this does not impact DCC Systems, implementation cost is limited to Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) time and effort. If approved, this modification will be implemented in the February 2021 SEC Release. This is a Self-Governance modification.

2. Issue

What are the current arrangements?

In February 2019, the DCC noted to the SEC Panel that the method for delivering Planned Maintenance releases was sub-optimum. As such it wished to move to a risk-based approach to help deliver Planned Maintenance releases more efficiently.

Whilst the SEC is silent on the methodology for scoping Planned Maintenance, it does set out when the Maintenance should occur and the timescales around publishing Maintenance schedules (Sections H8.3 and H8.4).

SEC Section H8.3 sets out that the DCC may only undertake Planned Maintenance between 20.00 hours and 08.00 hours, and that the duration of Planned Maintenance should not exceed six hours in any given month. Furthermore, Section H8.4 states the DCC must provide a schedule of Planned Maintenance at least 20 Working Days prior to the start of each month that the Planned Maintenance is due to occur.

Trial of a proposed new approach to Planned Maintenance

In 2019, the DCC began consideration of a revised approach to managing Planned Maintenance. Part of the new approach required amendments to existing rules of when the DCC was to produce a schedule of Planned Maintenance changes and at what times of day such changes should be

implemented. The DCC therefore requested the Panel grant it a derogation to these rules whilst a six-month trial on the new methodology was carried out.

The Panel agreed to a derogation of existing SEC conditions until November 2019[1] on the condition that the DCC first present an updated Forward Schedule of Change (FSC) to the OPSG and that clarity was provided over some of the terminology used. Following discussions at the OPSG a trial of the new Planned Maintenance approach began on 1 April 2019

Conclusions of the DCC trial

At the October 2019 Panel meeting, the DCC noted the trial was coming to an end and had proved a success, a view supported by feedback at the July 2019 OPSG meeting. The DCC requested an extension to the derogation whilst full results of the trial were presented to the OPSG in October and November 2019[2] and a resulting Modification Proposal to introduce the new approach could be raised.

The Panel initially granted a further three-month extension until February 2020 whilst the OPSG discussed the results and a modification could be initiated. The SEC Panel then approved the trial period to an enduring period, until such a time where the New Maintenance Methodology was implemented through this SEC Modification[3].

In July 2020, the DCC presented to the OPSG the overall strategy and approach of the New Maintenance Methodology measured alongside the objectives (described in Section 3). The DCC also presented the risk calculator used in its methodology to determine whether a change was a High or Low Impact change.

Latest results

In December 2020, the DCC presented further results of the trial to the OPSG measured against the objectives of the new maintenance methodology.

- There has been increased visibility of changes. The DCC provided evidence in February 2019 that there was only 32 changes on the FSC, whereas by 23 November 2020, there was 3,986 changes visible on the FSC.
- There has also been a massive increase in volumes of changes deployed across the DCC network. From July 2019 to July 2020 2,456 changes had been successfully deployed.
- The DCC highlighted that change success rates have been going up consistently since the start of the planned maintenance trial (May 2019).
- The DCC did note changes fail sometimes. 104 failures have occurred since 2019, with 19 of them causing significant impact. This means that more than 80% of failed changes cause minimal or no impact to the Service. This is due to rigorous run-book reviews, checkpoints and challenges. The DCC ensures formal lessons learned and actions are taken to address any changes failures.

Further details can be found in Annex D.

[1] OPSG_26_0511
[2] SECP_74_1511
[3] SECP_76_1701

What is the issue?

The issue is the Planned Maintenance methodology currently set out in the SEC does not differentiate the specific services, nor the business impact of changes. As there is no differentiation between Low or High impacts, this created a lack of inefficiency across maintenance as smaller changes that need to be implemented were not approached as effectively as for larger changes. The lack of differentiation has several impacts:

- Low impact changes are considered in the same way as complex or high-risk changes. For example, downtime on the Self-Service Interface (SSI) is treated in the same manner as Core Communication Services. The business impact and risks associated with these examples are very different.
- Notice periods are the same regardless of overall business impact. This results in unnecessary delays on Low impact, low risk changes.
- The existing lead times also result in significantly extended deployment times on changes. Any alterations to scheduled changes result in significant delays.
- With the specific constraint on downtime and with no differentiation on the impact of change on Users, the result is that very large numbers of changes, both high and low in impact, are implemented in a single change window. This increases complexity and risk, whilst simultaneously constraining the DCC's ability to deliver key changes in a timely manner.
- With a focus on downtime, the result can be that high risk or complex changes where no disruption to the Services is anticipated are not classed as Planned Maintenance and therefore do not get included in the forward schedule of change.

What is the impact this is having?

The impact of not changing the current arrangements is DCC would have to combine all changes into one window, adding unnecessary complexity into the release window. Combining all changes in one window would present inefficiency across DCC processes and wider industry.

Many of the changes included in the Maintenance windows are designed to resolve business and operational issues that impact the overall quality of DCC Services, as well as there being many changes specifically requested by the industry as enablers to their business.

3. Solution

Proposed Solution

The DCC is proposing implementing the new methodology on an enduring basis, to allow more low impact changes to be implemented more of the time and allow more focus on fewer high impact changes.

The aim of these changes are to:

- improve the visibility of changes;

- improve quality of changes;
- improve the throughput of changes aligned to demand;
- maintain focus on limiting downtime on high impact changes; and
- focus on business impact not just downtime.

The solution aims to improve visibility of changes to SEC Parties, improve quality of changes deployed, improve alignment to demand and focus on business impact rather than solely focusing on the amount of downtime. This requires update to the SEC to create the concept of High and Low Impact Maintenance windows and detailing the outage duration associated with each.

DCC Methodology

The new risk-based methodology developed to determine whether the category of the maintenance is High or Low Impact is based on the impact to 'core' services. If a change will impact a core service and thereby restrict a User's ability to send Service Requests it is considered High Impact; if it does not it is considered Low Impact.

This new DCC methodology proposes the introduction of two High Impact and up to six Low Impact Planned Maintenance windows per month. Whilst the Planned Maintenance would continue to take place between 20:00 and 08:00 hours (as per Section H8.3) each Low Impact Planned Maintenance window would have a maximum duration of six hours and High Impact Planned Maintenance would have a total maximum duration of six hours calculated across both windows. High Impact changes would have a minimum lead time of 20 Working Days and Low Impact changes a minimum lead time of 10 Working Days.

Notifying Users of Planned Maintenance

The DCC will continue to publish the schedule of Planned Maintenance (as per Section H8.4) and issue an email notification to all Parties 20 Working Days ahead of the month in which Planned Maintenance will occur. This notification will set out when the scheduled windows are for High Impact and Low Impact changes and provide high level information on what Parties should expect in each window. If additional Low Impact Planned Maintenance windows are required beyond this notice, a revised notice will be issued to Parties.

4. Impacts

This section summarises the impacts that would arise from the implementation of this modification.

SEC Parties

SEC Party Categories impacted			
✓	Large Suppliers	✓	Small Suppliers
✓	Electricity Network Operators	✓	Gas Network Operators

SEC Party Categories impacted			
✓	Other SEC Parties	✓	DCC

While Parties will not be directly impacted in implementing this modification, Maintenance on DCC Systems affects all SEC Parties as above. Whilst the Maintenance affects DCC Systems there are no changes to DCC Systems, only to the maintenance of them and the corresponding downtime. All Parties will be affected by DCC System downtime.

Four of the six respondents to the Refinement Consultation noted that there will be impacts on their organisations. One Large Supplier stated that whilst there are positives in the new methodology, there is still an impact on their organisation by certain systems being down when those changes impact their customers. Another Large Supplier also stated the impact on its business would be consequences to prepayment consumers, consequences to installation and commission and costs to Suppliers.

DCC System

There are no overall impacts on the DCC System in this modification but contract changes with the Communication Service Providers (CSPs) are required.

SEC and subsidiary documents

The following parts of the SEC will be impacted:

- Section A ‘Definitions and Interpretations’
- Section H 'DCC Services'
- Appendix AL ‘SMETS1 Transition and Migration Approach Document’

The changes to the SEC required to deliver the proposed solution can be found in Annex A.

Consumers

From a consumer perspective, there is unlikely to be any impact, as this modification still limits consumer impacting changes to one outage window per month.

A Large Supplier in the Refinement Consultation outlined there may be detrimental impact on consumers who have a prepayment meter as they will not have their top up credited to their meter. This runs the risk of added consumer contact or loss of confidence in their smart meter. The DCC responded by stating this is not correct and the outage limit for maintenance which impacts prepayment activities remains at six hours.

The respondent also added concerns of costs to Suppliers to try and manage the ensuing messaging to customers at times of material risk. The DCC responded noting there should be no need to message customers during Low Impact maintenance as smart meter functions will not be impacted.

Other industry Codes

This modification has no impact on other industry Codes.

Greenhouse gas emissions

This modification has no impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

5. Costs

DCC costs

There are no costs on the DCC to implement this modification,

Initially it was believed that this modification would require DCC System changes and a Preliminary Assessment was undertaken. However, upon further investigation and negotiation the DCC confirmed no costs would be incurred and no Impact Assessment required.

More information can be found in the DCC Preliminary Assessment response in Annex B.

SECAS costs

The estimated SECAS costs to implement this modification is two days of effort, amounting to approximately £1,200. The activities needed to be undertaken for this are:

- Updating the SEC and releasing the new version to the industry.

SEC Party costs

Two SEC Parties in the Refinement Consultation stated that there would be costs incurred on their business. One respondent stated that the change posed a risk to consumers with a prepayment meter, specifically in situations where downtime affects the consumer's inability to top up their meter. The SEC Party stated their business would have to manage the consumer's expectations, which may lead to compensating the consumer. No costs were provided from any respondent.

6. Implementation approach

Approach implementation approach

The Panel has agreed an implementation date of:

- **25 February 2021** (February 2021 SEC Release) if a decision to approve is received on or before 11 February 2021; or
- **24 June 2021** (June 2021 SEC Release) if a decision to approve is received after 11 February 2021 but on or before 10 June 2021.

This is a document only change and it has no impact on DCC Systems; it is simply aligning the SEC to the current DCC processes which are being used in the trial. Contractual changes between the

DCC and the CSPs are required, but do not affect the implementation lead time of this modification. The February 2021 SEC Release is the earliest SEC Release this modification could be included in.

7. Assessment of the proposal

Observations on the issue

The DCC presented to the OPSG the final output of the trial. The DCC concluded that the findings had been positive, and the trial had been a success. The DCC believed the new approach should be taken forward on an enduring basis by amending the current SEC provisions.

The Change Sub-Committee (CSC) understood the issue and noted the support for this change from OPSG members.

Solution development

DCC Methodology Development

Initially the DCC developed a new risk-based methodology to determine whether the category of the maintenance was High or Low Impact. This methodology involved multiple factors and assessment of core services, customer impact, complexity and downtime.

The methodology determined High Impact vs Low Impact by assessing:

- **Critical (Core) or non-critical service being impacted**

  Core services include anything affecting end-to-end communications between Service Users and Communications Hubs, Installation & Commission activities and previously scheduled Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 1 (SMETS1) migrations.

- **Consumer Impacting or non-consumer impacting**

  For instance, resolving issues that are preventing Prepayment or Pay As You Go (PAYG) customers topping up

- **Complex or easy**

  High Complexity requires multiple technical teams to implement the change, teams from different organisations and/or changes with no track record (one of a kind). Low complexity are all other changes, including changes with a single supplier and often a single team, a simple repeatable change, or slightly more complex changes that are proven and repeatable.

- **Downtime or no downtime**

  Downtime refers to whether the planned maintenance spans less or more than 10 minutes

How the Calculator works

Core Service

Core Services affected were given a score of 4, non-core services a score of 1 (this is referred to as service value in the calculator). Core services included anything affecting end-to-end communications

between Service Users and Communications Hubs, Installation and Commission activities and previously scheduled SMETS1 migrations.

Service	Caluculator
DUIS	4
DUIS1	4
DUIS2	4
DUIS3	4
Motorway	4
SMART M2M	4
Comms Hub Manager	4
Security Validator	4
Share Point	4
DCO Application	4

Service	Caluculator
OI / OT	1
SSI	1
SSMI	1
Remedy	1
Orchestration	1
Coverage Checker	1

Consumer affecting

Consumer affecting changes were given a score of 10; non-consumer affecting changes a score of 0

Downtime

Changes with a downtime of greater than 10 minutes were given a multiplier of 5; those with a downtime of less than 10 minutes a multiplier of 1

Complexity

High complexity changes were given a multiplier of 5; Low complexity change a multiplier of 2

○ **High complexity:**
▪ Multiple technical teams required to implement the Change
▪ Teams from different organisations required to support the Change
▪ Detailed Changes with no track record (1 of a kind Changes)
○ **Low complexity:**
▪ All other Changes not attributed to "High Complexity". Examples are:
• Changes contained within a single supplier, typically a single team
• A simple repeatable Change
• Slightly more complex Changes that are proven, repeatable, possibly automated and well-practiced
• Typically, single team implementation

Calculator

The individual variables would be summarised as below:

Core Service	Customer Affecting	Low Complexity	Downtime Greater than (>)10 mins
4	10	x 2	x 5
None Core Service	**None Customer Affecting**	**High Complexity**	**Downtime Less than (<)10 mins (caters for Failovers)**
1	0	x 5	x 1

This table shows how a number of different changes may be categorised and their lead times

Service Value	Customer Affecting	Complexity	Downtime	Total Score	Lead time
1	0	2	1	2	10WD
1	0	2	5	10	10WD
1	10	2	1	110	20WD
1	10	2	5	110	20WD
1	10	5	5	110	20WD
4	10	2	1	140	20WD
4	10	5	5	140	20WD

Following feedback from Users the DCC then amended this to a simpler method. Users continued to be concerned with any change that affected their business ability to send end to end communications. Therefore, the DCC changed the methodology to place any changes impacting the core services in a High Impact window, and changes not affecting core services in Low Impact windows. This has been operating for the last six months, and is the Proposed Solution set out in Section 3 above.

Could this change impact Prepayment customers?

One Large Supplier responding to the Refinement Consultation noted that it could not support the Proposed Solution for various reasons that it felt presented risks to consumers. It stated its key concerns were around a lack of rationale for the timing and windows proposed; extending the time allowed for planned maintenance from four hours to six hours (limited only to SSI) all month.

The DCC advised the amount of six hours remains the same for core services outage, and the amount of time allowed for SSI goes from four hours to a potential amount of 36 hours. However, prior to the modification, there has been a large amount of work done to improve the SSI over the trial period which has often used more than six hours per month.

The Large Supplier further presented its concerns that any outage, at any time, impacts prepayment meter customers because they top up at all times of the day and night. The DCC advised that any Low Impact maintenance will not disrupt the ability to perform prepayment top ups because the outage limit for maintenance which impact prepay activities remains at six hours.

The DCC further stated that it considers the risk to be minimal in that the extension is to Low Impact maintenance which does not disrupt the ability to apply top ups.

Another Large Supplier noted that whilst it agreed with the changes implemented in the modification, the commencement of any maintenance that affects DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) should not be starting at 20:00 as this directly impacts Prepayment customers. The principle of any maintenance is that customer top up impact should be completely avoided. The respondent believed that this is not the case and those involved with implementing the planned maintenance do not consider this as a factor. This change does not mention this as a consideration at all and it should be. The DCC responded advising that whilst it understood the concern, the SEC indicates that Planned Maintenance can be carried out within the hours of 20:00 to 08:00. Changing the hours of maintenance is out of scope for this modification.

Has the impact on Users been considered?

A Large Supplier stated that although there are positives in the new methodology it does not consider User impacts and is focused on the DCC's ability to define impact. There is still an impact on its business by certain systems being down when those changes impact its customers. The DCC responded by stating the rationale behind creating High and Low Impact windows is directly based on User impact. High Impact maintenance impacts core services which have maximum User impact and this is why there is no increase on the six hours currently allowed by the SEC. The DCC recognises that Low Impact maintenance does also impact Users but has taken this approach in order to de-risk the activities that impact "core" services and to allow it to put through the necessary volume of changes. The DCC believes that not being able to implement change, because of lack of hours, would ultimately have a far greater impact on Users.

A Network Party also considered that there needs to be a mechanism for the DCC to capture within the Performance Measurement Report (PMR) any instances of Low Impact Maintenance which unexpectedly results in disruption of end-to-end communications between Users and Communication Hubs. The DCC responded advising this is out of scope for this modification. However, this could be considered as a change to the PMR in another modification.

How much notice would Users receive of Unplanned Maintenance?

One Working Group member queried Unplanned Maintenance and how much notice Users would receive in these cases. The DCC confirmed that it would set out the planned maintenance at the beginning of the year. Any additional maintenance would be considered 'unplanned' and there could be as much as two months' notice for this, although there would be a minimum of 10 days' notice. The only exception would be where unplanned maintenance was an emergency. In a true event of an emergency, there is no minimum lead time as such, however, this is dependent on the scenario. In the event of an emergency incident fix then a change can even be raised retrospectively, however, Service Users would be informed by a major incident management communication.

A question was also raised about consumer impacts, for instance anything that might affect Prepayment top ups and what monitoring would happen. The DCC stated that this would be monitored by the Technical Operations Centre (TOC) as part of its Business as Usual monitoring and reporting. In addition, maintenance that may affect consumers would be carried out where possible between 20:00 and 02:00 to reduce consumer impacts.

Legal text comments

A Refinement Consultation respondent noted the need for a minor clarification in the legal text. Their recommendation was that 'either direction' be added after *'Users and Communications Hub'* under the definition of Planned Maintenance in SEC Section A 'Definitions and Interpretations' for greater clarity. The Proposer agreed to the minor clarification to the legal text, and the updated description of 'High Impact Planned Maintenance' within the definition for 'Planned Maintenance' now reads:

a) High Impact Planned Maintenance where one or more of the following is disrupted;

i. end-to-end communications between Users and Communications Hubs in either direction;

ii. install & commission activities; or

iii. previously scheduled SMETS1 migrations.

Another respondent also recommended that the removed clause of 'or poses a Material Risk of disruption to', not to be removed from the legal text.

> **Planned Maintenance:** *means, in respect of a month, Maintenance of the DCC Systems planned prior to the start of that month which will disrupt, or poses a Material Risk of disruption to, the provision of these services …*

The Proposer agreed that the definition should remain in the legal text, and this removed text has now been reinstated.

Are changes needed to Service Provider contracts?

The DCC initially believed that contractual changes would be required to fully deliver the solution, and a Preliminary Assessment was requested in November 2019 to assess this. The DCC's response was not provided until June 2020.

Following discussions with the Working Group in July 2020, SECAS asked the DCC to confirm whether contractual changes were needed and, if so, whether an Impact Assessment was required to determine the costs of this. The DCC was not able to confirm this until November 2020, when it informed SECAS that any contractual changes required would not require associated costs to the industry to deliver MP092 and so no Impact Assessment was required. Following this, SECAS was able to present the Modification Report to the Panel.

Support for Change

The OPSG has been supportive of this change following the success reported by DCC during the derogation period. The Working Group was also supportive of this change following discussion of the solution and results of the trial period.

Six Parties responded to the Refinement Consultation: three Large Suppliers, one Small Supplier and two Network Parties. Five of the six respondents agreed with the Proposed Solution. One of the Large Suppliers did not agree due to its concerns noted above over the potential impact of this modification on consumers and in particular Prepayment customers.

One respondent noted that the Proposed Solution makes it easier for the DCC to manage maintenance releases and believed there would be less chance of service disruption to Users. The other respondents generally agreed with the solution overall and stated that it is an efficient improvement on the current arrangements around Planned Maintenance.

One Large Supplier had several concerns regarding the progression of the modification and required further clarity from the DCC. SECAS facilitated discussion between the DCC and the Supplier to clarify all the issues. The Large Supplier confirmed that all its concerns had been adequately addressed.

The Panel agreed to progress this modification to report phase on the understanding that the Operations Sub-Group would monitor the installation of these Communications Hubs and the upgrading of the firmware by DCC to ensure no compatibility issues arise and that firmware upgrades by the DCC take place in a timely fashion after installation.

Views against the General SEC Objectives

Proposer's views

The Proposer believes this modification will better facilitate SEC Objective (b)[4] as the new Planned Maintenance methodology allows the DCC to better meet its licence obligations.

Industry views

Five of the six Refinement Consultation respondents agreed with the Proposer that this modification better facilitates SEC Objective (b) as it helps DCC to better meet its obligations and prioritise planned maintenance.

The other respondent disagreed that this modification better facilitates SEC Objective (b) as to work efficiently, the DCC should strive towards reducing downtime rather than changing its legal obligation of providing a reliable interface. The DCC responded noting it believe this modification will help plan and carry out maintenance more effectively, and that maintenance is required to keep the DCC Total System running efficiently.

Views against the consumer areas

This modification will provide benefits to consumers as the new maintenance methodology seeks to reduce maintenance downtime.

Improved safety and reliability

Refinement Consultation respondents were concerned that the modification did not address the impacts on consumers effectively. SECAS, in discussion with the DCC, was able to clarify that great consideration was given to the impacts on consumers under the trial period, and that the modification will have a neutral impact regarding reliability for consumers, as the modification presents no additional impacts to current arrangement around Planned Maintenance

Lower bills than would otherwise be the case

A Large Supplier also stated in the Refinement Consultation that the inability for prepay consumers to top up their prepayment meter due to downtime could lead to a negative impact on bills. The DCC was able to also able address this concern directly with the Large Supplier and this has been recorded in the discussion section above.

Reduced environmental damage

This modification has no impact in reducing environmental damage.

[4] Enable the DCC to comply at all times with the objectives of the DCC licence and to discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the DCC licence.

Improved quality of service

This modification could indirectly positively impact on improved quality of service by better ensuring the maintenance needed to keep the DCC infrastructure running efficiently can be efficiently scheduled.

Benefits for society as a whole

This modification has no impact on society as a whole.

Appendix 1: Progression timetable

This Modification will be presented to the SEC Panel on 11 December 2020. Once approved, a Modification Report Consultation will be issued.

Timetable	
Event/Action	**Date**
Draft Proposal raised	22 Oct 2019
Presented to CSC for decision	29 Oct 2019
Panel converts Draft Proposal to Modification Proposal	15 Nov 2019
Preliminary Assessment requested	18 Nov 2019
Preliminary Assessment returned	5 Jun 2020
Modification discussed with Working Group	1 Jul 2020
Refinement Consultation	20 Jul 2020 – 7 Aug 2020
SECAS asks DCC if Impact Assessment is required	4 Aug 2020
DCC confirmed no Impact Assessment is required	6 Nov 2020
Modification Report presented to Panel	11 Dec 2020
Modification Report Consultation	15 Dec 2020 – 11 Jan 2021
Change Board vote	20 Jan 2021

Appendix 2: Glossary

This table lists all the acronyms used in this document and the full term they are an abbreviation for.

Glossary	
Acronym	**Full term**
CSC	Change Sub-Committee
DCC	Data Communications Company
DUIS	DCC User Interface Specification
FSC	Forward Schedule of Change

Glossary	
Acronym	**Full term**
OPSG	Operations Group Sub-Committee
PAYG	Pay As You Go
PMR	Performance Measurement Report
SSI	Self-Service Interface
SEC	Smart Energy Code
SECAS	Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat
SMETS1	Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 1
TOC	Technical Operations Centre
WD	Working Day