

This document is classified as **Clear** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Recipients can distribute this information to the world, there is no limit on disclosure. Information may be shared without restriction subject to copyright.

MP244 ‘Device Alerts for Smart Meter credit replenishment’

August 2024 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF Energy
	Amy Cox (AC)	EDF Energy
	Francesca Scott (FS)	EDF Energy
	Clare Manning (CM)	EON
	Sharon Armitage (SA)	EON
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Joanne Rush (JR)	SSE
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Small Suppliers	Simon Moore (SM)	Bryt Energy
	Steve Blackler (SB)	E Gas & Electricity
Other SEC Parties	David Jones (DJ)	Alt Han Co
	Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
	Beth Tatton (BT)	Calisen Metering
	Rob Heath (RH)	Calisen Metering
	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
	Craig Biffen (CB)	EUA
Network Parties	Kelly Kinsman (KK)	NGED
	Stuart Blair (SB)	Northern Power Grid
	Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN
	James Murphy (JM)	Stark

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB)	David Rollason (DR)	
David Walsh (DW)	Rosie Davies (RD)	
Citizens Advice		
Emily Stone (ES)		

Other Participants		
SECAS		
Simon Grimwood (SG) <i>Meeting Chair</i>	Alexandra Scott (AS) <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	Elizabeth Woods (EW) <i>Lead Analyst</i>
Mo Sumro (MS) <i>Lead Analyst</i>	Georgie Severin (GS) <i>Lead Analyst</i>	Ben Giblin (BG) <i>Lead Analyst</i>
Rainer Lischetzki (RL) <i>SECAS Consultant</i>		

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified and an update in response to points raised at the July 2024 Working Group.

Issue

- Multiple scenarios where a Supply could have exhausted its credit value potentially resulting in loss if of power.
- There are currently no Device Alerts to notify a Supplier of issue resolution e.g., credit being topped up.
- This impacts Suppliers' ability to proactively provide support to vulnerable consumers who might be rationing or Self-Disconnecting.
- It also adds potentially avoidable traffic to the Data Communications Company (DCC), as Suppliers resort to sending SRV7.4 'Read Supply Status' multiple times to receive an update.

Business Requirements

Business Requirements		
Ref.	Requirement	Responsible for delivery
1	A SMETS2 Device Alert notifying a Supplier of the re-enablement of a Supply following the receipt of various Device Alerts relating to scenarios where credit limits have been exceeded or exhausted.	DCC Meter Manufacturers

Working Group Discussion

Assessment of Change

An attendee of the Working Group (DD) highlighted that the intended implementation for the solution would be 2026. They go on to say that based on this, the actual benefits of the solution will not be in place for years. Their concern is therefore that the price to pay for the solution to be implemented will not be conducive to any cost savings.

DD goes on to mention that the current workaround of utilising Service Request Variant (SRV) 7.4. 'Read Supply Status' is functional, and more organisations will implement this workaround as this solution will not be in place for another two to three years.

They also highlighted that the cost for the Data Communications Company (DCC) Full Impact Assessment is relatively low, compared to the wider industry costs. The contentious point in the modification is the impact on Devices, and as such the question would be whether the industry is prepared to accept the impact.

Solution Development

Another attendee of the Working Group (RB) questioned whether anything had changed from the previous presentation at the July 2024 Working Group. SECAS (GS) confirmed that some clarity was provided on Non-GBCS/Non-Mandated Alerts and the impact on Device firmware this modification would have. The DCC (DW) added that a question had been raised around the definition of the two modes in the Preliminary Impact Assessment, which SECAS took as an action to clarify at this Working Group, before the modification can progress.

SECAS posed the question as to whether the Full Impact Assessment should be requested. The Working Group agreed further work should be undertaken before the Full Impact Assessment is requested. A member of the Working Group (RB) highlighted the modification is going against the Technical and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) recommendations and suggested for the modification go ahead once the TABASC has been consulted and an approved solution is put forward.

The Working Group Chair (SG) explained that TABASC had put forward a recommendation, however the modification process is Proposer-led, and their view was that the Alert should be mandated. The Proposer (KC) clarified their stance that the mandated Alert would be a benefit to the industry, as there are no tools to monitor self-rationing and self-disconnecting consumers at present.

Another attendee of the Working Group questioned what the next steps would be, as the Impact Assessment could not be requested. SECAS (GS) highlighted that the solution would be discussed with the Proposer and TABASC. Depending on the feedback, this may require a further Refinement Consultation.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to liaise with Proposer to develop the solution further;
- SECAS to present the solution to TABASC.