

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.

‘User Demand and Network Traffic Insights’ October 2024 Issues Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
	Francesca Scott (FS)	EDF
	Amy Cox (AC)	EDF
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MRa)	Scottish Power
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
Other SEC Parties	Beth Tatton (BT)	Calisen Metering
	Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
Network Parties	Hajrah Asif (HA)	Northern Power Grid
	Shuba Khatun	SSEN

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB)	Gav Parrott (GP)	David Walsh (DW)
Paul McShane (PS)		
SECAS		
Simon Grimwood (SG) <i>WG Chair</i>	Rachel Black (RBI) <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	Elizabeth Woods (EW)
Marc Rhodes (MRo)	Georgie Severin (GSe)	Ali Beard (AB)

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, and a view of the Proposed Solution.

Background

- Following the implementation of [MP116 'Service Request Forecasting'](#) the SEC does not currently place any obligation on DCC Users to provide demand assumptions or share details of their future or upcoming traffic demands.
- A DCC User could significantly increase network demand with little or no notification to the DCC risking the performance of the network.
- Post Feb 22 there are new use cases and/or significant new traffic demands.

Potential Solution

- Implement a SEC obligation on DCC Users to provide quarterly insights and plans relating to their forecast traffic including new use cases, increased roll out, and innovations.
- Introduce a standardised template.
- The DCC would require Users to provide lead-times for increased levels of usage and/or new traffic patterns.
- Possible exception for small Users and low usage.
- If there are no significant changes to be reported compared to last submission, then Users can indicate this and there is no further requirement to provide information in that submission.
- 'Other Users' would be included in the obligation.

Issues Group Discussion

An issues group member (EL) suggested that it had already been established through the outcome of MP116 that Users are unable to accurately forecast and this activity best resides with the DCC and this change feels like it is going back on that. They went on to question whether it is Supplier Users causing the issue as they are not changing their behaviour and have been operating the same way for the last five years or is it Other Users and parties that are causing the issues.

The Proposer (GP) stated that they were not asking Suppliers to set up teams to do demand forecasting like they used to. Recognising that it's been a linear growth driven by roll out and SMETS1 migration. In the last year or so the DCC have seen new use cases and new Users using the network in different ways. While the DCC have lots of information on what's happened before it is less predictable for new Users and use cases. The Proposer went on to state that unless the DCC get different insights from Users how do they get stronger assumptions? It's about sharing insights to factor into demand forecasting that the DCC share with Service Providers on a quarterly basis. If change is minimal the DCC don't want people filling out forms needlessly but need to have a mechanism through the SEC to gain insight where there are significant changes in behaviour from existing or new Users.

An issues group member (EL) suggested that a lot of traffic is driven by users of Other Users and it seems that there isn't much understanding of this so it may be worth better understanding this use case.

An issues group member (RB) endorsed what had been said by (EL) and added that he believed that 'bland obligations detached from evidence' are unlikely to work. He queried what the issue is that needs to be addressed or is it just generalised concern? They went onto state that there is a need to bring together the evidence that the Proposer has mentioned. The member stated that activity at peak times should be the focus which would not be addressed by a generalised obligation. They suggesting looking at the specific concerns of the DCC and how and when they will impact the network.

An issues group member (JM) questioned the value in providing insights that aren't accurate as proven in the past. They suggested a better approach was to look at when change was occurring and how it may affect traffic profiles.

The Proposer (GP) reiterated the approach was not looking to put in place something where all Users have to complete detailed responses every quarter and it was intended to be 'light touch'. The need for insight is where Users change the demand that they put on the network in order for the DCC to plan accordingly as there is currently a gap in insights for the future.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to work with proposer to better define the Proposed Solution.