

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.

MP181 'Meter Asset Provider access to asset related data held by the DCC'

March 2022 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Elizabeth Woods	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Anik Abdullah	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
David Kemp	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Tom Rothery	DCC
Emma Johnson	British Gas
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Nigel King	E.ON
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davis	ESG Global
Martin Bell	EUA
Peter Hoare	Kaifa Metering
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Elias Hanna	Smart ADSL
Audrey Smith-Keary	SSE - OVO
Emslie Law	SSE - OVO
Matthew Alexander	SSN
Gemma Slaney	WPD

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, the Proposed Solution and the findings from the Data Communications Company (DCC) Preliminary Assessment.

Issue

- Meter Asset Providers (MAPs) and meter Manufacturers wish to access smart asset-related data held by the DCC:
 - Global Unique Identifier (GUID)
 - Device type, Manufacturer and model
 - Device firmware version
 - Device status
 - Communication Service Provider (CSP) region
 - Supplier ID (this has been added following the request of meter Manufacturers)
 - Communications Hub make, model and firmware version (this has been added following the request of the Energy and Utilities Alliance (EUA))
- This data is held within the DCC Systems and was initially thought to be confidential
- MP181 asks that the SEC is amended to enable the DCC to provide a service as an Explicit Charge within SEC Section K 'Charging Methodology' to disclose the above data.

Proposed Solution

- The DCC to provide a 'paid for' service for MAPs and Manufacturers to use
- Once implemented, the service will not impact Parties not using it
- MAPs will be requested to provide proof that they are the owner of the asset(s) via SharePoint (GUID list)
- The DCC is to retrieve the dataset requested by the relevant MAP or Manufacturer from its Technical Operations Centre (TOC)
- The DCC is to provide the dataset to the relevant MAP or Manufacturer with notification

DCC Preliminary Assessment

- The business requirements can be met in full and delivered using existing data available in the TOC
- A single .CSV file per MAP/Manufacturer will be made available on a private SharePoint or on an existing DCC SharePoint on a fixed date or working day
- For meter Manufacturers, extracts will be produced for all Devices relevant to the Manufacturer and will be delivered back to their own dedicated section in the existing DCC SharePoint site

- Rough order of magnitude (ROM) costs for Design, Build and Pre-Integration Testing (PIT): £45,000 - £65,000
- DCC Impact Assessment to take 30 Working Days and will cost £20,000

Working Group Discussion

GDPR

SECAS informed the Working Group of the SEC Lawyer's position that the DCC can disclose the requested data if it is carrying out 'permitted business'. A Working Group member (EL) queried whether this means that DCC can disclose any data if carrying out 'permitted business'. The DCC (TR) responded to state that the DCC cannot carry out any activities that contravene any of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) principles but if it is allowed by law and codified in the SEC then the DCC could then perform the relevant activity.

Cost of the modification

A Large Supplier representative (RB) commented that Suppliers making the data available within the DCC's systems will have an associated cost for Parties and sought confirmation that the set-up costs of the Proposed Solution would not be borne from DCC Users that will not use the solution. They also asked whether MAPs would pick up a share of the costs for collecting and processing this data going forward. Another member (JG) queried how the up-front costs would be picked up. SECAS (BB) noted the DCC's Preliminary Assessment had stated any set-up costs would be picked up through the Explicit Charge, and not charged as part of the modification's implementation.

The Proposer (LH) stated that the data is already held by the DCC, and that any future data will be uploaded by Suppliers as part of business as usual (BAU). This is regardless of the modification being implemented. They considered that Parties that do not utilise this service will not be financially impacted.

The usage frequency was queried as this will impact the cost of the Explicit Charge. The DCC (TR) stated that the set-up costs will be offset the more the service is used. A Large Supplier representative (RB) commented that after the initial set up costs have been paid for, any additional Users will be investing money back into the DCC.

Notification of the available report

SECAS asked the DCC how a Party will be notified when a new report has been made available. The general consensus is that this will be via email, however the DCC will confirm this when further refining the Proposed Solution.

MAP GUID list accuracy

SECAS informed the Working Group that to use the service, a MAP will provide a GUID list to the DCC as proof that it is the owner of the asset it is requesting data for. The Working Group questioned the accuracy of these GUID lists. This relates to how up to date the list would be and whether a MAP has acquired or lost Devices since the GUID list was last produced (MAPs can churn Devices

between different MAPs). The Proposer stated that in this instance, the MAP would re-submit an updated GUID list following any changes in their inventory and advised that these lists are updated frequently.

The Working Group also queried how the DCC will validate a MAP's GUID list. The Proposer stated that the DCC would be able to check for discrepancies between a MAP's uploaded files (such as duplicates). The Working Group considered that ad hoc requests for the reports could be problematic. SECAS noted there are instances where Parties update files every 24 hours and make them available to the DCC (such as D0350 files). The Proposer commented that the transfer of Devices between MAPs is not a frequent occurrence.

A Large Supplier representative (JG) commented that the approach for updating the GUID list must be consistent across all MAPs. Updates should also be made regularly rather than ad-hoc. In terms of ensuring only relevant data is made available, a MAP representative (CS) commented that it would be very difficult for a MAP to duplicate a GUID or Advanced Shipment Notice (ASN) for an asset they do not own. This would make it unlikely that MAPs will access data for assets that they do not own.

A Large Supplier representative (JG) commented that they manage their assets in-house and have experience of buying and selling assets, reiterating that the Proposed Solution needs to facilitate for this activity.

Business case

A Large Supplier representative (JG) enquired what the asset data will be used for. The Proposer responded that it would help identify Device issues such as out of date or incorrect firmware, which the MAP will then be able to advise its customers (Suppliers) on how to fix. They advised that this will be of particular benefit to Small Suppliers who have limited resource to manage firmware upgrades. The Proposer stated that the Proposed Solution will allow them to be more proactive and better mitigate against issues. They also informed the Working Group that MAPs will be in contact with all Manufacturers whose Devices they own regarding the findings following data analysis.

Another Working Group member (MB) advised they had seen issues in the past and agreed it would be useful for MAPs to have better sight of what Devices are on what firmware version. They could then advise on upgrades and other operational matters. A Working Group member (RB) noted a lot of churn contracts have an obligation to keep firmware on Devices up to date. They queried if there was an opportunity for MAPs to pursue Suppliers for failing on these obligations.

SECAS (JM) asked if there was an indication for how many MAPs are going to use the services. The Proposer commented that this will depend on the how much the service will cost.

SECAS advised that the Device Type of an asset can change when a firmware upgrade provides additional functionality.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS and the Proposer will review the draft legal text;
- SECAS will issue the Refinement Consultation; and

- Subject to the comments received in the consultation, SECAS will present the Modification Report to the Change Sub-Committee under the recommendation that it enters the Report Phase.