

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.

MP247 ‘Future Dating of Service Requests for SMETS1 Devices’

March 2024 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Rachel Black (RBI)	SECAS
Kev Duddy (KD)	SECAS
Elizabeth Woods (EW)	SECAS
Mo Sumro (MS)	SECAS
Georgie Severin (GSe)	SECAS
William Marshall (WM)	SECAS
Bradley Baker (BB)	DCC
Rosie Davies (RD)	DCC
Gary Stuart (GSt)	DCC
David Walsh (DW)	DCC
Julie Brown (JB)	British Gas
Rochelle Harrison (RH)	British Gas
Beth Tatton (BT)	Calisen Metering
Carl Whitehouse (CW)	Calisen Metering
Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
Kelly Kinsman (KK)	National Grid Electricity Distribution
Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN
Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
George MacGregor (GM)	Utilita

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, and the proposed business requirements.

Issue

- Short-term peak usage caused incidents for SMETS1 Service Providers (S1SP), e.g. during previous Price Change events.
- Future dating Service Requests (SRs) allows the DCC to better manage traffic in advance of peak events.
- Currently, a clause in the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) prevents the DCC from being able to do this for SMETS1 Devices.

Current arrangements

- All Future Dated Requests for SMETS1 Devices are effectively Future Dated Response Pattern (DSP).
- DSP holds all SMETS1 Future Dated SRs, for release to SMETS1 Devices at a future date.

Business requirements

Business Requirements		
Ref.	Requirement	Responsible for delivery
1	DCC Users must be able to send Device Future Dated Service Request (SR) to any Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS)1 Device.	DCC
2	DCC User systems will not require changes to support Device Future Dated SRs.	DCC
3	DCC User processes to remain consistent for all different SMETS1 Device Models.	DCC
4	Reporting to monitor Future Dated SRs sent to and stored on SMETS1 Devices.	DCC

Working Group Discussion

SECAS (EW) provided an overview of the issue, current arrangements, intent of the modification, the Service Requests (SRs) in scope and the proposed business requirements.

Terminology

A Supplier representative (GM) wanted clarification on the terminology of 'Device Future Dated', and if it was to only mean Service Requests (SRs) which are held at the Device level. They added that there should be no room for misinterpretation of 'Device Future Dated'. SECAS (EW) and the Proposer (RD) confirmed this is the case.

Reporting

A Supplier representative (GM) queried why any reporting would be needed for this modification, as there would be limited value due to SMETS1 Devices approaching end of life.

Costs-benefits and timescales

A Supplier representative (GM) queried the value of this proposal due to projections that SMETS1 Devices would all be replaced in the next 4-5 years. They added that once this is implemented, the cost case for SMETS1 Devices would be reduced. A Large Supplier representative (AH) noted that 80% of their portfolio of SMETS1 Devices would be removed by 2029, and queried the predicted implementation timescales. They added that if this took another 18 months, there is likely no cost benefit to industry, unless the solution was cheap. The Proposer (RD) noted as this has not had a Preliminary Assessment yet, the timescales are not set yet. They added that they do not anticipate this being cheap, due to five different Service Provider (SP) changes involved.

A Supplier representative (GM) queried whether the DCC were able to implement a solution based upon SMETS1 cohorts and split per S1SP. They noted different Parties would all have different portfolios which would lead to differing views on benefit. The Proposer (RD) noted that changes were required in the Data Service Provider (DSP) system as well as individual S1SP systems. They suggested that it may not be cost effective to split the S1SP solutions.

A Large Supplier representative (AH) noted from a Charging Methodology view, costs cannot be split between Parties according to their impact, as industry are charged according to market share. They noted an exception to this would be if this progressed as an Elective Service but didn't think this was possible due to required changes in DUIS. SECAS (EW) noted as this would be DUIS impacting, it is likely to target June 2026 SEC Release, although will only know once the Preliminary Assessment is returned.

The Working Group concluded that the cost/benefit analysis could only be conducted once the DCC returned the Preliminary Assessment to indicate costs and timescales for implementation.

Working Group members agreed the business requirements address the identified issue and were ready to proceed to request the DCC Preliminary Assessment.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to finalise the business requirements.
- SECAS to request the DCC Preliminary Assessment after discussions at TABASC and OPSG.