

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'

December 2024 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Julie Brown (JB)	British Gas
	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Amy Cox (AC)	EDF
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
	Francesca Scott (FS)	EDF
	Sharon Armitage (SA)	E.ON Next
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Other SEC Parties	Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
	Rob Heath (RH)	Calisen
	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
	Michael Snowdon (MS)	Secure Meters
	James Murphy (JMu)	Stark
	Nik Wills (NW)	Stark
Network Parties	Kirsty Maddock (KM)	National Grid
	Jamie Lowe (JL)	Northern Power Grid
	Matthew Alexander (MA)	SSEN

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB)	David Walsh (DW) <i>Proposer</i>	Stuart Drinan (SD)
Ofgem		
Cristina Ullastre (CU)		
SECAS		
Simon Grimwood (SG)	Abi Obadan (AO)	Elizabeth Woods (EW)

Other Participants		
<i>Working Group Chair</i>	<i>Meeting Secretary</i>	<i>Lead Analyst</i>
Alison Beard (AB)	Georgiana Severin (GSe)	Marc Rhodes (MRh)
Sophia Master (SM)	Rainer Lischetzki (RL)	

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue, Alternative Solution and the Preliminary Assessment.

Issue

- Short-term peak usage caused incidents for S1SP
- DUIS currently prevents DCC from Future Dating SRs for SMETS1 Devices
- DSP holds all SMETS1 Future Dated SRs, for release to SMETS1 Devices at a future date

Alternative Solution

- Allow Users to send Future Dated SRs to SMETS1 Devices without being held at the DSP
- Cost saving Alternative Solution (only SRV 1.1.1 and 1.2.1)
- Does not include Alert / Notification to indicate FD command has arrived at Device.

Legal Text

- Will be developed as part of the Full Impact Assessment.
- SEC Appendix AD 'DCC User Interface Specification'

Support

- 1 Respondent supported (MOC only).
- 1 Respondent did not support modification for any SMETS1 cohort.

Alternative Solution DCC Preliminary Assessment

Breakdown of Alternative Solution DCC Preliminary Assessment costs				
Alternative Solution	Design, Build and PIT	Full Impact Assessment Cost	Complete up to PIT	Design, Build and PIT duration
All Cohorts	£1.25m to £2.1m	£104,230	40 Working Days	6 months
MOC Only	£516k to £745k	£38,235	40 Working Days	6 months

Working Group Discussion

SECAS (EW) provided an overview of the modification and Alternative Solution DCC Preliminary Assessment summary.

Working Group members were asked if an Impact Assessment should be requested for all cohorts or only the MOC cohort.

A Working Group member (EJ) queried if the implementation costs included the new DSP, and if not, this would lead to an increase in costs, leading to added work to incorporate into the new DSP as this is targeting the June 2026 SEC Release. The DCC (DW) noted that the DSP components of this modification is a relatively small part compared to the total costs.

SECAS (AB) queried how significant would the regression testing costs amount to. The DCC (DW) noted that they would only know once a DCC Impact Assessment is completed, and it was important to get clarity on what we are voting on today. A Working Group member (KC) noted that they are in favour of the MOC only option and are overall in favour of this modification.

A Working Group member (EL) noted that industry do not know which DSP this would be implemented into, and what fundamental changes that will provide. They added that the Working Group and Change abroad would need to know the actual costs, without this, they would not be able to recommend or sign-off any options. The DCC (DW) noted that DSP changes would be addressed in the DCC Impact Assessment. Another Working Group member (AH) agreed and noted that from a benefits case, this does not stack up. Working Group member (EL) added that Suppliers have different exposure to the MOC Cohort, however the benefits cannot be measured without knowing what the costs are. Several Working Group members agreed.

Working Group member (JM) queried what the timelines were for delivery and noted that if MP247 will take two years to deliver, the benefits case diminishes. SECAS (EW) noted if MP247 is delayed now, it will miss the June 2026 SEC Release. Working Group member (JM) noted that if this is pushed out to 2027 SEC Release, industry would only get another five years of benefit from the changes, and they added that this is not a strong enough benefits case.

SECAS (AB) noted that as we are unable to assess against the new DSP at present, they asked the Working Group if MP247 should be put on hold or to use what information we currently have to estimate the costs. The Working Group supported putting the modification on hold.

The Working Group Chair (SG) concluded that the overall consensus is to put MP247 on hold until details including cost and timescales are available for the new DSP.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to place modification on hold; and
- DCC to provide details for the new DSP, including cost and timescales; and
- SECAS to return to the Working Group once DCC has provided relevant information.