

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'

November 2024 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Emma Johnson (EJ)	British Gas
	Julie Brown (JB)	British Gas
	Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
	Sharon Armitage (SA)	E.ON
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
Other SEC Parties	Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
	Ian Lovatt (IL)	Chameleon
	Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
	Jeff Studholme (JS)	Smart Meter Assets
Network Parties	Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB)	Chris Barlow (CB)	David Walsh (DW)
Robin Seaby (RS)		
SECAS		
Simon Grimwood (SG) <i>WG Chair</i>	Rachel Black (RBI) <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>	Rainer Lischetzki (RL) <i>SECAS Technical Consultant</i>
Ali Beard (AB) <i>Modifications Manager</i>		

Overview

Issue

- Short-term peak usage caused incidents for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS)1 Service Providers (S1SP), e.g. during previous Price Change events.
- Future dating Service Requests (SRs) allows the Data Communications Company (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.
- 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.

Reduced scope solution

- Allow DCC Users to send Future Dated Service Requests to SMETS1 Devices without being held at the DSP.
- Reduced scope Proposed Solution will only include Service Reference Variant (SRV) 1.1.1 'Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)' and SRV 1.2.1 'Update Price (Primary Element)'.

Reduced scope DCC Preliminary Assessment Summary

- Cost – £1.25m to £2.1m
 - DSP and DS&A – remained the same as full scope DCC Preliminary Assessment
 - Costs between S1SP Cohorts still greatly varied
- Implementation is expected to take 6 months up to the end of PIT
- Full Impact Assessment cost – £104,230
- SMETS1 Service Providers (S1SPs), Dual Control Organisation (DCO), Data Service Providers (DSP) and DCC Data Science and Analytics (DS&A) team impacted

Working Group Discussion

Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) (MS) provided an overview of the issue, reduced scope solution, reduced scope DCC Preliminary Assessment and feedback gained to date from the Refinement Consultation respondents.

Business case and benefits

A Working Group member (JS) noted that there was the last few price changes have went smoothly, but that it is important to look forward as we move to the next year, how many SMETS1 meters would of transitions to the DCC. SECAS (MS) highlighted that after migration is completed around 13 to 15 million SMETS1 Devices would have transitioned to the DCC and could use Future Dated Service Requests, they added they were uncertain about how many of the Devices would be in Pre-Payment but currently the Service Requests are being held with the DSP, which contributed to large spikes in traffic.

The DCC (DW) stated that the costs do not include System Integration Testing (SIT), User Integration Testing (UIT) and implementation costs will become available after a Full Impact Assessment has been completed.

Potential for third solution

A Working Group member (KC) stated that they are supportive of this modification and questioned whether it is possible to address a particular cohort of SMETS1 Devices if Working Group members are finding the Alternative Solution to be a high cost. SECAS (MS) stated that a discussion could take place between the relevant Parties to discuss if this would be a possibility. SECAS (EW) advised that a Middle Operating Capability (MOC) cohort would be in the range of £515,000 to £745,000 up to Pre Integration Testing (PIT) that the request for a Full Impact Assessment would be just under £39,000.

Impact Assessment request

Working Group members were asked if an Impact Assessment should be requested for this modification. A Working Group member (DD) requested for clarification on whether the Impact Assessment is being requested would be for both solutions, or one of the solutions. They further asked if there is a third solution which could look at one cohort alone. The DCC (DW) stated that the Preliminary Assessment had been completed against the 2 Service Requests in the Alternative Solution across three cohorts. They followed up advising there is a pricing breakdown in the Preliminary Assessment.

A Working Group member (AH) has expressed that they were opposed to any development for SMETS1 cohorts. They explained that their organisation intends to complete a phase out of their SMETS1 cohorts by 2029. And that their perspective is that the development of enabling Users to send Future Dated Services Requests to SMETS1 Devices without being held at the DSP is an expensive change as well as the implementation date being in 2026.

SECAS (AB) asked Working Group members if the Impact Assessment should be requested for the Proposed Solution, Alternative Solution or a specific cohort. A Working Group member (JS) noted that it is difficult to provide an answer as different stakeholders could be in different inventory levels on certain cohorts, but they suggested that most prepayment consumers are on Middle Operating Capability (MOC) cohort. They noted that there is a disproportionate benefit on MOC cohort and that it would be appropriate to focus on them.

A Working Group member (JM) stated that they are against request an Impact Assessment under that basis that the costs and time taken to implement the solution would be a depreciated benefits case for their organisation. They noted that this should have explored at the point of enrolling SMETS1 Devices. They stated that the value is not visible given the temporary nature of SMETS1 Devices.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to request the Impact Assessment from Change Board; and
- SECAS request the Impact Assessment from the DCC; and

- SECAS to return to the Working Group; and
- SECAS to present the modification to Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC); and
- SECAS to present the modification to Operations Group (OPSG)