

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.



MP252

‘Amending the process for Communications Hub returns’

Modification Report

Version 0.3

18 September 2024



About this document

This document is a draft Modification Report. It currently sets out the background, issue, and progression timetable for this modification, along with any relevant discussions, views and conclusions. This document will be updated as this modification progresses.

Contents

1.	Summary	3
2.	Issue	4
3.	Solutions	7
4.	Impacts	8
5.	Costs	10
6.	Implementation approach.....	11
7.	Assessment of the proposal	11
8.	Case for change	15
	Appendix 1: Progression timetable	16
	Appendix 2: Glossary	16

This document also has three annexes:

- **Annex A** contains the business requirements for the solution.
- **Annex B** contains the full DCC Preliminary Assessment response.
- **Annex C** contains the draft DCC Alternative Returns for Communications Hubs Guidance document.

Contact

If you have any questions on this modification, please contact:

Elizabeth Woods

020 4566 8335

elizabeth.woods@gemserv.com

1. Summary

This proposal has been raised by David Lane from SMS PLC.

Smart Energy Code (SEC) Section F 'Smart Metering System Requirements' and Appendix I 'CH Installation and Maintenance Support Materials' details the requirements/obligations to enable Parties to return Communication Hubs. This can either occur where a problem is identified prior to its installation or after installation and subsequent removal. To return a Communications Hub, the Party must send a Service Reference Variant (SRV) for each Communications Hub they want to return to the Data Communications Company (DCC).

The DCC has identified over 65,000 Communications Hubs which are 'not on the wall' and are in the possession of non-Responsible Parties. Where the Party in possession is not the Responsible Supplier, the Party are unable to decommission the Communications Hub or identify the Responsible Supplier.

At the DCC Returns Workshop in July 2023 and the DCC Supply Chain Working Group in December 2023, the DCC received feedback from industry of issues within the whole process. There was agreement amongst attendees that the current process does not work well and is inefficient, with attendees noting there have been many issues raised over the last few years in various forums. Attendees felt there was a need for a fit for purpose process to address issues now and for future volumes of Communications Hub returns.

The Communications Hubs in the Proposer's (and other non-responsible Parties) possession are taking up space in their warehouses and incurring ever increasing storage costs. The Proposer also noted that where they are unable to meet service level agreement (SLA), there is a financial impact for the Party in possession of the Communications Hub, the Responsible Supplier and indirectly, consumers.

The Proposer also highlighted that the volume of Communications Hubs will continue to increase and likely at an accelerated rate once 4G Communications Hubs are rolled out.

The Proposed Solution will allow any SEC Party to return Communications Hubs to the DCC. Solution Option A will require SEC Parties to return Communications Hubs to the DCC using the current method via the CSPs, and the DSP and DCC to process the returns internally. Solution Option B will require SEC Parties to provide the DCC with a list of intended Communications Hubs for return, after validation and confirmation before processing the returns.

This modification will impact all SEC Parties and the DCC. If approved, this modification is targeted for the November 2025 SEC Release and will be progressed as a Self-Governance Modification. The estimated cost of the DCC System changes up to the end of Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) for Solution Option A is between £860,000 - £1,000,000, and Solution Option B is between £200,000 and £300,000.

2. Issue

What are the current arrangements?

A Communications Hub is a physical Device that includes a Communications Hub Function (CHF) together with a Gas Proxy Function (GPF) that is used to connect a Smart Meter with the DCC System. Each Communications Hub remains the property of the DCC, and the Responsible Supplier is charged with a rental fee for each one. This rental fee is triggered upon the point of delivery and remains whether the Communications Hub is installed at a property or being held in storage prior to installation.

The DCC provides a returns process for Communications Hubs. The aim being that these can be triaged, refurbished and reissued. The Communications Hub can either be returned without ever being installed at a property or following a removal. To return a Communications Hub, the Party must send an individual SRV for each Communications Hub they want to return to the DCC¹. Clauses 9 and 10 of SEC Appendix I outline how a Communications Hub should be removed, notify the DCC of its return and how to return the Communications Hub. Currently two key conditions must be met:

1. The SRV requesting return must originate from the Supplier who is responsible for the Communications Hub; and
2. The Communications Hub status must be either 'Decommissioned' if it has been installed previously or returned prior to installation.

Alternatively, if a Party is not able to submit an SRV in accordance with SEC Appendix I clauses 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7 or 9.8 that Party shall contact the DCC Service Desk.

The SRVs associated with Communications Hub returns are outlined in SEC Appendix AD 'DCC User Interface Schedule' (DUIS). They are SRV 8.14.3 (CommsHubStatusUpdate-FaultReturn) and SRV 8.14.4 (CommsHubStatusUpdate-NoFaultReturn). The criteria state that the only Eligible Users are Import Suppliers, Gas Suppliers and Registered Supplier Agents (RSA).

What is the issue?

The Proposer, who is a Meter Operator (MOP), has accumulated over 20,000 Communications Hubs over the years, which have ended up in their possession through incorrect removal procedures and not in the status of decommissioned on the Smart Metering Inventory (SMI). As the Proposer is not the Responsible Supplier, they are unable to decommission the Communications Hub nor identify the Responsible Supplier due to the confidentiality clauses in SEC Section M 'General' as follows:

M4. CONFIDENTIALITY

Prohibition on disclosure and use by DCC

- M4.1** *Subject to Sections M4.3 and M4.4, the DCC shall not disclose another Party's Confidential Information to, or authorise access to another Party's Confidential Information by, any person.*
- M4.2** *Subject to Section M4.3, the DCC shall not use a Party's Confidential Information for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was provided (or otherwise made available) to the DCC, and in any event for any purpose other than the purposes of this Code*

¹ Some organisations have an internal method of sending bulk return requested to the DCC.

The ownership of a Communications Hub would fall into that definition of Confidential Information, which the DCC is therefore precluded from disclosing. This is likely an oversight from when the SEC was drafted, however, the prohibition is clear. The SEC would need to be amended to provide the DCC with the authority to provide this information to other parties.

Due to the Party in possession of the Communications Hubs being unable to update the details to the DCC these Communications Hubs are unable to undergo triage, refurbishment, redeployment, or secure disposal. This also has resulted in incorrect charges being placed on Suppliers for Communications Hubs which are no longer at a consumer's premises, nor in the Supplier's possession. A further complication is that due to the age of some of these stranded Communications Hubs, the current Responsible Supplier may not be the Party who was the Supplier when the Communications Hub was incorrectly removed due to consumers switching Suppliers.

The Proposer has found the Communications Hub removal and returns process overly complicated and resource heavy. This holds challenges for Parties to follow efficiently and allow for Devices to be returned within the timeline stated in the SEC Appendix I 'CH Installation and Maintenance Support Materials' as follows:

10. COMMUNICATIONS HUB RETURNS

- 10.1 *Where a Supplier Party has handed back a Special Installation Mesh Communications Hub to the DCC whilst in attendance at the relevant premises and where the Special Installation Mesh Communications Hub had been installed at a previous installation visit, the Party shall submit Service Request 8.14.3 (Communications Hub Status Update – Fault Return) or Service Request 8.14.4 (Communications Hub Status Update – No Fault Return) in respect of the Communications Hub returned in accordance with DUIS within three (3) Working Days.*

Delivery of Returns

- 10.11 *Where the Party does not return a Communications Hub within 90 days pursuant to Section F8.6 of the Code, the Communications Hub shall be deemed to be lost or stolen and the DCC shall prevent that Communications Hub from connecting to the SM WAN.*

As referenced in SEC Section F 'CH Installation and Maintenance Support Materials' as follows:

F8. REMOVAL AND RETURN OF SMETS2+ COMMUNICATIONS HUBS

Return of Communications Hubs

- F8.6 *Where a Communications Hub is removed by a Supplier Party from a premises at which it was previously installed, the Supplier Party shall return the Communications Hub to the DCC within 90 days after the date of its removal. This obligation to return a Communications Hub only applies where the Communications Hub Function which forms part of that Communications Hub has at any time had an SMI Status of 'installed not commissioned' or 'commissioned'.*

These sections and clauses constitute a 90-day SLA to return the Communications Hub following decommission, and a three-day SLA between decommission and return request SRV sent.

Based on the above, the main issues the Proposer would like to explore further as part of this modification are as follows:

- Inability to Identify current Communications Hub's Responsible Party and no current process for Non-Responsible Party to return Communications Hub to Communications Service Provider (CSP). Non-Responsible Parties unable to send secure SRV 8.3 'DecommissionDevice' before sending SR8.14.3 'CommsHubStatusUpdate-FaultReturn' and SR 8.14.4 'CommsHubStatusUpdate-NoFaultReturn' for Communications Hubs to be returned.
- No process to return Communications Hubs where a Change of Supplier process has failed to change the Responsible Party or a current Supplier fails to Decommissioned at point of Communications Hubs removal and subsequently, the Consumer proceeds with a Change of Supplier.
- SEC Parties unable to meet the 90 Day SLA from when SRV 8.3 'DecommissionDevice' and SR8.14.3 'CommsHubStatusUpdate-FaultReturn' or SR 8.14.4 'CommsHubStatusUpdate-NoFaultReturn' is sent until the Communications Hub is returned to CSP.
- The current manual process for the DCC and SEC Parties to validate each Communications Hub return request, adding time delays to the process which prevents unsolicited Communications Hub returns being sent to the CSP.
- With current Communications Hub returns process being laborious, this has limited the volume of Communications Hub returns which can be processed by the CSP.
- Lack of near real time reporting mechanism to monitor Communications Hubs returns data.

What is the impact this is having?

The Proposer has over 20,000 Communications Hubs in their possession, taking up space in their warehouses and incurring ever increasing storage costs. The DCC has noted they are aware of over 65,000 Communications Hubs which are not 'on the wall' and are with non-Responsible Parties. These Communications Hubs will also be the cause of ongoing rental charges to the Responsible Supplier until they're returned. The Proposer also noted that where they are unable to meet SLA, there is a financial impact for the Party in possession of the Communications Hub, the Responsible Supplier and indirectly, consumers. The Proposer believes that if the rules are relaxed or an alternative returns route can be found, the Communications Hubs could undergo triage, redeployment, refurbishment or secure disposal.

The Proposer also noted that the volume of Communications Hubs will continue to increase and at an accelerated rate once installation of 4G Communications Hubs begins.

Impact on consumers

There is an indirect impact on all consumers, as this would mean costs associated with Communications Hubs are allocated correctly to SEC Parties. It would also ensure uninstalled or removed Communications Hubs are able to undergo triage, redeployment, refurbishment or secure disposal. This would reduce the number of new Communications Hubs that need to be manufactured which should result in cost saving for industry, which is passed onto consumers.

3. Solutions

Proposed Solutions

Both Proposed Solutions will allow any SEC Party to return Communications Hubs to the DCC.

Solution Option A

SEC Parties to return Communications Hubs to the DCC using the current method via the CSPs. The DSP will provide an interface for CSPs (and potentially in future the Accenture Device Manager to accommodate 4G Communications Hubs) to notify the DSP of a Communications Hub which has been returned. Upon notification of a Communications Hub being returned via this interface, the DSP will set the status of the CHF (and its associated GPF) to “Decommissioned” in the SMI. The returned Communications Hubs will then be processed for reuse or recycle.

Solution Option B

SEC Parties to provide the DCC with a list of intended Communications Hubs for return. The DSP will provide an interface via the SSMI for DCC to notify the DSP of Communications Hubs SEC Parties want to return. The DCC will validate the Communications Hubs returns request, by informing SEC Parties of which Communications Hubs listed requires the DCC to set the SMI status to ‘Decommission’ in order to process the Communications Hubs return. Upon the DCC receiving ‘sign-off’, the DSP will set the status of the CHF (and its associated GPF) to “Decommissioned” in the SMI. The returned Communications Hubs will then be processed for reuse or recycle.

SEC Parties can still return Communications Hubs via the existing process and this solution will sit alongside it.

4. Impacts

This section summarises the impacts that would arise from the implementation of this modification.

SEC Parties

SEC Party Categories impacted			
✓	Large Suppliers	✓	Small Suppliers
✓	Electricity Network Operators	✓	Gas Network Operators
✓	Other SEC Parties	✓	DCC

Breakdown of Other SEC Party types impacted			
✓	Shared Resource Providers	✓	Meter Installers
✓	Device Manufacturers	✓	Flexibility Providers
✓	DCC Other Users	✓	MAPs/ MAMs

This would impact the DCC and all SEC Parties, as it is an alternative route for any SEC Party to return a Communications Hub to the DCC.

Solution Option A is not expected to have any negative impact on SEC Parties, as it is intending to use current Communications Hub process. There is likely to be a positive impact on SEC Parties due to non-Responsible Party would be able to return a Communications Hubs to the DCC.

Solution Option B will have impact on SEC Parties who are in possession of a Communications Hub and not the current Responsible Supplier wishing to return a Communications Hub to the DCC. They will need to manually generate a list of Communications Hubs to return, for the DCC to validate and process before sending them back to the DCC.

The DCC will need to make system and internal process changes for both solution option.

DCC Systems

DCC System changes

Solution Option A

This solution option will have impacts on the DSP and two CSPs and potentially in future the Accenture Device Manager to accommodate 4G Communications Hub returns. This will introduce a new 'RETURNED' status which will require changes their backend systems and internal processes.

Solution Option B

This solution option will have impacts on the DSP only, requiring a new interface via the SSMI for DCC to notify the DSP of returned Communications Hubs.

The full impacts on DCC Systems and DCC's proposed testing approach can be found in the DCC Preliminary Assessment response in Annex B.

DCC System traffic

This modification will have no impact on DCC System traffic.

SEC and subsidiary documents

The following parts of the SEC will be impacted:

- SEC Appendix H 'CH Handover Support Materials'
- SEC Appendix I 'CH Installation and Maintenance Support'
- New DCC Guidance document - Alternative Returns for Communications Hubs

The changes to the SEC this will only be provided as part of the DCC Impact Assessment.

Technical specification versions

This modification will impact Appendix AD 'DCC User Interface Specification' (DUIS). The proposed changes will be made clear after the Impact Assessment is returned by the DCC.

Devices

Devices impacted			
	Electricity Smart Metering Equipment		Gas Smart Metering Equipment
✓	Communications Hubs		Gas Proxy Functions
	In-Home Displays		Prepayment Meter Interface Devices
	Standalone Auxiliary Proportional Controllers		Home Area Network Connected Auxiliary Load Control Switches
	Consumer Access Devices		Alternative Home Area Network Devices

This will affect all Communications Hubs.

Consumers

This modification will not impact Consumers.

Other industry Codes

This modification will not impact any other industry Codes.

Greenhouse gas emissions

This modification will not impact greenhouse gas emissions.

5. Costs

DCC costs

The estimated DCC implementation costs to implement this modification is set out below. The breakdown of these costs are as follows:

Breakdown of DCC implementation costs – Solution Option A	
Activity	Cost
Design, Build and Pre-Integration Testing (PIT)	£860,000 - £1,000,000
Systems Integration Testing (SIT)	TBC
User Integration Testing (UIT)	TBC
Implement to Live	TBC
Application Support	TBC

The DCC have indicated that Solution Option A would incur significant integration functional and regression testing costs.

Breakdown of DCC implementation costs – Solution Option B	
Activity	Cost
Design, Build and PIT	£200,000 - £300,000
SIT	TBC
UIT	TBC
Implement to Live	TBC
Application Support	TBC

The DCC have indicated that Solution Option B would incur far less integration functional and regression testing costs.

More information can be found in the DCC Preliminary Assessment response in Annex B.

SECAS costs

The estimated SECAS implementation cost to implement this as a stand-alone modification is one day of effort, amounting to approximately £600. This cost will be reassessed when combining this modification in a scheduled SEC Release. The activities needed to be undertaken for this are:

- Updating the SEC and releasing the new version to the industry.

SEC Party costs

SEC Party costs will be sought as part of the Refinement Consultation.

6. Implementation approach

Recommended implementation approach

Solution Option A

SECAS is recommending an implementation date of:

- **25 June 2026** (June 2026 SEC Release) if a decision to approve is received on or before 25 May 2025; or
- **5 November 2026** (Month 2026 SEC Release) if a decision to approve is received after 25 May 2025 but on or before 5 October 2025.

The earliest possible SEC Release that can be targeted is the June 2026 SEC Release, this is based on the 13 months' timescale required for implementation stated in the DCC Preliminary Assessment.

Solution Option B

SECAS is recommending an implementation date of:

- **6 November 2025** (November 2025 SEC Release) if a decision to approve is received on or before 6 April 2025; or
- **25 June 2026** (June 2026 SEC Release) if a decision to approve is received after 6 April 2025 but on or before 25 November 2025.

The earliest possible SEC Release that can be targeted is the November 2025 SEC Release, this is based on the seven months' timescale required for implementation stated in the DCC Preliminary Assessment.

7. Assessment of the proposal

Areas for assessment

Number of Communication Hubs with non-Responsible Parties

The Proposer has noted they have 20,000 Communications Hubs in their warehouses and this number is growing daily. The DCC has identified over 65,000 Communications Hubs which are not at consumer premises and instead are with non-Responsible Parties.

The Proposer agrees the confidentiality clause applies, however wanted to explore the possibility of having an opt-in scheme with clearly defined minimal data of the current Responsible Parties' data to be shared with the DCC as a mediator. They believed that this would help to immediately alleviate the current number of Communications Hubs being held in various parties' warehouses.

This was to be investigated during the development stage with many Parties requesting simplification and efficiencies of the Communications Hubs returns process can be made. Details of the investigations are noted in the 'Observations on the issue' section below.

How far will this issue grow as 2G/3G Communications Hubs are replaced?

SECAS notes that the transition to 4G Communications Hubs in 2025 will likely drive a large increase in Communications Hubs affected by this issue. Attendees at a DCC Returns workshop queried DCC about costs and volumes of Communications Hubs in supply chain at point of transition in 2025. The DCC provided information suggesting they expect c.200-300k Communications Hubs to be surplus to requirements. There was consensus to limit Communications Hubs surplus to requirements; with options to increase exchanging Communications Hubs between Parties who have surplus, limiting new orders, and having a fit for purpose returns process. The business case for the modification will be affected by these outcomes and monitored by the Communications Transition Group (CTG) as industry transitions to 4G Communications Hubs.

Sub-Committee input

SECAS has engaged the Chairs from the Operations Group (OPSG), the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) and the Smart Metering Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) to confirm what input is required from these forums. SECAS has received input from the following Sub-Committees to this modification:

Sub-Committee input	
Sub-Committee	Input sought
OPSG	Input on Proposed Solution and review process for smoother and easier Communication Hub returns process for all Parties involved
SMKI PMA	We do not believe this has any SMKI impacts
SSC	Feedback on any security impacts based on the Proposed Solution developed
TABASC	Feedback on potential changes to business process and changes to SRVs based on the Proposed Solution developed

Observations on the issue

DCC Returns Workshop discussion

The Communications Hubs returns process was discussed at the DCC Returns Workshop in July 2023. There was agreement amongst attendees that the current process does not work well and is inefficient, with attendees noting there have been many issues raised over the last few years in various forums. Attendees felt there was a need for fit for purpose process to address issues now and for future volumes Communications Hub returns.

Below are some of the discussion points of the workshop:

- There is a disconnect between meter installers that are removing Communications Hubs and the 'back office', to create SRV for returns within current SLA, and growing number of Communications Hubs Parties don't own in their possession.
- Views expressed that a simplified process is needed and that removal of the 90-day SLA would help, along with removal of mandatory SRV from Current Supplier to the DCC:
 - Questions raised as to the implications of removing the SRVs and leaving this up to the DCC (via their CSPs) to complete upon return.

- It was noted that more than one SEC Party has invested in systems/process to make the current process work and have capability for multiple/bulk SRV returns. While Other SEC Parties have not.
- Noted that previous attempt to raise a Bulk Returns Process ([MP117 'Bulk CH returns'](#)) had failed on grounds of costs and lack of necessity for all.
- The DCC has had exploratory talks with DCC Service Providers (SPs) about potential simplification, however. there was no detail on system changes, time or potential costs mentioned.

The outcome of the DCC Workshop was for this Modification to be raised, and the DCC has committed to have regular call about returns process each month with SEC Parties to work through issues and progress – this will be aligned with Supply Chain Working Group monthly meetings.

Bulk returns request tool

The Proposer's organisation is currently in development of a bulk returns request tool and are aware there are several other SEC Parties who have already invested to have their own bulk returns request tool. Currently, the Proposer and others without a bulk returns request tool are needing to raise individual SRs for each Communications Hub they wish to return to the DCC. The Proposer also noted that they would not want any amendment of the Communications Hubs returns process to interfere with this. As this portion of the issue has been previously discussed under [MP117 'Bulk CH returns'](#), which was ultimately withdrawn due to the cost involved, the Proposer has requested that a bulk returns request tool not be included as part of this modification.

DCC Supply Chain Working Group discussion

This modification was discussed at the DCC Supply Chain Working Group in December 2023. There was agreement amongst attendees that the timeline is for when this modification might get a solution in place too far in the future. There were concerns that this would not alleviate issues in time for 4G rollout. There was agreement that the current process does not work well and has led to this issue of non-Responsible Parties in possession of Communications Hubs which they are unable to do anything with. Attendees felt there needed to be a quicker solution to resolve the current unidentified Communications Hubs in their possession, as this has a direct impact for MAPs and Suppliers. There was a request for the DCC to investigate a possible Communications Hub amnesty until this modification can look into an enduring solution which is future proofed.

Solution development

The Proposer has noted a high-level Proposed Solution whereby the DSP will filter incoming Future Dated Response Pattern (DSP) SRs, if the targeted Device has the capability to accept the Future Dated Response Pattern (Device) SR, the DSP will send the SR down to the Device. If the Device is unable to accept Future Dated Response Pattern (Device) SR, the SR will be held at DSP to be sent as per current business as usual (BAU) process. Therefore, the Proposer believes there will be no DCC User business process nor System impact.

Requirement Workshop

During the development of the business requirements, it was noted with the current Communications Hub returns process, CSPs are only able to process 'Decommissioned' or 'Pending' Communications Hubs. They added that the DCC did not want to encourage 'bad behaviour' of DCC Users, noting that any solution developed should be used only if Parties are unable to return Communications Hubs via the current returns process.

Working Group

The business requirements were discussed at the Working Group in April 2024. The Working Group agreed that the business requirements addressed the issue, and the modification should proceed with the request of the DCC Preliminary Assessment.

The DCC Preliminary Assessment was discussed at the Working Group in September 2024. SECAS and the DCC confirmed that all Communications Hubs are in scope, however the DCC Preliminary Assessment costings are based on 2G and 3G Communications Hubs, and the 4G Communications Hubs costs would be additional. The Working Group queried if both solutions were able to be scaled up when 2G/3G sunset begins, which the DCC confirmed there are no scaling concerns. The Working Group noted that a slicker Communications Hubs returns process for a higher price could be worth it for the correct solution. The Working Group noted that both options would impact SEC Parties, as a non-Responsible Party would now be able to return a Communications Hubs to the DCC.

The Working Group queried at what point in the new process with payments stop for the Responsible Party. The DCC noted they have drafted an Alternative Returns for Communications Hubs Guidance document (see Annex C), which will layout the charging plan, and this would be further refined as part of the DCC Impact Assessment. The DCC noted that the party in possession' where they are not the Responsible Party, are not paying any Communications Hub charges, so the DCC charges the Responsible Party. Working Group members agreed the Proposed Solutions deliver the business requirements; however, they were evenly split on whether to proceed with Solution Option A or B.

OPSG views

The business requirements were discussed with the OPSG in April 2024. The OPSG requested more clarity on processed and charges, and to consider using the refurbishment process. They agreed that the modification should proceed with the request of the DCC Preliminary Assessment.

The DCC Preliminary Assessment was presented to the OPSG in September 2024 where there were no comments at this stage.

SSC views

The DCC Preliminary Assessment was discussed with the SSC in August 2024. The SSC noted no security implications and would like to regular updates as this modification progresses.

8. Case for change

Business case

Implementing this modification will create a route for SEC Parties to return Communications Hubs in their possession, where they are not the Responsible Supplier.

Many Parties are in support of a review and update of the Communications Hub returns process, and further industry views will be sought as part of the Refinement Consultation.

Views against the General SEC Objectives

Proposer's views

The Proposer believes that this modification will better facilitate SEC Objective (a)², as it will allow existing stock to be reused or recycled in the supply chain of Communications Hubs, and their critical components allows Device procurement to operate more efficiently and provides assurance to DCC Users on stock levels so that they can effectively plan installations.

Industry views

The Working Group were supportive of the modification, further industry views will be sought as part of the Refinement Consultation.

Views against the consumer areas

Improved safety and reliability

This modification will be neutral against safety and security for consumers.

Lower bills than would otherwise be the case

This modification will have an indirect positive impact against this consumer benefit area, as it will reduce additional costs that will not be further passed onto consumers.

Reduced environmental damage

This modification will ensure the Communication Hubs are able to be reused or recycled where possible.

Improved quality of service

This modification will be neutral against this consumer benefit area.

² Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, operation and interoperability of smart metering systems at energy consumers' premises within Great Britain.

Benefits for society as a whole

This modification will be neutral against this consumer benefit area.

Appendix 1: Progression timetable

Timetable	
Event/Action	Date
Draft Proposal raised	5 Oct 2023
Presented to CSC for initial comment	17 Oct 2023
CSC converts Draft Proposal to Modification Proposal	19 Dec 2023
Business requirements developed with Proposer and the DCC	20 Dec 2023 – 15 May 2024
Modification discussed with the Working Group	3 Apr 2024
Business requirements discussed with OPSG	9 Apr 2024
Preliminary Assessment requested	1 Jul 2024
Preliminary Assessment returned	6 Aug 2024
Preliminary Assessment discussed with SSC	28 Aug 2024
Preliminary Assessment discussed with Working Group	4 Sep 2024
Preliminary Assessment discussed with OPSG	10 Sep 2024
Refinement Consultation	18 Sep – 9 Oct 2024
<i>Modification discussed with Working Group</i>	<i>6 Nov 2024</i>
<i>Impact Assessment costs approved by Change Board</i>	<i>20 Nov 2024</i>
<i>Impact Assessment requested</i>	<i>21 Nov 2024</i>
<i>Impact Assessment returned</i>	<i>24 Jan 2025</i>
<i>Modification discussed with Working Group</i>	<i>5 Feb 2025</i>
<i>Modification discussed with OPSG</i>	<i>11 Feb 2025</i>
<i>Modification Report approved by CSC</i>	<i>18 Feb 2025</i>
<i>Modification Report Consultation</i>	<i>19 Feb – 11 Mar 2025</i>
<i>Change Board Vote</i>	<i>26 Mar 2025</i>

Italics denote planned events that could be subject to change

Appendix 2: Glossary

This table lists all the acronyms used in this document and the full term they are an abbreviation for.

Glossary	
Acronym	Full term
CH	Communications Hub

Glossary	
Acronym	Full term
CHF	Communications Hub Function
CSP	Communications Service Provider
CTG	Communications Transition Group
DCC	Data Communications Company
DUIS	DCC User Interface Services
GPF	Gas Proxy Function
MOP	Meter Operator
OPSG	Operations Group
RSA	Registered Supplier Agent
SEC	Smart Energy Code
SECAS	The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat
SLA	service level agreement
SM WAN	Smart Metering Wide Area Network
SMI	Smart Metering Inventory
SMKI PMA	Smart Metering Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority
SP	Service Provider
SRV	Service Request Variant
SSC	Security Sub-Committee
TABASC	Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee