

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.



MP293

‘Deferment of DCC Planned Maintenance during Adverse Weather’

Modification Report

Version 0.3

18 November 2025

Corporate member of
Plain English Campaign
Committed to clearer
communication

592



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.	Assessment of the proposal	6
	Appendix 1: Progression timetable	12
	Appendix 2: Glossary	13

Contact

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

Lydia Bentley

020 3922 0748

lydia.bentley@gemserv.com

1. Summary

This proposal has been raised by Abigail Watson from Electricity North West Limited (ENWL). In June 2021, the Data Communications Company (DCC) raised a similar Modification, [MP166 'Adverse Weather Planned Maintenance Process'](#), with a view to exploring the impact on their service provision of an adverse weather event during a Planned Maintenance event. Following a review of provisional costs associated with delivery of the Modification, and at that time there being no recorded occurrence of clash between adverse weather and a DCC planned outage, MP166 was withdrawn. This Draft Modification seeks to re-explore this issue as new information relating to the costs and benefits has become available.

Adverse weather events can be highly disruptive to Electricity Network Parties and their customers. It is the responsibility of the Network Party to respond to damage to energy infrastructure caused by an adverse weather event, such as a storm and aim to restore power to off-supply customers as soon as possible. Network Parties rely on the ability to interact with Communication Hubs for Smart Meters to determine the size and scale of damage to their network caused by an adverse weather event and to check if a customers' power has been restored following restoration activity. By ascertaining if a Smart Metering System (SMS) is responsive, and repeating this across a given geographic area, the Network Party may more accurately map which areas of their network are most affected (and if they have successfully restored power) in order to determine how to manage their response.

Where a DCC Planned Maintenance event overlaps with an adverse weather event (both during and following the event), a Network Party will lose the ability to communicate with a SMS, therefore losing critical functionality of the DCC network that Network Parties utilise during adverse weather events. When MP166 was considered, it was deemed that such an overlap would be unlikely, having never occurred before, and therefore, a cost-benefit test could not be met and the Modification was withdrawn. Since this time, Storm Daragh¹, a Met Office "named storm" occurred during the days immediately prior to a Planned Maintenance window on 10 December 24. On the 7 December 260,000 customers were without power, with 23,000 still remaining off power by the 10 December² Network Parties have reported that this overlap was disruptive to their response approach.

The overlap of Storm Daragh and a DCC Planned Maintenance event has provided real-life Data on the costs and impacts of this issue which was unavailable at the time of MP166. As such, the Proposer has raised this Modification with a view to codifying a defined set of criteria which would need to be met to trigger the deferment of DCC Planned Maintenance event. During the development of the Modification, a second solution option has been brought into scope. The DCC have proposed a novel mechanism by which a small subset of Service Reference Variants (SRV) and/or Alerts may be kept available during a Planned Maintenance, allowing Network Parties to remain in communication with SMSs during an Adverse Weather event, even if the DCC were to be engaged in a concurrent Maintenance activity.

¹ [Met Office: Storm Daragh](#)

² [Storm Darragh updates – Energy Networks Association \(ENA\)](#)

2. Issue

What are the current arrangements?

A High Impact Planned Maintenance event (the impact rating relevant to the scope of this Modification) is one in which there is Material Risk of disruption to the provision of services. SEC Section A 'Definitions & Interpretations' defines it based on one or more of the following criteria being met:

- i. end-to-end communications between Users and Communications Hubs in either direction;
- ii. install & commission activities;
- iii. previously scheduled SMETS1 migrations.

The Met Office define adverse weather conditions using a number of predictable variables. A Yellow, Amber & Red³ rating system is applied to weather events, calculated against a matrix of predicted impact vs likelihood. The Met Office calculate impact⁴ based on the type of weather (i.e., thunderstorms, snow, rain), the geographic spread of the weather event, and the predicted scope of disruption and risk to life.

Currently, if a Planned Maintenance event is set to coincide with an adverse weather event, there is no system in place to decide on whether that Planned Maintenance should proceed; rather, it is within the DCC's discretion. During Storm Daragh, Planned Maintenance proceeded following a request from a Network Party seeking a deferment; some Network Parties report that this overlap exacerbated existing operational and logistical complexities arising from business-as-usual adverse weather recovery activities. Network Parties also reported that the overlap resulted in their inability to realise the benefits to Network Operators of being a DCC User during that outage.

What is the issue?

SEC Section H 'DCC Services' establishes arrangements for Planned Maintenance events under clause H.8 'Service Management, Self-Service Interface and Service Desk'. Currently, there are no provisions within Section H.8 for the deferral of a Planned Maintenance event where an adverse weather event occurs during the scheduled period. Additionally, clause H8.2 requires the DCC to conduct Maintenance in a minimally disruptive manner.

Without clear, codified provisions on how a deferral might be managed in the context of adverse weather, any decision to defer may be considered to be disruptive as SEC Parties would have no way to predictably or reliably determine if a Planned Maintenance event may be deferred, as the decision to do so is currently entirely within the gift of the DCC.

Additionally, paragraph H8.4A of Section H states that where additional Maintenance is required in support of a previously scheduled Maintenance, notice of that event must be communicated:

- a) at least 10 Working Days in advance of any additional Low Impact Planned Maintenance; and
- b) at least 20 Working Days in advance of any additional High Impact Planned Maintenance

³ [Met Office weather warnings guide](#)

⁴ [Met Office National Severe Weather Warning Service Impact tables](#)

This means that any changes to a Planned Maintenance event, such as a deferral due to an adverse weather event, must either be re-classified as Unplanned Maintenance, or must be deferred based on the criteria established in paragraph H8.4A – Potentially a significant delay.

What is the impact this is having?

Impact on consumers

For consumers affected by an adverse weather event, they may experience significant disruption to their energy supply. This disruption may range from being off-supply for an extended period, to reduced provision of services relating to their supply. Any factor that might hinder the ability of a Network Party to respond to damage to consumer supplies, such as a Planned Maintenance event, may exacerbate impact to consumers.

Impact on Network Parties

The Proposer (A Network Party, acting on behalf of all large Electricity Network Operators) has reported that they and others experienced disruption to their provision of adverse weather recovery services as a result of not having access to communicative SMSs. This impact was quantified during Storm Daragh by Data on Network Party impacts that was unavailable during the progression of MP166. It has also been reported that organisations who provide services to Network Parties will also be impacted on a consequential basis. There is an additional impact to Network Party staff of threat of life with field staff – Should an DCC Planned Maintenance and adverse weather event overlap, the loss of SMS comms functionality may cause the Network Party to deploy more staff into the adverse weather area than they might otherwise have had to. These staff will be checking to see if power has been restored in areas affected by the adverse weather as the overlap hinders the ability to do this remotely, and they may be more exposed to the associated risks as a result of their presence in those areas.

Impact on DCC

The DCC have indicated that both they and their Service Providers will be impacted should a Planned Maintenance need to be cancelled and/or re-scheduled. These impacts include, but are not limited to:

- **Effect on their Operational Performance Regime (OPR):** Unplanned Maintenance is subject to OPR reporting for Service Availability. An Unplanned Maintenance may need to be carried out in order to changes to the initial Planned Maintenance. The OPR is defined within the DCC Licence.
- **“Domino Effect” on other Planned Maintenance events:** When the DCC conduct a Planned Maintenance, it may be that outcomes from a prior Maintenance are required to facilitate it. As such, cancelling a Maintenance in June, for example, may prevent a July maintenance from taking place.
- **Consequential Impact on Service Providers:** Planned Maintenance may involve activities conducted by the DCC’s Service Providers. Where a Planned Maintenance is cancelled, this will have an impact, both financially and operationally, on the Service Providers who had been scheduled to support.

- **Mitigation of Incidents:** If a Planned Maintenance is required to prevent an Incident (i.e., a Critical Maintenance), then deferral of this Maintenance may result in a disruption to DCC Services more detrimental to DCC Users (including Network Parties) than any disruption which may have resulted had the Maintenance not been deferred.

3. Assessment of the proposal

The Proposer has asked SECAS to explore two solution options for MP293:

1. Requiring the DCC to defer a Planned Maintenance when it will overlap with an adverse weather event.
2. The DCC will make a limited number of SRVs/Alerts available to Network Parties during a Planned Maintenance, i.e., SRVs/Alerts that are “Always On”.

These solution options will be developed in parallel and are subject to different considerations and assessment.

Areas for Assessment – Deferral Solution Option

Quantification of Impact

SECAS has worked with the DCC and with Network Parties to understand ways in which they may be impacted as a result of a Planned Maintenance either being deferred or not deferred respectively. These impacts are detailed in Section 2 of this document. However, SECAS will need to quantify these impacts in order to determine whether a cost-benefit test can be met for this Modification.

When [MP166 - 'Adverse Weather Planned Maintenance Process'](#) was raised to explore this issue previously, it was withdrawn due to high implementation costs identified by the DCC and its Service Providers. As there had never been an overlap between a Planned Maintenance and an adverse weather event when MP166 was being considered, the benefits case identified by Network Parties was purely theoretical. As there has now been an overlap, there is real-world data to explore to substantiate the benefits case for Network Parties.

SECAS will need to work with the DCC to understand the full scope of their impact as a result of deferring a Planned Maintenance (on both the DCC, their Service Providers, and DCC Users) on a quantifiable basis. SECAS will also need to quantify the impact on Network Parties arising from the Storm Daragh / Planned Maintenance overlap in December 2024 – Costs from not having had access to SMS communications must be calculated relative to costs incurred from a comparable adverse weather event where SMS communications were viable. This will allow for a more equal determination of cost-benefit.

DCC Planned Maintenance Deferral Decision Matrix

The Proposer has suggested that an adverse weather impacts matrix could be used to determine if the criteria have been met for a deferral of DCC Planned Maintenance. The Proposer’s rationale for a matrix is that it would provide a consistent and predictable way of determining ahead of time if a deferral should be considered. Due to the fast-moving nature of an adverse weather event, processes

governing convention of a Panel decision (or similar) on an ad hoc basis may not be agile enough to respond.

SECAS will work in collaboration with the DCC, Network Parties and other affected SEC Parties to determine how this matrix will be constructed. Assuming a matrix with size of affected area vs severity/impact, factors to consider will include:

- **Adverse weather severity:**
 - How will severity be determined? Should it be based on the established Met Office colour grading system of yellow, amber & red? Or should it use a different metric?
 - Should the severity differentiate between different types of adverse weather? For example, should an adverse weather warning primarily relating to impact from snow and ice have a differential rating to one primarily relating to wind and rain?
- **Size of adverse weather impacted area:**
 - How should the spread of the adverse weather be determined?
 - If determined against Grid Supply Point (GSP) groups, should adverse weather in one part of Scotland (a large GSP area in km²) result in DCC Planned Maintenance being cancelled across all of Great Britain?
 - Should there be a minimum number of affected areas before deferral is considered? For example, should a minimum of two areas be required before deferral can be considered?
- **Type of DCC Planned Maintenance:**
 - Should a higher matrix score be required for more critical DCC Planned Maintenance to be deferred?
 - If so, how will this be determined?
- **Time of year consideration:**
 - Should there be two matrices, one for DCC Planned Maintenance in the summer and one for the winter? This would be reflective of the differing size and scale of adverse weather over the course of the year.

Deferral decision: Ownership & Determination

Where the matrix indicates that a DCC Planned Maintenance should be deferred, two questions need to be answered:

1. Is the matrix outcome final and binding? i.e., where the matrix indicates that a DCC Planned Maintenance must be deferred, will this be automatically triggered with no other stakeholder input required?
2. Should the matrix outcome be non-binding, instead acting as a trigger to consider deferral where conditions are met, who shall own the final decision on whether to defer the DCC Planned Maintenance? Should this be the DCC, SEC Panel, SECAS, or some other body of combination thereof.

Interim Deferral Policy Agreement – DCC & Network Parties

Over the course of 2025, Network Parties have been engaging with the DCC in conversations supported by the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero (DESNZ) aimed at developing a policy document that would agree the criteria against which the DCC would defer a Planned Maintenance that would be concurrent with an adverse weather event. A mutually agreed deferral criteria would then form the basis of the legal drafting for the MP293 deferral solution.

During the progression of MP293, two versions of the draft policy document were in discussion: V2.7 and V2.8. Broadly, V2.7 represented a position supported by Network Parties, but lacking support from the DCC. In contrast, V2.8 represented a position supported by the DCC, but lacking support from Network Parties.

At the time of publication of this document, the DCC are exploring a V2.9 which may offer concessions to Network Parties to ameliorate concerns in respect of V2.8. However, the Proposer has instructed SECAS to draft legal text that would codify V2.7 of the draft policy document into the SEC.

Areas for Assessment – “Always On” Solution Option

Initial Considerations & Introduction into scope of MP293

During discussions on the deferral solution option, the DCC raised the prospect of a potential solution in which a small number of Service Reference Variants (SRV) and/or Alerts could be kept on during a Planned Maintenance. In this way, even when an adverse weather event happens concurrent with a Planned Maintenance, a Network Party could still be in communication with an SMS via one of the “always on” SRVs. As a result, both the DCC and Network Parties could achieve their operational goals during an Maintenance and an adverse weather event respectfully, without detriment to the other.

The Proposer has asked SECAS to explore the “Always On” solution alongside the deferral solution option, with a preference for the “Always On” solution as the primary means of resolving this Modification’s problem statement. Following discussion between Network Parties and the Energy Network Association (ENA), the trade association for Network Parties, the Proposer has identified two SRVs/Alerts that they believe would enable sufficient communication with SMSs during an adverse weather event. These are SRV 7.4 – ‘Read Supply Status’, and Alert AD1 – ‘Power Outage Event’.

“Always On” SRVs/Alerts

The DCC have suggested that development of a Minimum Viable Product for the “Always On” solution might include up to four or five SRVs/Alerts, where two could be for Network Party benefit, and the remaining two/three may ones that are useful for Suppliers. These Supplier-centric SRVs/Alerts could be used for Prepayment SMS functions and could support top-up functionality during an adverse weather event, for example. SECAS suggested to the Proposer, in [our/their] role as a “Critical Friend”, that an expansion of the scope of the MP293 “Always On” solution to encompass SRVs/Alerts that have appeal to other SEC Parties beyond Network Parties may strengthen the cost-benefit equation for this Modification.

The Proposer has asked SECAS not to pursue this expansion in scope, however. It is their view that as this Modification was raised to address problems specific to Network Parties, i.e., to enable them to fulfil their obligations to consumers in respect of supply restoration following adverse weather events, that the scope should remain limited to Network Party benefits only. As such, SRVs/Alerts relating to Supplier functions or Prepayment functionality will not be included within the scope of MP293. SECAS have advised the Proposer that this more limited scope can be progressed, but that a

narrowing of the benefits case relative to the cost may result in this Modification facing greater barriers in terms of approval.

Implementation & Delivery Considerations

The Proposer has also indicated that they would like implementation of this Modification to target the DCC's DSP1. As the core issue of MP293 relates to consumer detriment, and the potential endangerment of both consumers and also Network Party staff, it is their wish that this Modification is delivered as soon as possible. As such, the Proposer has asked SECAS to explore how the "Always On" solution can be delivered in the earliest possible timeframes.

SECAS have raised the prospect of delivery into DSP1 with the DCC. The DCC have indicated that implementation prior to November 2027 is unlikely due to both design, build, and test requirements, combined with the necessary governance steps in the progression of the Modification. Additionally, they have advised that delivery into DSP1 is likely to be highly costly, though a value cannot be provided until a Preliminary Impact Assessment is conducted. SECAS has advised the Proposer that in seeking to implement the "Always On" solution into DSP1, they are likely to incur significant costs relative to the expected benefits of a marginally earlier implementation. The Proposer has indicated that they would like to proceed against DSP1, however.

The DCC has indicated to SECAS and the Proposer that they expect that DSP2 will have very limited downtime and may require as little as four hours of Planned Maintenance a year. Based on the DCC's assessment, the expected return for delivery of the proposed solution into DSP2 may therefore not be proportionate relative to the cost. The Proposer has indicated that they would like to pursue implementation into both DSP1 and DSP2, however.

Sub-Committee Input

SECAS will engage with the Chairs from the Operations Group (OPSG), the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), the Security Sub-Committee (SSC), the Smart Metering Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA), the Testing Advisory Group (TAG) and the Privacy Sub-Committee (PSC) to confirm what input is required from these forums.

SECAS believes the following Sub-Committees will need to provide the following input to this modification:

Sub-Committee input	
Sub-Committee	Input sought
OPSG	Assess any potential operation impacts as a result of the potential solution(s).
TABASC	Assess any potential technical impacts as a result of the potential solution(s).
SSC	Assess any potential technical impacts as a result of the potential solution(s).
TAG	No input required
PSC	No input required
SMIKI PMA	No input required

Observations from Sub-Committees

Discussions at Change Sub-Committee (CSC) – June 2025

A question was raised asking if it is not only the Data Service Provider (DSP) and the DCC Service Providers, but also the wider SEC users who are impacted. SECAS advised they will take this on

board as they progress and explore the impact of the solution. A point was also raised to note that there have been instances where consumers have been notified of a loss of SMS functionality due to a Planned Maintenance, and that where this is deferred with short notice, consumer advice has therefore become inaccurate.

The Proposer and SECAS noted similarities between MP293 and MP166 but noted that there is a difference between the two modifications; when MP166 was considered, an adverse weather event had never occurred at the same time as a DCC Planned Maintenance, and as such the impacts were theoretical. They went on to note that in December 2024 there was such an overlap, and that impact could therefore now be quantified. The Proposer referenced their suggestion relating to a Planned Maintenance deferral decision matrix.

A question was raised asking if MP293 would impact the six Service Providers for Data Service Provider two (DSP2), rather than one Service Provider as per the current DSP arrangements. They noted that current architecture is different relative to DSP2; SECAS will take this into consideration. A point was raised by the CSC Chair advising that SECAS will be also be exploring a similar Modification – [MP294 'Review of DCC Maintenance Activities and Temporary Additional Allowance'](#) - and these two modifications may impact on each other. This will be considered during the progression of this Modification.

A question was raised asking how adverse weather events are categorised. SECAS will explore and take note of how the Met Office calculate adverse weather event ratings when considering the solution to this Modification.

Discussion at Security Sub-Committee (SSC) – July 2025

MP293 was discussed at SSC in respect of the “Deferral” solution option. SECAS asked for feedback on the Proposed Solution, and if there were any issues or considerations that SECAS were not aware of.

Members shared their feedback on the modification generally and additionally recommended that SECAS review the storm severity grading to determine what qualifies as a major event.

Discussion at Technical Architecture & Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) – July 2025

MP293 was discussed at TABASC in respect of the “Deferral” solution option. SECAS asked for feedback on the proposed solution, and if there were any issues or considerations that SECAS were not aware of.

Members noted that where a Planned Maintenance will deliver changes to support a planned SEC Release, a deferral of that Maintenance may impact the delivery of the associated changes. This would therefore require a careful assessment of the relative benefits of a deferral on a Maintenance-by-Maintenance basis. The DCC noted that they cannot fully categorise the impact of this scenario until they have conducted an Impact Assessment, but Members agreed that each Planned Maintenance window should be reviewed on its own merits.

It was emphasized that Unplanned Maintenance, which is typically critical, must not be deferred, and that any deferral of planned maintenance should be limited to avoid knock-on effects on subsequent schedules. Members also highlighted the need to avoid excessive cancellation of Planned Maintenance events, stressing that only severe weather events should justify deferral, and raised concerns about potential over-classification leading to repeated postponements.

Discussion at Operations Sub-Group (OPSG) – July 2025

MP293 was discussed at OPSG in respect of the “Deferral” solution option. SECAS asked for feedback on the proposed solution, and if there were any issues or considerations that SECAS were not aware of.

Members emphasized the need to consider consumer impacts resulting from extended supply interruptions when SECAS come to assess the cost-benefit case for MP293. The Proposer (who was present) provided additional context on Network Party Impact. They told Members that Network Parties are seeking a codification of deferral obligations to enable challenges to DCC decisions and ensure transparent tracking of maintenance deferrals.

The DCC highlighted that deferrals are complex and can create a “domino effect” on subsequent maintenance windows. While supporting the rationale for codification, the DCC noted that flexibility is required in order to accommodate varied adverse weather scenarios. An interim, uncoded process currently allows Network Parties to request deferral within 24–48 hours of a storm, feeding into internal go/no-go decisions, but only permits a 48-hour delay. The Chair raised a question for SECAS, asking how the impacts of a deferral could be assessed from a cost perspective.

Discussion at Change Sub-Committee (CSC) – November 2025

The Proposer asked SECAS to revisit the prioritisation and authority determination status. SECAS provided an overview of the Modification and advised Members that the Proposer has asked SECAS to increase the prioritisation from Medium to High, and to change MP293 from a Self-Governance Modification to an Authority-Determined Modification. The Proposer also gave Members an overview of the Modification, providing a rationale for the increase in prioritisation, citing enhanced consumer impact, legal & regulatory compliance impact, and impacts on operational performance.

The Proposer also provided their rationale for the change in status from Self-Governance to Authority-Determined, citing the following criteria as per SEC Section D ‘Modifications Process’ - “the variations are likely to have a material effect on existing or future Energy Consumers”.

SECAS also advised Members that the Proposer has asked for the Modification to be re-classified as Ofgem Urgent. SECAS informed Members that this decision falls within the authority of the SEC Panel, and that whilst the CSC cannot make this determination, they should be aware of the rationale behind the proposal.

CSC voted to upgrade the prioritisation from Medium to High and agreed a change to make this an Authority Determined Modification. SECAS and the Proposer also initiated a conversation on the rationale for the change in Urgency. The Proposer told Members that MP293 meets the following Ofgem-set criteria, in their view: “A significant commercial impact on parties, consumers or other stakeholder(s)”. SECAS showed Members an indicative timetable, which would be submitted to Ofgem pending SEC Panel approval of Urgency status. This indicative timetable would enable an implementation in November 2027. SECAS told Members that [we/they] are currently in conversation with the Proposer about shortening the timetable, so the Proposer’s ambition for a June 2027 implementation could be realised.

SECAS told Members that whilst it may be possible to truncate the proposed timetable enough to allow for a June 2027 implementation, that this would likely result in a significant increase in costs arising from the DCC’s Impact Assessment, and also an increase in the opacity of the governance process as Consultation stages are reduced, limiting the scope for industry engagement. The DCC added that in their view, a June 2027 implementation is unrealistic. The Proposer indicated to CSC

Members that it is still intention, however, to work with SECAS to affect an earlier implementation in order to realise the perceived benefits of the Modification faster.

Appendix 1: Progression timetable

Timetable	
Event/Action	Date
Draft Proposal raised	09 June 2025
Presented to CSC for initial comment	17 June 2025
Converted to Modification Proposal	17 June 2025
Presented to TABASC	03 July 2025
Presented to SSC	09 July 2025
Presented to OPSG	28 July 2025
<i>Requirement Workshop SECAS, Proposer, DCC and Service Providers</i>	<i>24 November 2025</i>
<i>SEC Panel agrees to request Urgency¹</i>	<i>25 November 2025</i>
<i>Presented to TABASC/Working Group/OPSG/SSC for feedback</i>	<i>26 November 2025 – 9 December 2025</i>
<i>DCC Preliminary Assessment on DSP1 only</i>	<i>5 January 2026 – 6 February 2026</i>
<i>Working Group Discussion*</i>	<i>03 March 2026</i>
<i>Refinement Consultation and Sub-Committee feedback*</i>	<i>9 March 2026 – 13 April 2026</i>
<i>Working Group Discussion*</i>	<i>05 May 2026</i>
<i>Request Impact Assessment at Change Board*</i>	<i>20 May 2026</i>
<i>DCC Impact Assessment*</i>	<i>20 May 2026 - 31 July 2026</i>
<i>Working Group Discussion*</i>	<i>02 September 2026</i>
<i>Sub-Committee feedback*</i>	<i>02 September 2026 – 15 September 2026</i>
<i>CSC agree to progress to Report Phase*</i>	<i>15 September 2026</i>
<i>Modification Report Consultation*</i>	<i>16 September 2026 - 7 Oct 2026</i>
<i>Change Board final vote*</i>	<i>21 October 2026</i>
<i>Authority Determination*</i>	<i>21 October 2026 – 10 December 2026</i>
<i>DCC Design Build and PIT*</i>	<i>January 2027 – June 2027</i>
<i>DCC SIT and UIT*</i>	<i>June 2027 - November 2027</i>
<i>Implementation into DSP1 only*</i>	<i>November 2027</i>

Italics denote planned events that could be subject to change

*The DCC has stated that it cannot commit to any timelines beyond the Preliminary Assessment until the Preliminary Assessment has been completed

1 – Events beyond this point are subject to approval of Urgency by SEC Panel.

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
CSC	Change Sub-Committee
DCC	Data Communications Company
DSP	Data Service Provider
ENWL	Electricity Northwest Limited
GSP	Grid Supply Point
Met Office	Meteorological Office
OPR	Operational Performance Regime
OPSG	Operations Group
SEC	Smart Energy Code
SECAS	The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat
SMETS1	Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 1
SMS	Smart Metering System
SRV	Service Reference Variant
SSC	Security Sub-Committee
TABASC	Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee