MP304 'Scheduling Services for SMETS1 Devices'

Conclusions Report – version 1.0

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation and the decision of the Change Board regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

Summary of conclusions

Change Board

The Change Board voted to **approve** MP304. It believed the modification better facilitated SEC Objectives (a)[1] and (g)[2].

Modification Report Consultation

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) received two responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Both respondents believed that the modification should be approved. They considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objectives (a) and (b)[3].

[1] facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain

[2] facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of this Code.

[3] enable the Data Communications Company to comply at all times with the General Objectives of the Data Communications Company (as defined in the Data Communications Company Licence), and to efficiently discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the Data Communications Company Licence.

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

The two respondents to the Modification Report Consultation believed that the modification should be approved and implemented. One respondent highlighted the fact that the effectiveness of the modification relies on Suppliers using the scheduling option for Service Reference Variant (SRV) 4.3 *'Read Instantaneous Prepay Values'.*

Another respondent highlighted the improvements to operational efficiency and reduction in manual intervention by implementing the scheduling service. They mentioned that this scheduling service is equivalent to that available for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 2 (SMETS2) Devices and this modification will remove a functional gap by enabling the same for SMETS1 Devices. The respondent added that scheduled SRV4.3 requests align with the broader industry effort to optimise Data Communications Company (DCC) messaging costs while maintaining high-quality prepay data delivery for consumers.

Change Board vote

Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to **approve** MP304 under Self-Governance.

The vote breakdown is summarised below:

Change Board vote				
Party Category	**Approve**	**Reject**	**Abstain**	**Outcome**
Large Suppliers	5	-	-	**Approve**
Small Suppliers	3	-	-	**Approve**
Network Parties	1	-	-	**Approve**
Other SEC Parties	2	-	-	**Approve**
Consumer Representative	1	-	-	**Approve**
			Overall outcome:	**APPROVE**

Quoracy

SECAS noted the lack of quoracy for Network Parties. SECAS recommended that, given the priority and urgency of the modification, and that the previous meeting had been postponed due to lack of quoracy of Network Parties, the voting should proceed. The Change Board agreed and SECAS recommended that it would seek to ratify the vote at the next Change Board meeting. The Ofgem representative agreed that this approach was acceptable in these circumstances.

Views relating to the General SEC Objectives

Objective (a)

The Change Board believed that MP304 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a). They believed that the implementation of the modification would allow for better operation and efficient provision of Smart Metering Systems at consumers' premises.

Objective (g)

In addition to SEC Objective (a), one member of the Change Board (Large Supplier) believed the modification would also better facilitate SEC Objective (g).

Change Board discussions

A member of the Change Board (Large Supplier) questioned the graphs provided as part of the presentation, as the assumption presented was that no Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification 1 (SMETS1) Devices will be removed between now and the end of December 2027. The DCC clarified that the numbers presented showed a slightly diminishing demand for SRV4.3, which will be due to a Device exchange however, since the DCC could not predict how quickly Suppliers would exchange SMETS1s they had made an estimate. The DCC also confirmed that it would be applicable to all SMETS1 cohorts.

The Change Board member (Large Supplier) added that a further discussion regarding Ofgem disallowances is required, as the modification implies all costs can be passed on. This would go against the Ofgem disallowance when calculating price control. The Change Board Chair clarified that the aim of the modification is to create the ability for SRV4.3 to be schedulable. This will in turn reduce the number of SMS messages that are sent as well as the associated costs. Ofgem has disallowed some SMS costings in the past, and the modification does not aim to make a tacit agreement to pay the costs. The final decision on disallowances will remain with Ofgem and approval of this modification should not affect the rationale for that decision.

The Change Board member (Large Supplier) pointed out that this was previously considered to be included in Enrolment and Adoption (E&A). The reason it was ultimately not included in E&A was because it was considered economically unviable as SMETS1 Service Providers (S1SPs) charged significantly for the exact solution presented as part of this modification.

The Change Board member (Large Supplier) went on to question next steps if the solution is not adopted. They stated that this functionality was desired at one point but deemed too expensive, only to be implemented now. The pragmatic reality is that there will be difficulties within organisations with adopting new versions of Appendix AD 'DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS)'. The Change Board Chair clarified that as long as the organisations with the largest Middle Operating Capabilities (MOC) cohorts adopt the new version of DUIS, the cited benefits will be realised.

Another member of the Change Board (Large Supplier) questioned the number of organisations that hold large numbers of MOC cohorts that would be able to provide a reassurance that it is their intention to adopt the solution. A member of the Change Board (Large Supplier) identified themselves as one of the organisations that would be committed to making the changes and adopting the solution described in the modification. They stated it would improve their internal business processes as well as bring them in line with SMETS2.

The Change Board member (Large Supplier) also stated that their organisation holds a significant number of MOC cohorts of prepay. However, they stated that it would be down to the Adaptor

Provider to uplift to the required version of DUIS for the benefit to be realised. This would require an internal business case to justify the change when the Adaptor Provider already has a solution (a work around given that this was not include in E&A) in place. They went on to state that generally, a DUIS uplift does not equal immediate adoption, as organisations may choose to test the new version and wait before adopting. This causes a delay between the solution becoming available and the organisations effectively adopting it.