

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.

MP239 ‘Enduring Solution for Resolving SMETS2 Device Certificate Misalignment Issue’

Annex A

Business requirements – version 0.1

About this document

This document contains the business requirements that support the solution(s) for this Modification Proposal. It sets out the requirements along with any assumptions and considerations. The Data Communications Company (DCC) will use this information to provide an assessment of the requirements that help shape the complete solution.

1. Business requirements

This section contains the functional business requirements. Based on these requirements a full solution will be developed.

Business Requirements		
Ref.	Requirement	Responsible for delivery
1	Device certificate misalignment issues are to be resolved to enable the Service User to send all Service Requests (SRs) to a Device and for the Device to respond accordingly.	DCC
2	The Proposed Solution must resolve the issue for three scenarios: - Change of Supplier (CoS) when the gaining Supplier cannot rectify the issue through manual intervention. - When the previous Supplier has ceased to trade, and a Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) has been nominated. - When the Device does not support the process of Service Reference Variant (SRV) 6.24.2 'Retrieve Device Security Credentials (Device)'.	DCC
3	Addressing Device certificate misalignment issues should not require a manual Smart Metering Inventory (SMI) update except in exceptional circumstances.	DCC
4	Device certificate reporting is to be enduring as opposed to being produced on an ad-hoc basis and made available to Smart Energy Code (SEC) Parties.	DCC
5	Device certificate reporting must not duplicate information contained within current Post-Commissioning reporting.	DCC

2. Considerations and assumptions

This section contains the considerations and assumptions for each business requirement.

2.1 General

This solution will be applied to Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS)1 and SMETS2 Devices.

2.2 Requirement 1: Device certificate misalignment issues are to be resolved to enable the Service User to send all Service Requests (SRs) to a Device and for the Device to respond accordingly.

The DCC Data Science and Analytics (DS&A) team has produced a report that states that approximately 44,000 Devices have misaligned certificates. The misalignment occurs between the Device and the Data Service Provider (DSP) Master Key Store. If the Device certificates are misaligned, the Device is rendered incommunicable. To address the issue and allow the Supplier to send all SRs to the Device, the certificate misalignment must be corrected. This is currently carried out manually, which is labour-intensive for the Supplier and DSP.

2.3 Requirement 2: The Proposed Solution must resolve the issue for three scenarios:

- **Change of Supplier (CoS) when the gaining Supplier cannot rectify the issue through manual intervention.**
- **When the previous Supplier has ceased to trade, and a Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) has been nominated.**
- **When the Device does not support the process of Service Reference Variant (SRV) 6.24.2 'Retrieve Device Security Credentials (Device)'.**

The Proposer has highlighted the three most common scenarios that are impacted by Device certificate misalignment. In each scenario, the Supplier will only be able to send SRV 6.24.2 'Retrieve Device Security Credentials (Device)' to the Device, meaning that the consumer will not benefit from smart functionality. Although these are the three most common scenarios, the Proposer has indicated that there may be other instances where Device certificate misalignment occurs.

2.4 Requirement 3: Addressing Device certificate misalignment issues should not require a manual Smart Metering Inventory (SMI) update except in exceptional circumstances.

The Modification Report states that although the issue can be addressed by manual intervention by the DSP, the process is time consuming for both the Supplier and DSP, as well as there not being a consistent process for rectifying the errors. As such, it is the intention to have an automated solution, and only in exceptional circumstances will Suppliers and the DSP have to revert back to a manual update to the SMI.

The Proposer has requested that Devices that are currently impacted by the issue (approximately 44k Devices) are passed through the process in bulk to address the existing backlog.

2.5 Requirement 4: Device certificate reporting is to be enduring as opposed to being produced on an ad-hoc basis and made available to Smart Energy Code (SEC) Parties.

The Proposer has advised that they have received reports from the DCC to provide visibility on the issue which have been of use, and it would be beneficial if they are produced and made available to SEC Parties on a regular basis. The DCC will investigate the best way to make them available to SEC Parties.

2.6 Requirement 5: Device certificate reporting must not duplicate information contained within current Post-Commissioning reporting.

The Proposer has stated that there should be no duplicated data with the current contents of Post-Commissioning reports. It is advantageous to have a single source of data to not cause confusion amongst the recipients of the reports. The contents of the reports will be agreed following the completion of the Preliminary Assessment.

3. Solution development

This section contains a must-have, should-have, could-have, won't-have (MoSCoW) analysis for the different requirement components to be considered as part of the solution.

MoSCoW Analysis			
Requirement Ref.	Description	Responsible for delivery	MoSCoW
1	The Proposer and DCC have agreed that the Proposed solution must deliver this requirement.	DCC	M
2	The Proposer and DCC have agreed that the Proposed solution must deliver this requirement.	DCC	M
3	The Proposer and DCC have agreed that the Proposed solution must deliver this requirement.	DCC	M
4	The Proposer and DCC have agreed that this requirement is 'should-have' as further details regarding the reporting such as the contents will be investigated during the Preliminary Assessment.	DCC	S
5	The Proposer and DCC have agreed that this requirement is 'should-have' as further details regarding the reporting such as the contents will be investigated during the Preliminary Assessment.	DCC	S

Key

- M = Must have
- S = Should have
- C = Could have
- W = Won't have

4. Glossary

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

Glossary	
Acronym	Full term
CoS	Change of Supplier
DCC	Data Communications Company
DS&A	Data Science and analytics
DSP	Data Service Provider
SEC	Smart Energy Code
SMETS	Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications
SMI	Smart Metering Inventory
SoLR	Supplier of Last Resort
SR	Service Request
SRV	Service Reference Variant