

SEC Modification Proposal, SECMP0242

Change to Operational Metrics to Measure on Success

Preliminary Impact Assessment (PIA)

Version:	0.3
Date:	8th September, 2023
Author:	DCC
Classification:	DCC Public

Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Document History	4
2.1	Revision History	4
2.2	Associated Documents.....	4
2.3	Document Information	4
3	Context and Requirements.....	5
3.1	Problem Statement.....	5
3.2	Business Context and Requirements.....	5
3.3	Business Requirements.....	5
4	Description of Solution.....	9
4.1	DSP Solution Description.....	9
4.2	DCC Data Science and Analytics	10
4.2.1	DCC Service Ownership.....	10
4.3	DS&A Solution Overview.....	10
4.4	Solution Constraints and Changes.....	12
4.5	Delivery Mechanism.....	13
4.6	Working Methodology.....	13
4.7	Data Delivery, Testing, and User Acceptance	13
5	Impact on Systems, Processes and People.....	14
5.1	Infrastructure Impact	14
5.2	Security Impact.....	14
5.3	Data Science & Analytics Team and Wider DCC Operations	14
5.4	Report Delivery	14
6	Implementation Timescales and Approach.....	14
6.1	Testing and Acceptance	14
7	Costs and Charges.....	16
7.1	Design, Build, and Testing Cost Impact.....	16
	Appendix A: Glossary	17

1 Executive Summary

The Change Board are asked to approve the following:

- Total cost to complete the Full Impact Assessment (FIA) of **£19,303**.
- The timescales to complete the Full Impact Assessment of 40 Working Days

The total ROM costs to deliver SECMP0242 are £208,750 with a tolerance of $\pm 20\%$, which includes Design, Build, and PIT activities.

Problem Statement

Using a previous Modification, DCC reports on the Round Trip Times of messages sent across the DCC Total System. However, this reporting does not give any indication of whether a business process has completed successfully from the point of view of a customer, nor does it give any view of the detail of the delay associated with a particular point in the process.

The OPSG and Performance Measures Review Group (PMRG) are requesting monthly reports containing the Success or Failure and execution of each of the Business Process Service Request Variants broken down by DCC outcome and Business Process outcome. The overall volume of transactions for the Service Reference Variant (SRV) for that month should also be included.

Benefit Summary

The Proposer has stated that it would be more beneficial if the DCC could measure the 'success' of a Service Request (SR), Service Reference Variant (SRV), or Alert as well as the perceived success of selected Business Processes with a view to identify the basis of any failures, and potentially identifying areas of investigation to remove problem causes.

By including Business Processes the impact on the customer, and a differentiation between processes impacted by DCC concerns or user error can be identified and examined.

The inclusion of Future Dated information in the Service Audit Trail (SAT) will facilitate a significant improvement in DCC being able to track business processes where either a DSP Future Dated or Device Future Dated command or SRV is invoked.

2 Document History

2.1 Revision History

Revision Date	Revision	Summary of Changes
04/09/2023	0.1	Initial version
08/09/2023	0.3	DCC review complete

2.2 Associated Documents

This document is associated with the following documents:

Ref	Title and Originator's Reference	Source	Issue Date
1	DP242 Modification Report v0.2	SECAS	13/06/2023
2	MP242 business requirements v0.4	SECAS	13/06/2023

References are shown in this format, [1].

2.3 Document Information

The Proposer for this Modification is Rochelle Harrison from British Gas.

The initial Preliminary Impact Assessment was requested of DCC on 8th August 2023.

3 Context and Requirements

In this section, the context of the Modification, assumptions, and the requirements are stated.

The requirements have been provided by SECAS, the Proposer, and the Working Group.

3.1 Problem Statement

Smart Energy Code (SEC) Modification MP122A 'Operational Metrics' (implemented on 25 February 2021) introduced Target Response Times (TRTs) to the Operational Performance Regime (OPR).

However, the Data Communications Company (DCC) is not currently able to measure TRTs, and instead can only measure Round Trip Times (RTTs). Without TRT data, only the RTTs can be reported against the targets captured in SEC Section H 'DCC Services', reducing the value of these reports generated as part of the OPR. Within the Proposed Solution for MP122A, it was agreed that the criteria for measuring the success or failure of an entire business process would be determined by the number of responses and those that returned a failed response. This would be assessed by the Operations Group (OPSG) upon the presentation of the Performance Measurement Report (PMR) based on commentary provided by the DCC on each failure.

3.2 Business Context and Requirements

The OPSG and Performance Measures Review Group (PMRG) have stated that it would be more beneficial if the DCC could measure the 'success' of a Service Request (SR), Service Reference Variant (SRV), or Alert. Where a corresponding 'failure' is not due to the DCC Total System, then exceptions will be allowed. All exceptions will be reviewed and agreed between Operations Group and DCC before being included in any reporting. An example of such as exception would be where a Service User sends updates to a Device for which the User is not responsible, which in turn generates error messages.

SRs, SRVs and Alerts from both Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) 1 and SMETS 2+ Devices will be within scope of this proposal.

3.3 Business Requirements

Requirement 1: This modification will capture the consumer experience and pinpoint areas of concern through determining the success or failure of an agreed set of Service Reference Variants (SRVs).

The Proposer has stated that the current reporting captured under the PMR does not reflect the consumer experience. The intent of this modification is to provide additional reporting from a consumer-centric perspective, to help identify areas where performance may be improved. During the Preliminary Assessment, the DCC will investigate the proposed delivery time of the reports with a view to aligning them with the Business Process Indicator reports.

Requirement 2: The DCC is to measure the success and execution of an agreed set of Business Processes and SRVs. The agreed set of Business Processes are:

- **Install and Commission**
- **Change of Supplier (Gain)**
- **Pre-Payment**

- **Update Device Firmware**
- **Meter Reads**
- **Tariff Updates**

It should be noted that “Pre-Payment” has been split into “Prepayment” and “Top Up Device” in the following list.

The Proposer has indicated that the following Business Processes and associated SRVs are critical to the end consumer experience.

Install and Commission	8.11 Update HAN Device Log
	6.21 Request Handover of DCC Controlled Device (Update Supplier Certificates)
	8.1.1 Commission Device
	8.7.2 Join Service (Join GPF with GSME)
	6.20.1 Set Device Configuration' (Import MPxN)
	1.1.1 Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)
	6.8 Update Device Configuration (Billing Calendar)
	8.14.1 Communications Hub Status Update Install Success.
Change of Supplier (Gain)	6.23 Update Security Credentials (CoS)
	1.1.1 Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)
	6.8 Update Device Configuration (Billing Calendar)
Pre-Payment	1.6 Update Payment Mode (Payment Mode = Prepayment)
	2.1 Update Prepay Configuration
Top Up Prepayment	2.2 Top Up Device (Update Balance with positive value)
Update Device Firmware	11.1 Update Firmware
	11.2 Read Firmware Version
	11.3 Activate Firmware (Individual SR for each GUID for firmware activation)
	11.4 Update PPMID Firmware
Meter Reads	4.6.1 Retrieve Import Daily Read Log
	4.6.2 Retrieve Export Daily Read Log
	4.8.1 Read Active Import Profile Data
	4.8.2 Read Reactive Import Profile Data
	4.8.3 Read Export Profile Data
	4.10 Read Network Data
	4.17 Retrieve Daily Consumption Log
Tariff Updates	1.1.1 Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)
	1.2.1 Update Price (Primary Element)

Requirement 3: The DCC will measure against the following conditions to determine success:

Scenario	DUIS Response Code	GBCS Execution Status	DCC Outcome	Business Outcome
SRV passes DSP validation	I99	N/A	ACK	N/A
SRV fails DSP validation	E1 – E100*	N/A	Success	Failure
Failed to send request to CSP/S1SP	E20	N/A	Failure	Failure
No response from Device	E21	N/A	Failure	Failure
No response from Device at Future Dated execution time (T)	E30	N/A	Failure	Failure
Failed to send request to CSP/S1SP or No response from Device for Scheduled or Future Dated SRV (T)	E31	N/A	Failure	Failure
Failed to send request to ECoS Party (T)	E66	N/A	Failure	Failure
No response from ECoS Party (T)	E67	N/A	Failure	Failure
Response received – GBCS Success	I0	Success	Success	Success
Response received – GBCS Failure	I0	Failure	Success	Failure

Note: * excludes the E codes E20, E21, E30, E31, E66, E67

(T) indicates messages related to Timeouts

The four conditions will set out the criteria for determining the success or failure of the SRVs included within the seven Business Processes.

Requirement 4: The conditional success / failure will be agreed by the Working Group before the commencement of the DCC Full Impact Assessment and any additional conditional status will be agreed by the Panel (delegated to the SEC Operations Group).

The Working Group will review the PIA to determine the criteria for the success or failure of an SRV delivered to the User. If the modification is approved and implemented into the SEC, SEC Panel, who are likely to delegate to the Operations Group, may choose to add further conditional statuses. This will likely be through a guidance document to not require further amendments to the SEC.

Requirement 5: If a timeout occurs before an SRV is received by the User, it will automatically be categorised as a failure.

Due to the DCC's current inability to accurately measure Target Response Times, if a timeout occurs before a Service Request (SR) / SRV / Alert is received by the User, it will be deemed a failure.

Requirement 6: When measuring the success and failure of the agreed Business Processes, the DCC is to provide reporting that includes retries, and also without, for transparency.

During discussion with the OPSG, it was agreed that the DCC will provide reporting that will factor in SEC User retries, and also report without them. This will provide transparency to SEC Parties on how retries impact DCC performance. An example of this is a Supplier Party

sending the same SRV repeatedly to commission a newly installed Device. DCC will identify the level of impact of this requirement within the Preliminary Assessment. This will be displayed as a measurement of retries against each SRV. The Proposer will then decide if this is to remain before requesting the Full Impact Assessment.

Requirement 7: The data included in the report will be classified as a Business Process Indicator.

During the Refinement Process, the DCC has stated that categorising the data as measures will likely have high associated costs. As such, the data will remain as indicators.

4 Description of Solution

Following analysis of the Requirements above, the DSP and DCC teams propose the following solution:

- The addition of Future Dated SRV information by the DSP to help the DCC DS&A team review and report on business processes overall.
- Creation of a dedicated data-model within the DCC production data platform.
- Using the data model to produce a simple summary report detailing the Success / Fail of the Business Process broken down by DCC Outcome and Business Process outcome as a percentage, volume of transactions for the combined Business Process SRVs will also be provided to help give context, and with no exclusions.
- Using the data model to produce a more detailed report containing the Success / Failure and execution of each of the Business Process SRVs broken down by DCC outcome and Business Process outcome. The overall volume of transactions for the SRV for that month will also be included.
- Journey tracking will be used to help explain gaps between the simple raw SRV reporting and E2E consumer and SEC Party experience of the success / failure and execution of the request ID within the business process, and it's associated journey using SRVs.
- Journey tracking will require much larger data models and processing.
- Report will be compiled and shared with SEC Parties via SharePoint

4.1 DSP Solution Description

For Future Dated requests, the first SAT log entry written for the request will have the northbound sent date/time populated with the execution date/time (instead of being empty). This will be the SAT record with:

- Mode of Operation = 10 (DSP Future Dated)
- Transaction status = 18 (Stored for Future Delivery)
- Report status id = 3 (DCC Only/Transform Complete)

For Device Future Dated requests, this will be the SAT record with:

- Mode of Operation = 4 (Device Future Dated)
- Transaction status = 1 (Pending Completion)
- Report status id = 1 (On Demand Southbound Pending Completion)

To minimise the change impact, an existing field will be utilised for the date/time, i.e., there will be no additional field added to SAT records.

Given the scope of the changes and DCC's desire to only use feature switches where necessary, it is proposed that the DSP application changes are not protected by a feature switch.

4.2 DCC Data Science and Analytics

A description of the DCC's Data Science and Analytics (DS&A) function was included in the PIA for SECMP0223.

DCC DS&A will be responsible for the design, development, implementation and Business as Usual (BAU) maintenance of the solution for this Modification.

4.2.1 DCC Service Ownership

DCC's Service Ownership (SO) function was formed in March 2023. It has particular focus on having accountability of performance management of End to End (E2E) Business Processes within the DCC. This means a focus on consumer and customer outcomes, so DCC can deliver optimal service. The SO team own and act as the experts of the E2E processes and controls that enable a seamless DCC managed Smart Meter experience, as well as translating Service and Technology into Operational insight, which enables in depth understanding of the factors that impact performance. The SO team will also drive proactive continuous improvement to deliver optimal end user outcomes, for future and current services.

This will be undertaken by the following objectives:

- Aim to be proactively informative rather than reactive to drive optimal performance
- Resolution based insight into customer behaviour and experience
- Improved insight into technical solution failures
- Defined E2E control points to drive accountability and responsibility within DCC
- A deeper understanding of technical solutions to enable knowledge across DCC Operations
- Alignment to promote one version of the truth throughout DCC Operations
- Implementation of E2E mapping of Services across Operations
- Continual Service Performance improvements (Technical and Process)
- Capturing and driving a risk management framework for DCC Services
- Compliance with all regulatory obligations and license conditions
- Ensuring the primary impacting end user outcomes are best in class
- Proposing and supporting SECMODs to make end user service optimal
- Defining seamless alignment groups within DCC
- Being regarded as the single source of truth over E2E performance across Industry

4.3 DS&A Solution Overview

Utilising the data contained within the SAT and Inventory datasets received from the DSP, a bespoke data pipeline will be developed to produce a data model. The data model will be

used to categorise and report on DCC and Business Process success or failure as per Requirement 3 above.

The categorisation of each individual Request in isolation may not give an accurate indication of the real-world end-user experience of performance.

This is where journey tracking comes into play. Journey tracking looks at the requests sent to a device and uses the SRVs and alert responses data to understand if the process was ultimately successful. A simplistic example of this could be SRV 8.11 used in the Install and Commission process. It could be the outcome of the 8.11 was E20 or E21 but there could still be a N24 Alert in close proximity to (but after) the 8.11 showing the join was successful, even if the outcome appeared to be a failure.

Journey tracking will also look to see if multiple similar SRVs were sent to a device in close proximity. If one of the requests were to succeed and the rest were to fail, the outcome of the Journey would be considered a success.

Measurement of success of a journey and the data points that can be used will vary significantly. Prepayment SRV 2.2 is an example of where DS&A have data around UTRN generation that can be combined with other alerts to not only identify the Journey outcome but also give a much better indication of where the cause of failure could be.

The output of Journey tracking will be broken down by Business Process. If Journey tracking indicates a journey was ultimately successful it will be broken down into categories and added to the baseline success figure defined in Requirement 2 of this document. The inclusion of the DSP Future Dated information will enhance the reporting accuracy wherever a Future Dated Service Request is used by a SEC party.

As part of the solution DCC will look to provide a mechanism to introduce additional datasets that can be used to understand lower than expected success rates. This could be SRVs sent during maintenance windows, SRVs sent to 'Non-Communicative' or non-compliant devices.

Notes on the requirements and solutions follow.

Requirement 1: This report will attempt to ensure the timescales align with Business Process Indicators.

Requirements 2 & 3

These requirements are part of the same dataset as the tabled criteria. Some points of note where DS&A:

- will look to **add** to the requirement 3 scenario table where the DCC outcome is a success, but the Service User systems failed to acknowledge/ rejected receipt of the response. This would be a business outcome failure. – *Where request terminates at report status code is 18 - Not Fulfilled Northbound at DCC Service User Gateway.*
- could additionally present the raw dataset in csv format, zipped up and presented in the DCC SharePoint. As an additional option, DCC could produce a PowerBI dashboard that can be used to interrogate / analyse the dataset and produce standard views. If the Working Group would prefer either of these more time consuming and costly option, these options could be added to the requirements for the FIA.

- recommend the dataset should contain atomic SRV level success / failure metrics, per Business Process per day as stipulated in Requirement 3 per day. The DS&A team does not hold this data currently and would look to secure it.
- For device future dated SRVs, a count of 8F66's will be considered execution success against the business outcome and 8F67 will be execution failure.

Requirement 4 – Proposal for Journey Tracking

“Journey Tracking” is defined as a review of the end-to-end execution of the successful outcome of the business process and the associated SRVs.

The end-to-end execution will look at the intent of the specific business process and whether it ultimately succeeded. Failures will be broken down into buckets of likely DCC or non-DCC responsibility. For instance, an E4 is likely to be non-DCC while an E66 is likely to be DCC's responsibility.

Included in the journey tracking are:

- Looking at unsolicited SRVs to understand the outcome of a transaction outside of the response window.
- Looking at subsequent success – so the first request may fail but if there is a success within a reasonable time window the journey is considered a success.
- Where an SRV can be utilised for purposes other than the specific business process DS&A will look to allocate the SRV to the appropriate process. An example of this is 1.1.1 which can be used for Install and Commission, Change of Tariff and Change of Supply.

DCC will look to include a mechanism within the report that will allow additional datasets to be incorporated into the report where it's expected that this will provide additional enhanced insight into the failure buckets. This may rely on DCC Service Providers / Service Users providing DCC with data to an agreed location in sufficient time to allow the report to be produced.

SECMP0242 is looking at reporting the ultimate outcome of a Business Process. The report will consider timeout to be deemed a failure in the context of understanding the number of attempts required for a Successful outcome.

Requirement 6

DS&A will factor retry tracking into all Business Process Journeys which will give an indication of first time and subsequent success and how many attempts it took to complete. It will also look to give a view of SEC Party orchestrations that include multiple attempts to send and SRV which lead to redundantly sending multiple attempts after a success.

For **Requirement 7**, all the relevant service requests, and any re-submissions within the end-to-end will be included.

4.4 Solution Constraints and Changes

Where an SRV is DCC only – 8.14.1 for instance – only the success (response Code) will be used to calculate success as it doesn't execute on the meter.

For Install and Commission, only transactions sent between 7am – 7pm Monday – Saturday will be included in Journey Tracking.

For CoS, SO will look to use a method of determining for what purpose a CoS request is being used for. Therefore, only Journeys where an end-user is moving from one supplier to another will be included.

Journey tracking will be calculated based on the DSP SAT and Inventory datasets, rather than the CSP or adaptor data.

As part of the implementation phase of Journey Tracking, DS&A may identify journeys that can't otherwise be tracked with a high likelihood of success. The addition of the DSP data on Future Dated requests would help significantly, but if this excluded, then the resulting accuracy may be a concern. If there are journeys that are a concern, DCC will ensure this is discussed with the Working Group during design and development.

For future dated Service Requests that are successfully set up on devices but either do not execute at the correct time or do not generate the correct volume of 8F66 alerts, leading to a E30 error this will be categorised as a business process failure, not a DCC failure.

4.5 Delivery Mechanism

The report(s) will be compiled and shared with SEC Parties via SharePoint in *xlsx* or *pdf* format. A summary will also be added to the reporting pack at OPSG Reporting sessions.

Also note the additional delivery options using *csv* files or PowerBI which could be added to the reporting are called out on page 11 above. DCC request that the Working Group consider these options, and indicate their preferences prior to the FIA.

4.6 Working Methodology

During the requirement gathering and refinement, principally as part of the SECMP0242 process which has driven this Modification requirement, DCC worked with the Business Proposers and SECAS to validate the proposals in the Operational Metrics Review (OMR) in terms of the viability of implementing the recommendations, to refine the requirements further, and to enable fast delivery of new requirements and improvements.

It is proposed that the reporting will be delivered by the DCC DS&A team via an iterative delivery mechanism, whereby a Minimum Viable Product (MVP) will be available in a first prototype release in the Implementation phase and following consultation with the Working Group, further functionality can be delivered in a fast and frequent continuous delivery mechanism until the final product is complete.

4.7 Data Delivery, Testing, and User Acceptance

The DS&A development and testing will not follow the PIT, SIT, and UIT pattern associated with a "conventional" SEC Release, and will not require the testing services of the System Integrator or CSPs.

5 Impact on Systems, Processes and People

As defined the change included in this document is confined to data already within the DCC, with no expected changes impacting SMETS1 or SMETS2 Service Providers beyond the DSP as noted.

5.1 Infrastructure Impact

No impact to existing infrastructure is anticipated. The solution as proposed will not add noticeable traffic or processing to the Smart Metering System or network.

5.2 Security Impact

The solution will need to ensure that only data related to the relevant SEC Party is made available, and will be security assured during the implementation phase through standard DS&A reviews, however no impact from such assessments is anticipated.

5.3 Data Science & Analytics Team and Wider DCC Operations

The full range of activities required to implement these requirements including design, development, testing, and implementation would be performed by DCC DS&A utilising in-house contractors and permanent staff. There will be a slight increase in the Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) required to do this and support, maintain, and deliver the reporting monthly. These Application Support efforts and costs will be evaluated fully in the FIA.

5.4 Report Delivery

Based on requirement 6 above, DS&A can generate the Business Process Indicators by the 15th Working Day after month end.

6 Implementation Timescales and Approach

The DSP work, development, build, and PIT will be completed within three months. It may be possible to deliver this as part of a Maintenance or SEC Release, and this will be investigated in the FIA. A key factor in planning and delivering this Modification's implementation and release by the DS&A team is that the changes are neither part of the Smart Metering System, nor do they impact any Technical Specifications, such that they can be implemented separate from the now-standard SEC Release dates.

This work should be completed within six (6) months of approval.

6.1 Testing and Acceptance

It is assumed that the DSP change will be implemented and tested as a separate release, and will include testing iteratively during development.

The DSP PIT will use automated testing where possible. No performance testing of the updated application will be performed, as the changes are not considered significant enough to warrant it.

Although the costing and effort for integration testing is not included in this PIA, details of the expected impacts are noted following.

The proposed DSP SIT execution scope for this change will include:

- Install and Commissioning (I&C) and decommissioning of a SMETS2 device set
- for SMETS1 and SMETS2 ESME or GSME, execute critical and non-critical DSP Future Dated SRs
- for SMETS2 ESME and GSME only, execute critical and non-critical Device Future Dated SRs
- verify Future Date Times are displayed on the SAT Log
- update the existing ESI-044 SAT Log Test Script

The SIT scope will result in approximately 105 tests being executed to verify the new behaviour, 78 of these tests are in the SIT-B environment and 27 are in the SIT-A environment. This change is not CSP or S1SP dependent, therefore, only one SMETS2 device set (CSP N or CSP S&C) and one already migrated SMETS1 device set from any Cohort (IOC, MOC or FOC) are required for this change, although SMETS1 migrations are not required.

DSP does not propose to integration test the added data in the SAT functionality in the UIT environment.

It is intended that selected Service Users would continue to be engaged in the design and development with the DS&A team. The same applies to later test phases including some User Acceptance Testing for this Modification. A full analysis of the testing methodology will be defined as part of the Full Impact Assessment.

7 Costs and Charges

The table below details the cost of delivering the changes and Services required to implement this Modification Proposal. The Rough Order of Magnitude cost (ROM) shown below describes indicative costs to implement the functional requirements as assumed above and includes the costs to provide the results through a Portal. It should be noted that the change has not been subject to the same level of analysis that would be performed as part of a FIA and as such there may be elements missing from the solution or the solution may be subject to a material change. As a result, the final price may result in a variation.

7.1 Design, Build, and Testing Cost Impact

The table below details the cost of delivering the changes and Services required to implement this Modification. The scope of supply under this PIA includes design, development (build), and testing within a selected DS&A environment which is not part of the DCC Total System.

£	Design	Build and Test	FIA Cost
Design Reports and Business Process (SO)	£56,250 tolerance +/- 20%	£30,000 +/- 20%	£10,000
Build (DS &A)		£90,000 +/- 20%	
Additional Future Dated SAT Data	£15,000 – 50,000		£9,303
Totals	£208,750 +/- 20%		£19,303

Based on the existing requirements, the fixed price cost for a Full impact Assessment is **£19,303** and would be expected to be completed in 40 days.

The largest component of the change is the work associated with designing the full business logic associated with each business process.

System Integration costs are expected to be low, with no requirement for User Integration Testing. User Acceptance Testing will be carried out in an iterative mode through the implementation cycle. We believe the post-PIT testing costs would be relatively low when assessed in the FIA.

Appendix A: Glossary

The table below provides definitions of the terms used in this document.

Acronym	Definition
BAU, BaU	Business As Usual
COS	Change of Supplier
CSP	Communication Service Provider
CSV	Comma Separated Variable
DCC	Data Communications Company
DSP	Data Service Provider
DS&A	DCC Data Science and Analytics
DUIS	DCC User Interface Specification
ECOS	Enduring Change of Supplier
ESME	Electricity Smart Metering Equipment
E2E	End to End
FIA	Full Impact Assessment
FTE	Full Time Employees
GBCS	Great Britain Companion Specification
GPF	Gas Proxy Function
GSME	Gas Smart Metering Equipment
I&C	Installation and Configuration
MVP	Minimum Viable Product
OMR	Operational Metrics Review
PIA	Preliminary Impact Assessment
PIT	Pre-Integration Testing
PMR	Performance Measurement Report
PPMID	Payment Meter Interface Device
ROM	Rough Order of Magnitude (cost)
SEC	Smart Energy Code
SECAS	Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat
SIT	Systems Integration Testing
SO	DCC Service Ownership
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SMETS	Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification
SR	Service Request
SRV	Service Request Variant
S1SP	SMETS1 Service Provider
UIT	User Integration Testing