

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.

SECMP0028 ‘Prioritising System Messages’

Conclusions Report – version 0.1

About this document

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

Summary of conclusions

Modification Report Consultation

SECAS received seven responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Six respondents believed that the modification should be approved, and one respondent believed the modification should be rejected. Most respondents considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a)¹.

¹ (a) the first General SEC Objective is to facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain;

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Priority Levels for individual Service Requests

Several respondents (Large Suppliers) noted they felt the priority levels assigned to individual Service Requests (SRs) were not fully developed, and required more time and consideration before implementation into a Code Required Document. Specific SRs were mentioned within some responses, highlighting a preferred priority level from that respondent. The SRs are noted below:

- SRV 2.5 'Activate Emergency Credit' – increase from P3 up to either P1 or P2
- SRV 4.10 'Read Network Data' – Must be P1 or P2
- SRV 4.18 'Read Meter Balance' – increase from P3 up to either P1 or P2
- SRV 11.3 'Activate Firmware' – increase from P3 up to either P1 or P2
- SRV 7.4 'Read Supply Status' – Must be P1 or P2

Another respondent (Large Supplier) requested a review of the priorities assigned to SRs in the Southbound prioritisation workstream against that of the responses and Alerts prioritised in the Northbound prioritisation workstream completed by the DCC.

Governance

One respondent (Large Supplier) agreed with the approach to establish the priority levels within a Code Required Document to avoid new modifications when changes are required. However, they noted it wasn't clear how long it would take for changes to be implemented to the Code Required Document via the proposed governance process.

TABASC Feedback

Outside of the Consultation, TABASC members agreed that the technical solution (Southbound Prioritisation Mechanism) was fit for purpose. However, they noted that the Priority Levels should not be approved in their current form. The TABASC Chair noted that the Code Required document already had a governance process approved and amendments to the document should follow that process, outside of the modification. TABASC members agreed that final approval of the priority levels should rest with them, which would feed into the DCC changes. The DCC will need the final priority levels approved six months in advance of implementation which would give a deadline of May 2024.

Alternative processing

One respondent (Network Operator) noted they have concerns and felt that there should be an alternative method of prioritisation considered. They suggested each priority level between 1-5 is assigned a percentage of the processing capacity within the DCC Total System, ensuring all priority levels are always being processed.

Sub-Committee Input

Another respondent (Large Supplier) noted that input from the Security Sub-Committee (SSC) was not present within the modification report, and requested this be included. The respondent had previously expressed concern about the potential risk relating to 'Denial of Service', but this had been addressed by SSC. This has now been added to the Modification Report v1.1.