

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.

MP242 ‘Change to Operational Metrics to Measure on Success’

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 six responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Five respondents believed that the modification should be approved, and one respondent felt the modification should be rejected. Supportive respondents considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objectives (a)¹, (b)², and (g)³. One respondent felt that the modification compromised SEC Objective (b).

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

² enable the DCC to comply at all times with the General Objectives of the DCC (as defined in the DCC Licence), and to efficiently discharge the other obligations imposed upon it by the DCC Licence.

³ facilitate the efficient and transparent administration and implementation of this Code.

Managed by

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Five of the six respondents believed MP242 should be approved. The majority of the respondents felt that the modification better facilitated SEC Objectives (b) and (g), with one respondent (Large Supplier) also believing that SEC Objective (a) will be supported.

One respondent (Large Supplier) believes the annual and initial costs of this modification does not justify the outlined benefits and business case. They felt the reporting suite should be an automated process, and that the DCC has not provided sufficient reasoning to justify the need for additional resource to manage this process.

The DCC provided a response which included a breakdown of the responsibilities to be undertaken by the proposed additional resource. This includes acting as a point of contact for industry in relation to the proposed reporting suite, as well as undertaking quality and validity checks alongside identifying areas for improvement.

The DCC highlighted the need for ongoing collaboration with SEC Parties during the detailed design phase to ensure the reports are delivered as expected if the modification is approved.

The Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) shared concern in relation to the proposed resourcing costs presented by the DCC via the Impact Assessment. The TABASC felt that proposed additional resource should only be attributed to this modification if the resource were to work exclusively on the reports being introduced as part of this modification. The TABASC noted that the reporting will be tailored to individual SEC Parties, however they felt this could be automated and did not agree that one FTE should be required.