

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.

MP264 ‘Updating Independence of SMDA Testing Provisions’ Conclusions Report – version 0.1

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report 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. They considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objectives (a)¹ and (d)².

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 effective competition between persons engaged in, or in Commercial Activities connected with, the Supply of Energy.

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Improved cost efficiency

There were six responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Four respondents believed that the modification was a step forward for Smart Metering Device Assurance (SMDA) testing, as it may result in obtaining cost-effective and efficient means of providing the assurance needed under the SMDA scheme.

Potential conflicts of interest

Two respondents highlighted concerns regarding the potential conflict of interest whereby a Party may end up testing their own equipment.

The concern relates to the Data Communications Company (DCC) and Manufacturers tending for the role, as there may be a conflict of interest when carrying out interchangeability and interoperability testing of Devices.

One Party (Large Supplier) felt the modification should be rejected. They felt the possibility of the DCC testing its own Communications Hubs, or a Manufacturer testing its own Devices is a risk that was not fully addressed as part of the Modification Report; therefore, it would need to be addressed before it can be implemented.

This risk will be considered as part of the procurement process. Party representatives will be part of establishing the procurement requirements.

Another respondent (Large Supplier) noted that this could be managed through the assurance of the Testing Party's independence via the SMDA Sub-Committee.

As part of the selection criteria, Parties that tend for the role of SMDA Testing Provider will have to demonstrate independence to be considered for the role.