This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

SECMP0005 ‘‘Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices’

4th April 2016

Meeting 1 Minutes

Attendees:

Working Group 1 Members	Organisation
Mark Pitchford (SECMP0002 and SECMP0007 Proposer)	Npower
Alan Creighton (SECMP0003 Proposer Representative)	Northern Powergrid
Sam Charlton (SECMP0005 Proposer Representative)	EON
Emslie Law (SECMP0006 Proposer)	SSE
Chris Spence	EDF Energy
Gavin Brown (part)	Chameleon Technology (teleconference)
Louise Porter (part)	Utilita Energy (teleconference)
Tim Boyle	Chameleon Technology

Representing	Other attendees
DECC	Relve Spread
DCC	Stuart Scott
	Adam Pearce (part)
SECAS	Jill Ashby (Chair)
	Kevin Atkin (Technical Support)
	Ian Swanson (Technical Support)
	David Barber (Modifications Lead)
	Sebastian Rattansen (Meeting Secretary)
	Sasha Townsend (Modifications Analyst (part))

Representing	Other attendees
	Keith Phakoe (Modifications Analyst (part))

Apologies:

Working Group 1 Members	Organisation
Graham Smith (SECMP0003 Proposer)	Western Power Distribution
Tim Newton (SECMP0005 Proposer)	EON

1. SECMP0005 – Include Tariff and Register Labels in SMETS2 Devices

1.1 Overview

The Proposer presented a brief overview of the Modification Proposal. The Proposer noted that the ability to change the Tariff and Register Labels would reduce potential customer confusion. For example,

- Tariff Labels would enable Suppliers to use customer-friendly naming conventions for the tariff in operation e.g. “Economy 7”
- Register Labels would enable Suppliers to give Smart Meter registers a customer friendly name such as ‘Day’ or ‘Night’ or ‘Weekend’ rather than R1, R2 or R3

The Proposer noted that it would be ideal for the Modification Proposal to apply to Import for ESME (Electricity Smart Metering Equipment) and GSME (Gas Smart Metering Equipment), and Export too in the case of ESME (noting that the Export element would only apply to Register Labels).

1.2 WG consideration of Modification Proposal

The WG discussed the outline requirements of SECMP0005, which are set out below in Table 3:

Refinement	WG View
Naming conventions to be used for Tariff and Register Label data?	Naming conventions would ensure consistency and avoid mixed consumer experience. A WG member highlighted that a MRA (Master Registration Agreement) Issue Form (MIF194) has been raised for naming conventions of meter register labels that may provide ideas. SECAS will attend the relevant MRA meeting and update the SEC Mods WG accordingly. The WG noted that there are constraints on the number of characters in Zigbee Smart Energy

Refinement	WG View
	(ZSE) but considered the number of characters (between 12 and 20) should be sufficient
Tariff and Register Labels to apply for both ESME and GSME	The WG agreed it would be beneficial. SECAS Technical Support highlighted that there are more complexities with ZSE (relating to the 'Tariff Label' in the ZSE specification, which impacts all tariff Use Cases in GBCS (Great Britain Companion Specification)). A modular approach to constructing the changes will inform the scale of impact for: • Register Labels - ESME and GSME • Tariff Labels - ESME • Tariff Labels – GSME
Devices to support Tariff and Register Labels?	ESME/GSME need to be capable of displaying Tariff and Register Labels. Gas Proxy Function (GPF) needs to be able to make the data available over the Home Area Network In-home Displays (HAN IHDs) need to display the data (see further detail in 4.1.1) Prepayment Interface Devices (PPMID) to display Tariff Label

Tech Specs impacted to implement Tariff and Register Labels	The WG agreed:
	• GBCS – Use Cases for additional configuration data Items
	• SMETS
	  ○ ESME and GSME
	  ○ PPMID TS
	• Communications Hub Technical Specifications (CHTS) - GPF
	• PPMID

DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) SRs in which commands will be incorporated	The WG agreed the SRs below would be used: • 1.1.1 (Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)) – Critical Security Classification • 1.1.2 (Update Import Tariff (Secondary Element)) - Critical Security Classification • 4.11.1 (Read Tariff - Primary Element) and • 4.11.2 (Read Tariff – Secondary Element) would need to be modified.

Refinement	WG View
	• 4.2 (Read Instantaneous Export Registers) in the case of export (Register Label only). The existing SRs should not be deprecated, and this would create the option of whether to use the labelling functionality (see further detail in 4.1.1). Updates to DUIS will be required.
Mandate for Suppliers to support this functionality	Overall it would be beneficial to require all Suppliers to support this functionality (see further detail in 4.1.1)
Threshold Anomaly Detection impacts	Suppliers will need to provide Threshold volumes for Threshold Anomaly Detection Procedures (TADP) and DCC will need to add these to the TAD mechanisms in their systems. There may be impacts for the new payload inspection requirements (see further detail in 4.1.1)
Packet size	The content of the new SRs could be quite large and is likely to encounter GBT (general block transfer) issues (see further detail in 4.1.1)
Rules for populating the Tariff and Register Label data items and DCC processing if Suppliers leave them blank?	The WG considered that default values may be needed for all 48 registers

Table 3: SECMP0005 outline requirements

1.3 Supporting Discussion Points

SECAS also noted that this Modification Proposal would result in the relevant SR message sizes increasing. Bigger messages increase the risk of failures, which could have a negative impact, e.g. of a customer's tariff label not updating. Therefore, there was general agreement by the WG that any solution should consider the impact larger messages would have on Users and the DCC's network. Any estimates of packet size that could be obtained would be useful to inform the Mod.

Discussions around the pros and cons of requiring Suppliers to support this functionality noted that making it mandatory could make it more difficult for industry to support the mod. However, the WG agreed that overall it would be beneficial to require Suppliers to support this functionality. One benefit of making it mandatory would be ensuring all Suppliers can update incorrect labels. The WG also agreed that there should be no deprecation of the existing SRs, and that this would create the option of whether to use the labelling functionality.

The WG highlighted that this new data will not have been considered in scope when the payload inspection rules were discussed. SECAS will raise this with the SSC to gain their views.

The WG discussed implications for IHD displays. It was noted that there may be technology impacts arising from parts of the screen needing to be flexible to the characters to be displayed. This will also need to be considered as part of the assessment. Any indications of the implications for IHDs would be welcomed from the community of technology providers.

WG members noted the risk around working on technical specification documents that are not yet designated (a risk that applies to many of the Modifications currently in the Refinement Process) and are therefore subject to change. To mitigate this risk, the WG agreed to maintain a watching brief on changes to these documents that could affect the solution(s) the WG is developing.

The DCC informed the WG that in order to inform their Preliminary Assessment (PA), details of the new GBCS Use Cases would be needed.

1.4 Decisions and next steps

Progress on SECMP0005 matters will be brought to the next WG meeting.

ACTION WG1_01_08: SECAS technical support will draft changes to the technical specification documents (i.e. GBCS, SMETS, and DUIS).

ACTION WG1_01_09: SECAS will seek input from SSC on any impact this Mod has for anomaly detection and payload inspection