

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.

Paper Reference:	TABASC_87_0203_10
Action:	For Discussion

DP232 Issue and solution options

1. Purpose

[DP232 'ACB Certs on I&C'](#) is currently undergoing the Development Stage. The purpose of this paper is to seek the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee's (TABASC) input on the issue raised in this Draft Proposal and the potential solution options to this modification.

This paper provides the issue and solution options. More information is available in the Modification Report in Appendix B, and the Data Communications Company (DCC)'s initial assessment can be found in Appendix A.

2. Summary of MP232

This section summarises the key points of this Modification Proposal. More information is available in the Modification Report in Appendix B.

2.1 What is the issue?

A small number of production meters and Communication Hubs are failing the Install and Commission (I&C) process on-site. The root cause analysis of the failures suggests that the following circumstances contribute to the problem:

- The Data Service Provider (DSP) does not know which Access Control Broker (ACB) certificate was put on the Device during manufacture.
- The DSP process to establish the correct ACB certificates on the Device is only completed after the Installing Supplier submits their first Service Request (SR) to the Communication Hub.
- The Device failed the Message Authentication Code (MAC) validation and subsequently rejected the SR from the Installing Supplier because the DSP used the wrong ACB certificate to authenticate the command.

There is currently no requirement in the Smart Energy Code (SEC) for DCC Users to provide the DSP with details of the ACB certificate before I&C.

2.2 What are the solution options?

The root cause of this issue is that the certificate on the Device is not known before I&C, and the proposed enduring solution is to require the Device manufacturer (via Supplier or Meter Asset Provider (MAP)) to notify the DCC or the DSP on what certificates were put into the Device. This notification could be:

- **Process based** – for example, a file is loaded via the Self Service Interface (SSI).
- **SR 12.2 based** – a new attribute is introduced into a new version of the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) to allow a DCC User to pre-notify a new Device and inform the DCC which certificates (or the version of the mapping table) was put on a Device.
- **Device Alert based** – as soon as the Device is able, generate an Alert which contains the certificate information and send it to the ACB. This will require a Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS) change.

3. Timeline for this change

This modification was presented to the Change Sub-Committee (CSC) on 21 February 2023. The CSC noted that this is currently not a large issue but will be once a new ACB certificate goes live at the end of the year and then a new certificate being released on an annual basis. The DCC would want to resolve this issue before then. The CSC asked that this modification be progressed with a high priority and urgency to enable a decision in time for inclusion in a 2024 SEC Systems Release, which the DCC noted would be an acceptable implementation date to mitigate the issue.

We have also discussed this issue with the TABASC Chair. They queried why this modification is not considered a defect, as the DCC was always aware it would have to deal with multiple ACBs and why it has not yet developed the system accordingly. The DCC noted it has been aware of this issue and has raised a Change Request (CR) to put a short-term fix in place while this modification progresses. The DCC has stressed that it cannot fully resolve this issue in its entirety without a SEC change.

4. Questions for the TABASC

We seek the TABASC's view on the following questions to feed into the CSC's assessment of the issue and the subsequent business requirements for a solution:

- Do all the solution options resolve the issue?
- Does the TABASC have a preferred option?
- Are there any additional considerations which should be drawn out during the Refinement Consultation?

5. Next steps

Once this modification has been discussed with the TABASC and the Working Group, it will return to the CSC in March for confirmation to progress to the Refinement Process.

6. Recommendations

The TABASC is asked to:

- **PROVIDE** any views on the issue raised under this Draft Proposal;
- **PROVIDE** feedback on which is its preferred solution option and the rationale for this; and
- **CONFIRM** if any additional considerations should be drawn out during the Refinement Process.

Mohammedanwar Sumro

SECAS Team

23 February 2023

Attachments:

- **Appendix A:** DP232 Initial Assessment
- **Appendix B:** DP232 Modification Report