

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.

MP247 ‘Future Dating of Service Requests for SMETS1 Devices’

December 2025 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

SEC Party Category	Working Group Members	Representing
Large Suppliers	Julie Brown (JB)	British Gas
	Sharon Armitage (SA)	E.ON
	Francesca Scott (FS)	EDF
	Jack Marling (JMa)	Octopus Energy
	Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
	Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
	Emslie Law (EL)	OVO
	Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
	Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita
Small Suppliers	Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
	Steve Blackler (SB)	E Gas and Electricity
Other SEC Parties	Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
	Swetta Coopamah (SCo)	BEAMA
	Beth Tatton (BT)	Calisen Metering
	Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
	Michael Snowden (MSn)	Secure Meters
Network Parties	Kirsty Maddock (KM)	National Grid Electricity Distribution
	James Shippey (JSh)	Northern Powergrid
Ofgem	Ian Chalfon (IC)	Ofgem

Other Participants		
DCC		
Bradley Baker (BB)	David Walsh (DW)	
SECAS		
Simon Grimwood (SG) <i>WG Chair</i>	Abi Obadan (AO) <i>Meeting Secretary</i>	Georgie Severin (GSe) <i>Lead Analyst</i>
Marc Rhodes (MRh)	Ali Beard (AB)	Lydia Bentley (LB)

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue and a summary of the Preliminary Impact Assessment (PIA) for Future Data Service Provider (DSP).

Issue

- Short-term peak usage caused incidents for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications 1 (SMETS1) Service Providers.
- SEC Appendix AD 'DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS)' currently prevents the Data Communications Company (DCC) from future dating Service Requests (SRs) for SMETS1 Devices.
- DSP holds all SMETS1 future dated SRs for release to SMETS1 Devices at a future date.

Alternative Solution

- Allow Users to send future dated SRs to SMETS1 Devices without being held at the DSP.
- Cost saving Alternative Solution (only Service Reference Variant (SRV) 1.1.1 '*Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)*' and SRV1.2.1 '*Update Price (Primary Element)*').
- Does not include Alert / Notification to indicate future-dated command has arrived at Device.

Legal Text

- Will be developed as part of the Full Impact Assessment.
- DUIS impacted, but not the DUIS Schema.

DCC Preliminary Assessment for DSP2

Breakdown of DCC Preliminary Assessment Future DSP costs	
Design, Build and Pre-Integration Testing (PIT)	£1.46m - £2.2m
Full Impact Assessment	£122,903
Complete up to PIT	40 Working Days
Design, Build and PIT duration	Six (6) months

Working Group Discussion

A Working Group member (JB) questioned the cost of requesting the Impact Assessment as it is significant; they questioned the different elements that composed the final figure. The DCC (DW) clarified that this figure was made up of the costs quoted by the various Service Providers to carry out an impact assessment for the modification. The Working Group member (JB) went on to ask how many SMETS1 Devices were expected to still be operational by 2029 that would warrant the implementation of this modification. The DCC (DW) advised that while a definitive number was not on hand, there is an expected gradual decrease in numbers.

The Working Group member (JB) questioned the cost of doing nothing and allowing the current way of doing things to continue. The DCC (DW) provided the context of Price Control Updates Events (PCUE) whereby the DCC would see an increase in traffic as a driver for the business case of the modification. They went on to state that, to their knowledge, PCUEs have been running much smoother in recent months than it had when the modification was first introduced. The Working Group member (JB) agreed, stating the most recent PCUE had run much better. The Working Group member (JB) added that they would be interested in the costs of doing nothing, as the £2.2m quoted to realise a benefit for a couple of years, particularly considering the decreasing Devices that would benefit, feels like a big ask.

Another member of the Working Group (EL) added that the solution put forward as part of this modification was not originally included in Enrolment and Adoption (E&A) as it was deemed not possible. However, the existence of this solution suggests that the solution is now possible, at a high cost. They went on to state that the DCC will have information available regarding the switch-off of SMETS1 Devices provided by the Service Providers and the understanding is that date will be the end of life for the Devices. They queried the high costs quoted by the Service Providers to determine whether their systems would be able to implement the change (referencing the cost of the Impact Assessment). The DCC (DW) advised the PIA will offer a high-level insight into the impact of implementing the solution on the various Service Provider Systems. One of the deliverables is the cost associated with the design of the solution. The Full Impact Assessment (FIA) would go into the granular details of the solution design and the costs quoted to carry out the FIA are the Service Providers' costs to provide the details of the level of impact. The Working Group member (EL) acknowledged the point and circled back to the business case benefit that would justify the cost to industry. The DCC (DW) reminded the Working Group the request for costs to be provided before a decision can be made was the reason the modification was brought to their attention during the meeting.

The Working Group member (JB) questioned the details of the costs included in the £2.2million quote. Their understanding of the PIA was that various Service Providers had quoted the figures required to build a system that would be able to process future-dated requests, which would differ between Service Providers. They also referenced the PIA as the inference was that the S1SPs were already able to handle future-dated requests, not that their systems would need redesigning. The DCC provided a (RED) annex to the Working Group containing individual costs from the S1SPs to implement the modification. The Working Group **did not** support the costs of the implementation.

SECAS (GS) provided a summary of the impacts as described in the PIA. The Working Group member (JB) questioned the overwriting of an SRV 2.1 'Update Prepay Configuration' if an SRV 1.1.1 'Update Import Tariff (Primary Element)' is awaiting activation at Device level in the case of Secure. They went on to state SRV 2.1 holds its own information which would be relevant to the Device and should not be overwritten because another SRV is awaiting activation. The DCC (DW) acknowledged this and advised that these questions would be raised and answered during the FIA.

Another member of the Working Group (DD) added that the cost of implementation aside, the details of the individual impacts also add a level of challenge to the solution. The Working Group member (JB) agreed and added that Service Users will likely have to develop different approaches depending on the S1SP to accommodate the different intricacies of the solution. They added that coupled with the cost, the solution appears to outweigh the intended benefit.

The Working Group provided views against the implementation of the modification in its current presentation. One Working Group member (EL) explained that the business requirements still exist, however the industry has changed and as such the business case should be re-evaluated. Another Working Group member (JM) echoed the point and added there is ever-diminishing benefit for SMETS1 Devices. The DCC (DW) agreed the business case will require re-evaluation.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to engage with the Proposer to re-evaluate the business case.