SECMP0011 'Including MAP ID in the SMI'

20th June 2016

Meeting 2 Minutes

Attendees:

Working Group 2 Members	Organisation
Paul Saker (SECMP0004 Proposer)	EDF Energy
Hugh Mullens (SECMP0011 Proposer)	Utility Funding
Jane Franklin	Lowribeck
Sam Charlton	EON
Emslie Law	SSE
Mark Pitchford	nPower

Representing	Other attendees
DCC	Stuart Scott
	Pankaj Jain
SECAS	Adam Lattimore (Chair)
	Urszula Thorpe (Technical Support)
	David Barber (Modifications Lead)
	Seb Rattansen (Technical Support)
	Samuel Browne (Modifications Analyst)

Apologies:

Working Group 1 Members	Organisation
James Goldsack	DECC
Graham Wood	British Gas
Oorlagh Chapman	British Gas
Steve Thomas	British Gas

Working Group 1 Members	Organisation
Nigel Nash	Ofgem
Graham Smith (SECMP0008 Proposer	Scottish Power Energy

SECMP0011: 'Including MAP ID in the SMI'

1. Technical Sub-Committee (TSC) input

SECAS presented the TSC's feedback on this modification. TSC suggested that there would be more efficient to combine the implementation of SECMP0011 with SECMP0004 as both Modifications aim to include a data item into the SMI.

2. Validation

SECAS noted that one of the actions coming out of the previous WG meeting was that SECAS would find which databases contain Meter Asset Provider (MAP) ID. The focus being to find a reliable database that would allow DCC to validate MAP ID against. SECAS noted that a list of MAP IDs are contained on the Market Domain Databases (MDD). SPAA maintain the MDD for gas MAPs and Elexon maintain the MDD for electricity MAPs. Both of these databases are accessible publicly. SECAS made clear that these databases may not be 100% reliable (some MAPs are linked to the MRA; some are dummies). The WG MAP representatives agreed that this data seems outdated as they noted many of the displayed MAPs no longer exist.

DCC noted that there is no clear path for obtaining MAP ID information for the purpose of validation. A process will need to be established detailing how DCC are provided with this data. DCC suggested implementing a system of Infrastructure Key Infrastructure (IKI) security. SECAS suggested that such complex methods may not be required, but that indeed a system of trust would be required.

SECAS noted that a possible solution would be for a MAP representative to provide this information to DCC. The Chair noted that SECAS would need to look further into this information.

DCC noted that all of these requirements are feasible but before the design stars WG need to confirm whether validation is required and how it should be done.

A WG Member suggested that the consultation would allow Parties to show the benefit of validation.

Another matter that this validation would imply would be the delay between a MAP being registered on the MDD, to being introduced into the SMI.

> **ACTION: WG2_03_02: SECAS to investigate the process of MDD database maintenance (releases, format, validation).**

3. Self Service Interface (SSI) reports

In the previous WG2 meeting, MAPs were asked to confirm what report they would require to ascertain whether an existing SSI report could be modified or if a new report would need to be created. The MAP representatives at the meeting provided the DCC with the desired input/output

SECMP0011_WG meeting
02_Final Minutes

Administered by

Page 2 of 4

This document has a Classification
of **White**

Gemserv

fields for the new SSI reports. The new report would aim to provide MAPs with an overview of their assets. The new desired report is shown in Table 1 below:

DCC Reporting - Meter Asset Provider	
Inputs	**Outputs**
MAP ID	Device ID
Installation Date (range)	Device Model
Removal Date (range)	Manufacturer
Manufacturer	Meter Serial Number (inclusion subject to CR004)
Device Status	Device Type
Supplier ID	DCC Compliant
	DCC Approved
	Device Status
	Installation Date
	Removal Date (NULL if installed)
	Removal Reason
	Firmware Version
	Firmware Version Status
	MPxN
	CSP Region
	Property Post Code
	UPRN
	MAP Identifier (subject to CR011)
	MAP Effective From Date
	MAP Effective To Date (If applicable)
	Supplier Identifier
	Supplier Effective From Date
	Supplier Effective To Date (If applicable)

Table1: Proposed new MAP SSI report

DCC noted that Supplier Identifier would be problematic to include any SSI report. Making it available via the SSI would expose commercially sensitive information to all Users, as currently the SSI is built to provide all DCC Users with access to each of the SSI report.

The WG and DCC debated who could have access to this report. It was noted that while licensed DCC Users were regulated by Ofgem and would be penalised for unauthorised use of such information, the report would also be available for non-licensed Users whose use of such information would not be controlled. On this basis the WG concluded that the report should only be available to MAPs who are DCC Users.

The MAP representatives restated the need for Supplier ID to be included into this report and without this item this Modification Proposal would be significantly less useful. A possible solution proposed by the MAP representatives is that SEC/DCC could organise a monthly data dump. DCC challenged this proposal as currently DCC does not have any right to share Registration Data (where the Supplier ID information comes from). Section E of the SEC describes DCC's right to use Registration Data, which is limited to checking access control rights and calculating charges. WG suggested that to make this solution work, the SEC obligations regarding the right to use the Registration Data would need to be

SECMP0011_WG meeting
02_Final Minutes

Administered by

Gemserv

Page 3 of 4

This document has a Classification of White

amended but DCC noted that there may be some underlying privacy issues that would need to be looked at.

A Work Group Member suggested that to restrict access to this report a new User role be created. DCC noted that this is possible but would be time-consuming because this would require MAPs to go through the User Entry process relating to that new User role.

DCC stated that there does not seem to be a simple solution but if this is the only way for MAPs to get access to this information then the complexity may be worth it.

ACTION: WG2_03_03: SECAS and DCC to meet and develop a report.

4. Decoupling SECMP0004 and SECMP0011

As the newly introduced topics of validation were introduced into the WG, it was noted that SECMP0011 may require further refinement.

In order not to delay SECMP0004, SECAS suggested that these modifications remain separate for the Impact Assessment and consultation processes.

Administered by

Gemserv