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.

DP080 'Ensuring a managed move to DUIS version 3.1'

Problem statement – version 1.0

About this document

This document provides a summary of this Draft Proposal, including the issue or problem identified, the impacts this is having, and the context of this issue within the Smart Energy Code (SEC).

Proposer

This Draft Proposal has been raised by Helen Metcalfe from the Data Communications Company (DCC).

What is the issue or problem identified?

What issue has been identified?

Version 3.0 of the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) is the first version that supports both Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) 1 and SMETS 2 meters and was designated on 28 July 2019. Users who remain on DUIS versions 1.0 or 2.0 will not be able to communicate with SMETS 1 meters as part of day-to-day business until they uplift to version 3.0. In the absence of a managed plan to migrate all DCC Users on to DUIS version 3.0, there is a risk that a SMETS 1 meter could 'go dumb' on churn. This risk remains material until all DCC Users are using DUIS version 3.0 (or higher). Although there are clear obligations on Suppliers enrolling their SMETS1 meters to do so within 12 months of their meters becoming eligible for enrolment, there appear to be no obligations on Suppliers who have not installed SMETS1 meters.

There are now three active versions of SEC Appendix AD 'DCC User Interface Specification', with a fourth version, version 3.1, due to be implemented in the November 2019 SEC Release. Each version has a corresponding Message Mapping Catalogue (MMC) (SEC Appendix AF), and there are accompanying XML Schemas. Managing and maintaining any version of DUIS and MMC that does not support all DCC meters does not deliver economic and efficient provision of Services and does not facilitate wider interoperability objectives. The DCC believes collective discussion is urgently required to agree a managed process for all DCC Users to uplift to DUIS version 3.0 (or higher).

How does this issue relate to the SEC?

As the DUIS is included within the SEC as a SEC Appendix, any changes, including the removal of a version from the SEC, will require a SEC Modification Proposal.

What is the impact this is having?

What is the impact of not moving to DUIS version 3.0 or higher?

The DCC has stated that, now that version 3.0 has been designated, any DCC User who has not taken up this version 3.0 will not be able to communicate with any DCC SMETS 1 meters.

In addition, as long as DUIS versions 1.0 and 2.0 are SEC Subsidiary Documents, any regression testing that is undertaken, e.g. as part of a SEC Release, will incur the additional time and cost to include these versions of DUIS, increasing the implementation time and cost for any relevant Modification Proposals. Given that there will be no further functionality changes to either version of this specification, SEC Parties will be paying additional costs for confirming that the previous versions remain unchanged.

What are the views of the industry?

Views of the DCC

The DCC has stated its intent to actively support a managed move to DUIS version 3.1 and towards the removal of versions 1.0 and 2.0 as SEC Subsidiary Documents. Doing so can ensure the operation of SMETS 1 and SMETS 2 meters runs as smoothly as possible.

Views of SEC Parties

One Large Supplier commented on the Draft Proposal. They agreed there should be a managed process for DCC Users to uplift to DUIS version 3.0 (or higher). They suggested a transition period would be of great benefit, especially to Small Suppliers to assist this uplift. Finally, they also suggested removing support for DUIS version 1.0 once the proposal is accepted, and then withdrawing support for DUIS version 2.0 after the transition period ends.

Views of Panel Sub-Committees

The Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-committee (TABASC) agreed that it holds an interest in the progression of this proposal. It commented that with an uplift planned to DUIS version 3.0 in the November 2019 Release, the Proposer should consider planning for moves to DUIS version 3.1 instead. Additionally, members agreed with the proposal's intentions that a managed move to the recent versions of technical specifications. Finally, a TABASC member asked whether this Draft Proposal would look into an enduring solution so that proposals are not required for every removal of technical specifications from the SEC.

The Security Sub-Committee (SSC) noted it holds an interest in this Draft Proposal and would like any updates on its progression. In particular, members noted that any GBCS versions would need to align to the versions of DUIS. This led to the question of whether the DUIS should be included in the Technical Specification Applicability Table (TSAT).

The Operations Group noted its interest in the Draft Proposal. It enquired into the issue's framework, asking why it was about a move towards a new DUIS version, rather than a move away from older versions. Members acknowledged that there would be unnecessary costs with the two older versions of DUIS still in effect and agreed with the root of the issue.

The Smart Metering Key Infrastructure Policy Management Authority (SMKI PMA) considered the Draft Proposal and confirmed its interest. It commented on Parse and Correlate being impacted by the suggested change and noted any solution should take account of this. A member also commented on whether it would be better to manage the move towards DUIS version 3.1 rather than 3.0.

Views of the Change Sub-Committee

Upon its initial discussion at the Change Sub-Committee (CSC), the members were supportive of the Draft Proposal. A member commented that adapters need inclusion in this Draft Proposal. Like the TABASC, the CSC the noted a desire for an enduring solution to prevent raising a modification for every removal of DUIS versions in the future. There was a call for gathering Small Supplier opinions as to how many plan on migrating to DUIS version 3.0 and if so at what time. No Small Suppliers responded during the Development Stage, so a Request for Information (RFI) will be issued in the

Refinement Process to answer this. Another member suggested framing the business case on the issue of increased costs through regression testing, rather than through obligations of SEC Parties. This was due to there being a more quantifiable economic benefit, which in turn would be easier for industry to support.

When returned to the CSC a month later, the change of title was confirmed with the Proposer to reflect a move to DUIS version 3.1 instead of DUIS version 3.0.