

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.

## Operations Group Meeting 26b

**13 November 2019, 10:00 – 11:00**

**Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ**

### OPSG\_26b\_1311 - Draft Minutes

#### Attendees:

Category	Operations Group Members
Operations Group Chair	Dave Warner
Network Parties	Gemma Slaney (Teleconference)
	Matthew Alexander (Teleconference)
Large Suppliers	Nassar Zeb (Teleconference)
	Rochelle Harrison (Teleconference)
	Paul Clarke (Teleconference)
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna (Teleconference)

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Peter Doyle (Teleconference)
	Dominic Butt (Teleconference)
	Penny Brown (Teleconference)
	Edward Mace (Teleconference)
	Chris Thompson (Teleconference)
	Courtney O'Connor (Teleconference)
	Antony Thomas (Teleconference)
	Chris Rowell (Teleconference)
SECAS	Tim Hall
	Huw Exley
	Phillip Twiddy
	Robin Healey
BEIS	Graeme Milligan (Teleconference)
	Fahad Akhter (Teleconference)

## Apologies:

Representing	Name
Small Suppliers	Simon Dowse
	Heidi Wilbor
	Kate Barnes
Large Suppliers	Tony Shanahan
	Joey Manners
	Endika Enes
	Zoe Marklew
Other SEC Parties	Tom Woolley
	Geoff Huckerby

## 1. Introduction

The Operations Group (OPSG) Chair introduced members to the meeting.

This meeting was convened to further consider the DCC's statement of readiness for the next step in the migration of SMETS1 meters. This was originally considered at the OPSG meeting OPSG-26\_0511 on 5<sup>th</sup> November, and the DCC's original submission is included in the documentation for that meeting.

Since the last meeting on 5 November 2019, two issues had come to light that could impact the OPSG's recommendation to the SEC Panel regarding LSC 6, '*Pre-existing services remain stable for SMETS2 and SMETS1 prior operating capabilities*'; the RAG status for which was set at Green by the OPSG.

The two issues to be considered were:

- Pre-Payment Interface Device (PPMID) join parameter; and
- Erroneous production of SMETS 1 8014 power factor alerts and 8f40 voltage alerts.

## 2. PPMID Join Parameter

SECAS outlined the issue, explaining that if a User sets the PPMID join parameter for the Honeywell Elster Device Model Combination (DMC) to greater than 255 seconds, the Service Request (SR) is rejected.

A Large Supplier (LS) member noted that their setting is currently above this threshold and the issue would become critical in the case of a pre-payment customer. This is because, in system downtime, the PPMID allows the consumer to manually enter a Unique Transaction Reference Number (UTRN) and top up. However, the LS member noted that the current migration only covers dormant meters.

Therefore, for the risk to be realised, a meter would need to become active followed by an end consumer requesting to change it to pre-payment mode. As such, the LS did not see this eventually as a reason to change the current recommendation on readiness, but noted it was necessary and urgent for the DCC to provide a fix date. A second LS member was concerned that there was not currently a fix date, the importance of which should be emphasised to the DCC.

A third LS member noted, via email, that they do not have any asset exchange process for SMETS1 Devices. They explained that, if an element of a SMETS1 installation needs exchanging after a premise is migrated into DCC systems, the whole metering set would need to be replaced with SMETS2 equipment.

The Chair summarised the OPSG decision that the RAG status for the proposed migrations for LSC6 should remain Green. However, the request from OPSG was that the issue is assessed, and appropriate mitigation/s proposed and implemented, prior to the migration of any active meters, and that this should be highlighted in the OPSG recommendation.

A LS member proposed that a clarification note should be added to LSC 8 '*No detrimental impact to consumers' experience expected*' advising Suppliers that if an issue does arise, a meter change is required. Therefore, if an issue is encountered, Suppliers can either change the configuration to below 225 seconds or, if necessary, replace a meter set. The OPSG supported the inclusion of the note.

The OPSG **AGREED** that a clarification note should be added to LSC 8. It was **AGREED** that the potential issue should be communicated to SEC Parties.

**ACTION OPSG 26b/01:** The DCC assesses the PPMID join parameter issue and propose and implement mitigation prior to the migration of any active meters.

**ACTION OPSG 26b/02:** SECAS to add a note to LSC 8 of the Panel recommendation outlining the issue and OPS concerns.

**ACTION OPSG 26b/03:** SECAS to communicate the PPMID join parameter and the potential issues this could cause to all SEC Parties.

### 3. SMETS 1 Alerts

A Distribution Network Operator (DNO) member explained the nature of two alerts issues that they had encountered within SMETS1. The first was the erroneous production of 8014 power factor alerts and the second was unnecessary 8f40 voltage alerts.

They explained that they believe 8f40 alerts could be stopped if the voltage acceptance level was raised to 2580 (units of 1/10 volt). However, a system constraint means that it currently cannot be raised above 2530.

The DNO member noted that the scale of the problem was up to 2000 alerts per day being generated from their SMETS1 estate. A second DNO member agreed the scale. The DCC noted that it had been monitoring alerts through the Technical Operations Centre (TOC) but had seen lower levels of alerts reported. The DNO responded that a proportion of their data was gathered from the DCC Self Service Interface (SSI), so this was a surprise to them. The two DNO members present agreed to share screen shots from their SSIs, and Device MPxNs for the Devices they had monitored, with the DCC for comparison.

The Chair noted that the OPSG is aware of the alerts issues that are present in SMETS2 and the effort that is going into reducing these. The DNO member concurred, noting that if they got 100 alerts per Device per day, by the time circa 70,000 had been migrated, it would be a large-scale problem.

The Chair questioned at which point SMETS1 and SMETS2 alerts would meet within the DCC architecture. The DCC confirmed this was at the point of the Data Service Provider (DSP). However, they noted that the alerts could be monitored separately.

The DCC explained that the predicted volume of alerts are within capacity. The OPSG noted that this was contradictory to the sentiment of the message received from the DCC regarding alerts in the SMETS2 environment, where DCC was emphasising the need to contain the magnitude of the alerts issues.

The DNO member said that they do not believe migrations should be halted, but that the RAG status for LSC 6 should be amended to Amber, with an accompanying note which highlights the concern and requests that the DCC monitor alerts post migration and produces reports showing alert levels from SMETS1 meters. The migration could then, if necessary, be slowed, paused or stopped, as a result of these outcomes.

The Chair concluded from the discussions that the RAG status for LSC 6 should be set to Amber, but that migration should not be delayed or deferred: the OPSG **AGREED** this. It was further **AGREED** that the DCC would regularly report on alerts from SMETS1 devices to the OPSG

**ACTION OPSG 26b/04:** DNO members to share SSI screen shots and meter MPxNs for SMETS1 meters generating alerts with the DCC for analysis.

**ACTION OPSG 26b/05:** The DCC to give a regular report to the OPSG detailing alerts from SMETS1 meters.

## 4. Conclusion

The Chair noted that the RAG status for LSC 6, '*Pre-existing services remain stable for SMETS2 and SMETS1 prior to operating capabilities*' should change from Green to Amber, however this did not change the overall recommendation to Panel that the LSCs have been adequately met, if the identified actions are completed by DCC.

SECAS explained that it would encapsulate the changes to the paper to be issued to the SEC Panel as soon as possible, before its scheduled meeting on Friday 15 November. The OPSG agreed that the paper should be issued to OPSG members in parallel, and if members had any comments, these should be sent to SECAS and could be raised with the Panel via a verbal update.

**ACTION OPSG 26b/06:** SECAS to circulate the updated LSC Panel paper to OPSG members and members to provide any comments to SECAS ASAP.