

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.

MP077 ‘DCC Service Flagging’

June 2020 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Harry Jones	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Mari Toda	DCC
Remi Oluwabamise	DCC
Chun Chen	DCC
Paul Saker	EDF
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Simon Trivella	Centrica
Emslie Law	SSE/OVO
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Elias Hanna	Landis + Gyr
Steve Walker	PFP Energy
Lauren Irving	PFP Energy
Chikomborero Wade	IMServ
Fotis Tsompanidis	Trilliant
Mahfuzar Rahman	Scottish Power
John Noad	Npower

Issue and Solutions

Issue

The issue for MP077 ‘DCC Service Flagging’ was quickly recapped at the start of the Working Group meeting. Where there are issues with the reliability of the DCC Service Flag states and where there are gaps in between the 3 existing states of Active (A), Withdrawn (W) and Suspended (S).

Solutions

The solutions provided in the updated Preliminary Assessment included the Proposed Solution and an Alternative Solution option which was requested by the Working Group meeting in April 2020.

The Proposed Solution stated there would be three Service Flag states going forward, consisting of Active (A), Non-active (N) and InstalledNotCommissioned (I). The Withdrawn (W) and Suspended (S) Service Flag states would be removed.

The Alternative Solution would retain the Suspended (S) Service Flag state, whilst keeping the remaining elements of the Proposed Solutions unchanged. This would result in four Service Flag states of (A), (N), (I) and (S).

Preliminary Assessment and legal text

Preliminary Assessment

The Working Group questioned the completeness of the Preliminary Assessment given it did not include SMETS1 Devices. The DCC stated that they were still awaiting details from the SMETS1 Service Providers over SMETS1 analysis if the solution was extended beyond SMETS2. SECAS agreed to distribute any updated material once received. One Working Group member enquired as to why there weren't any previous mentions to the other codes such as the MRA or UNC in the updated Preliminary Assessment. The DCC confirmed that this would be included in a full Impact Assessment.

Legal Text

The legal text was discussed, mostly concerned with technical changes and where any other obligations should sit for the DCC to ensure the DCC Service Flags match what is delivered with what is written in the SEC. The technical changes in the SEC were noted to take place in SEC Appendix X 'Registration Data Interface Specification'. This would consist of changing out the existing Service Flag states for the newly proposed ones depending on the chosen solution. There was support for including written obligations on the DCC to deliver these changes in the SEC, and the Working Group was asked for where they felt this should be placed. The Proposer suggested including it in SEC Appendix AC 'Inventory, Enrolment and Decommissioning Procedures'.

Additionally, there were calls for guidance notes to fully detail what each Service Flag does in plain English and what it reflects in the inventory as well as what triggers a flag to be updated to that status. This guidance was recommended to be created as guidance notes rather than in the Modification Report or as part of the legal text. SECAS and the DCC agreed this should be completed before the Modification Proposal progresses further or is taken to Panel. Some Working Group members also noted there were different terms being used between the SEC and other industry codes e.g. Service Flags/Service Status. As part of the legal text, SECAS were asked to align these terms so they were consistent between codes. A Working Group member stated that no change to the SEC can take place unless the changes to the DTC are implemented before or at the same time as that switching will fail validation. The last changes to the DTC are currently planned for February 2021 until the governance is transferred to the Retail Energy Code (REC).

A Working Group member also enquired into whether the Service Flags should cover the "opt out" as it should be within the consumer's right to replace a smart meter/Device with a "dumb" meter. This point was rejected given the nature of the opt out was a personal preference in relation to switching a service rather than unilaterally withdrawing and not replacing the device. There was also a concern raised over any personal data being stored in the Smart Metering Inventory (SMI) and wider DCC Systems which added to why a Service Flag shouldn't cover the opt out.

A Working Group member also wanted it noted that the DCC should also look into fixing the existing issues going forward – a clean up of the data.

Next steps

SECAS

SECAS was tasked with expanding on the legal text and ensuring that plain English guidance for each Service Flag state was available. There were suggestions for another Refinement Consultation to be issued so that a choice could be made for the preference of solution could be taken to for Impact Assessment once the full Preliminary Assessment (including SMETS1 solution) was returned.

DCC

The DCC were tasked with returning the new updates for the Preliminary Assessment for the SMETS1 impacts. Additionally, any solution being presented should include a “clean up” of existing data and links between codes going forward.