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.

SECMP0007 'Firmware updates to IHDs and PPMIDs'

Conclusions Report – version 0.1

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

Summary of conclusions

Modification Report Consultation

Six responses were received to the Modification Report Consultation. Four believed the modification should be approved. Of the four that believed the modification should be approved, one believed the modification better facilitated Smart Energy Code (SEC) Objectives (a)[1] and (c)[2]. The other three did not give a view against the SEC Objectives but provided various views as to why the modification should be approved, which are summarised below.

One respondent believed the modification should be rejected. They did not give a view against the SEC Objectives but felt the modification did not have a justifiable business case.

One Network Party abstained from giving a view as to whether they thought the modification should be approved or rejected. Its views are summarised below.

[1] To facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.

[2] To facilitate Energy Consumers' management of their use of electricity and gas through the provision to them of appropriate information by means of Smart Metering Systems.

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Respondents in favour of approval

Four Supplier Parties believed the modification should be approved. One these respondents advised that it should be approved due to the following benefits:

- Security impacts – the ability to deploy fixes to potential security threats
- Operational Impacts – reduced number of site visits required
- Compatibility & Interoperability, e.g. Alert Storm rectification.
- Customer Impacts – better customer journey
- Innovation / Additional functionality
- Perception of quality of the Smart Meter program of work

However, this respondent did note concern with the high costs of the modification.

Another respondent stated that this modification will make it easier to give, in particular, give Prepayment meter interface Devices (PPMIDs) new features, address security threats and fix issues remotely. It added that the lack of Over-The-Air (OTA) capability would increase the risk of risk of PPMIDs becoming outdated, potentially needing replacing and incurring cost on Suppliers and ultimately consumers.

Another respondent noted that as well as the proposed OTA capability to PPMIDs and Home Area Network Connected Auxiliary Load Control Switches (HCALCSs), the additional Alerts proposed by this modification will provide additional assistance for Suppliers updating and managing their Devices.

Respondents in favour of rejection

One Supplier Party believed this modification should be rejected. It agreed OTA capability for PPMIDs would be useful. However, it thought the implementation costs were too high to provide a business case. It also felt a portion of this costs had been assigned to overestimated volumes OTA PPMID updates resulting from this modification.

It believed it would be more cost efficient to either upgrade the firmware on the Communications Hub or replace the PPMID as required.

Abstained Respondents in favour of rejection

One Network Party abstained from providing a view as to whether this modification should be approved or not.

It acknowledged the need for this modification but was unsure whether the benefits outweighed the costs. It noted the increase in costs from the DCC's Preliminary Assessment to its Impact Assessment and whether the Working Group had scrutinised these and reached a conclusion on the business case.