

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.

# SECMP0015 'GPF timestamp for reading instantaneous Gas values'

# October 2020 Working Group - meeting summary

#### **Attendees**

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Sasha Townsend	DCC
Simon Trivella	British Gas
Allan Row	British Gas
Ali Raza	EDF Energy
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Julie Geary	E.ON
Ferenc Vanhoutte	Geo Together
Elias Hanna	Landis & Gyr
Emslie Law	OVO (SSE)
Mahfuzar Rahman	Scottish Power
Eric Taylor	SLS
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Rachel Norberg	Utilita
Gemma Slaney	WPD

# Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified by SECMP0015, the Proposed Solution and the Data Communications Company (DCC) Impact Assessment. The Proposer additionally added to clarify that as Gas Reading were not timestamped they had no idea how old they were, it wasn't just a 30 minute delay when the Gas Proxy Function (GFP) received Gas Readings from the Gas Smart Metering Equipment (GSME).

#### Issue:

 Instantaneous Gas Smart Metering Equipment (GSME) register values can be read from the Gas Proxy Function (GPF);





- These will not normally be in-line with the readings on the GSME, since the GSME only
  provides intermittent updates to the GPF, typically once every 30 minutes; and
- Without a timestamp to know when the GSME last updated the GPF, the Supplier cannot know how up to date the information is.

#### **Proposed Solution:**

Allow Parties and Devices reading the instantaneous values from the GPF to know the time
on the GSME's clock when the value was provided. Also allow In Home Displays (IHDs) and
Pre-Payment Interface Devices (PPMIDs) to determine and display the time of the last
updates.

#### **DCC Impact Assessment:**

- Proposed lead time of 13 months
- Implementation cost of £4,596,044.00 (£2,016,378.00 is design, build and PIT) which differs from the DCC Preliminary Assessment implementation cost up to PIT of £750,000-850,000.

# **Working Group discussions**

SECAS provided a breakdown of the implementation cost of £4,596,044.

One Working Group member questioned why one Service Provider costs are five times the amount of the other Service Provider. The DCC noted that they had challenged the costs but that that a large proportion of the cost is to pay for extensive regression testing by the Service Providers as inaccurate testing has occurred previously.

It was agreed that a higher level of transparency of DCC assessment costs is needed, as this is currently a barrier to any change. It was pointed out the Ofgem require DCC to provide the costs of a stand-alone implementation therefore each modification is assessed with full testing costs which was unlikely to be realistic as modifications would be implemented alongside other modifications, reducing the costs of testing.

SEC Modification costs are currently being discussed in other forums in order to better understand how each part of a modification is costed. SECAS agreed to work with the DCC to present the costs in a more realistic way, acknowledging that it is extremely unlikely this modification will be implemented as a stand-alone modification.

The Working Group discussed the business case of the modification to assess the benefits. Working Group members agreed to provide information to SECAS following the meeting.

### **Next Steps**

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to seek further feedback relating to the business case
- SECAS to work with he DCC to present costs in a more realistic way

