

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.

# MP139 ‘MVP and IVP dates for CHTS’ Conclusions Report – version 1.0

## About this document

---

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

## Summary of conclusions

---

### Change Board

The Change Board voted to **approve** MP139. It believed the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a)<sup>1</sup>.

### Modification Report Consultation

Four responses were received to the Modification Report Consultation. All respondents believed the modification should be approved. They considered the modification better facilitated SEC Objective (a) as it will better facilitate the efficient provision and installation of smart metering systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> Facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers’ premises within Great Britain

## Modification Report Consultation responses

### Summary of responses

Four responses were received to the Modification Report Consultation, two Large Suppliers, a Small Supplier and a Network Party. All four respondents believed this modification will better facilitate SEC Objective (a) by ensuring efficient installation and operation of smart energy systems.

One of the respondents acknowledged the challenge and need to extend the Installation Validity Period (IVP) and Maintenance Validity Period (MVP) dates based on the reasons provided in the Modification Report.

Another respondent also noted their desire for assurances that all Devices are being upgraded as soon as possible upon connection to the DCC. This is to help mitigate risks presented by compatibility issues between older and later versions of Communications Hubs. The respondent expanded that the longer older versions are around, the more issues will persist.

The other respondent noted that they expect this proposal should be sufficient to use all remaining stock. However, there may need to be further consideration of the dates if COVID-19 were to result in another extended period of stand down of installation in 2021.

Furthermore, a respondent supported the approval of this modification as they felt it would enable them to better manage liability risks and reduce wastage associated with dead stock.

## Change Board vote

### Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to **approve** MP139 under Self-Governance.

The vote breakdown is summarised below:

Change Board vote				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	6	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
Small Suppliers	2	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
Network Parties	3	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
Other SEC Parties	1	0	1	<b>Approve</b>
Consumer Representative	1	0	0	<b>Approve</b>
<b>Overall outcome:</b>				<b>APPROVE</b>

One Other SEC Party abstained stating they felt Device Manufacturers do not believe that there has been enough interoperability testing undertaken to resolve their concerns around compatibility and this could lead to returns of Devices for reasons that could be avoided.

## Views against the General SEC Objectives

### Objective (a)

The majority of the Change Board believes that MP139 will better facilitate SEC Objective (a) as it will avoid large stock write off costs and therefore better facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.

### Change Board discussions

One Change Board member stated they were concerned around the lack of interoperability compatibility testing. From their conversations with other organisations and previous DCC work done, they felt there was not enough testing to address these concerns. The Change Board member stated they understood the urgency and purpose of the modification, despite their concerns. They also agreed with the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee's (TABASC) view of the risks presented not being enough to delay progress of the modification.