

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.

MP141 'SRV Visibility for Devices on SSI'

May 2021 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Holly Burton	SECAS
Harry Jones	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Khaleda Hussain	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Robin Healey	SECAS
Sasha Townsend	DCC
Remi Oluwabamise	DCC
Easton Brown	DCC
David Walsh	DCC
Gary Bailey	DCC
Graeme Liggett	DCC
Richard Amey	DCC
Gav Parott	DCC
Robin Seaby	DCC
Sarah-Jane Russell	British Gas
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Julie Geary	E.ON
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davis	ESG Global
Terry Jefferson	EUA
Gordon Hextall	Gemserv (SSC Chair)
Phil Twiddy	Gemserv
Alastair Cobb	Landis + Gyr
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Emslie Law	OVO Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Rachel Norberg	Utilita
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Kelly Kinsman	WDP

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, provided an overview of the returned Preliminary Assessment and discussed the business case and next steps.

Issue:

- Supplier Parties are currently unable to view Service Request Variants (SRVs) or Service Responses from other Service Users that they receive on their Devices. This is due to an obligation in the SEC that states only an individual User can view the SRVs and Service Responses they send or receive.
- This therefore leads to SRVs and Service Responses being received by Users which lack visibility or information, which is causing issues where they may be high priority or have security implications.

Working Group discussions

Proposed Solution and Business Requirements

SECAS presented the Proposed Solution that reflected the business requirements and subsequent Preliminary Assessment, stating that options were available to choose either just Requirement 1 or both requirements. Some of the Working Group members expressed positive opinions at the cost of the requirement options. One Working Group member enquired into the data being used to look back at a Device's history of SRVs and Service Responses. SECAS confirmed that the metadata being used was only Service Audit Trail (SAT) data, and that this would not cause privacy issues as confirmed by the Security Sub Committee (SSC). The Working Group agreed that the presented solution was fit for purpose and would allow a User to look back to SRVs and Service Responses on a Device if they were sent/received by a different owner at the time.

Business Case

After agreeing the Proposed Solution would work, SECAS asked the Working Group members for how strong a business case there would be in progressing this solution. SECAS asked about which Service Requests the Working Group members believed they would expect to see on a Device using the solution. One Working Group member explained that rather than expecting any particular SRV or Service Response to appear that requires actioning, they would use the solution to investigate for an SRV or Service Response causing the issue. This focus on using it to help identify erratic behaviour with a Device rather than specifically targeting an SRV or Service Response was a use case that the other Working Group members supported.

SECAS asked Working Group members about what sort of time period they would be expecting to retrieve SRV or Service Response SAT data from. A few of the Working Group members believed it should be as far back as the Self Service Interface (SSI) would allow until timing out, stating that they believed the limiting factor would likely be the amount of data retrieved rather than the time said data was collected across. The DCC confirmed that this was the case, and that three months' worth of data

could be collected over more than three months provided the data returned was low in volume across that time period. SECAS noted the Working Group was happy with the Proposed Solution's ability to retrieve data from several months back, and that a question on this aspect of the solution would be present in a Refinement Consultation.

Finally, SECAS asked the Working Group members if there were any other additional benefits that the Modification Proposal would bring if it were approved. One Working Group member believed that in addition to the benefits the new functionality would bring, there would be numerous efficiency gains brought about by being able to make decisions faster and close investigations sooner. Other Working Group members agreed with this stance, stating that it would reduce efforts required by their organisations to resolve consumer issues with meters and could help inform DCC of any common issues. SECAS took note of these comments and added that this would also be added as a question for respondents to answer in the upcoming Refinement Consultation.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS will add the comments from the Working Group meeting to the Modification Report and will issue a Refinement Consultation out to industry the following week.