

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.

MP117 'Bulk CH Returns'

June 2021 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

| Attendee | Organisation |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Ali Beard | SECAS |
| Holly Burton | SECAS |
| Harry Jones | SECAS |
| Bradley Baker | SECAS |
| Joe Hehir | SECAS |
| Kev Duddy | SECAS |
| Piers Garton | SECAS |
| Joey Manners | SECAS |
| Sasha Townsend | DCC |
| Remi Oluwabamise | DCC |
| Charlotte Semp | DCC |
| David Walsh | DCC |
| Abhijit Pal | DCC |
| Lynne Hargrave | Calvin Capital |
| Julie Geary | E.ON |
| David Lyons | E.ON |
| Alex Hurcombe | EDF Energy |
| Paul Saker | EDF Energy |
| Alastair Cobb | Landis + Gyr |
| Ralph Baxter | Octopus Energy |
| Emslie Law | OVO Energy |
| Mafs Rahman | Scottish Power |
| Elias Hanna | Smart ADSL |
| Matthew Alexander | SSEN |
| Paul Fitzgerald | SSE |
| Gemma Slaney | WPD |
| Kelly Kinsman | WPD |

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified and solution options before discussing the Request for Information (RFI) responses and proposed next steps.

Working Group objectives:

- **Note** the progress of the Modification Proposal so far
- **Note** the returned Impact Assessment, associated costs of the solution, legal text and RFI responses
- **Agree** the legal text is suitable, the implementation date is feasible and provide opinions on the proposal

Issue:

- SEC Section F5 'Communication Hub Forecasts & Orders' allows any SEC Party to place orders for Communications Hubs (CHs) from the Data Communications Company (DCC). Specified Parties can notify the DCC under SEC Section F8.7 in the event of needing to return the Communications Hub.
- This is done by submitting either DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) Service Requests 8.14.3 or 8.14.4, which allow Users to input one Global Unique Identifier (GUID) per request.
- This means that Users must send an individual Service Request to notify the DCC of each Communications Hub return.

Working Group Discussion:

SECAS provided an overview of the solution which is to increase the number of GUIDs on Service Requests 8.14.3 and 8.14.4 used for issuing Communications Hub returns. This will allow for the return of multiple Communications Hub units in a single Service Request.

A Refinement Consultation was issued earlier in the process which saw a 50/50 split of agreeing and disagreeing with the Proposal. One Party already had an inbuilt function so therefore this change would not aid them in any particular manner, the other Party noted that based on 100% of all Communications Hubs owned, this would have been easier.

One Working Group member (RB) questioned whether the party in question understood the intent of this modification and whether their expectations were correct. SECAS suggested the Party was aware as part of the RFI, as they mentioned that later on in the RFI when mentioning cost effective solutions, they had manually associated costs for sending those Service Requests (SR). These costs would be significantly reduced by implementing this modification.

A Working Group member (AH) noted the one recipient who was in favour of this modification was in fact EDF energy, who when asking their logistics team to answer the questions in the RFI, they were the ones who stressed the benefit if this had been implemented in the first place. It was appreciated that there were not many respondents but believe there is a small benefit.

A Working Group member (GS) highlighted one of the discussions held at the last Working Group was although it's good to send up to 999 in one SR, there is still an issue with the Service Level Agreement (SLA) in that, Parties are expected to return these SRs within a certain period.

SECAS responded although [MP154 'CH Returns SLA Amendment'](#) has been raised and are somewhat linked, they do run independently therefore it is not worth considering the merits of MP154 necessarily unless approved. The Working Group should continue to compare against the five Working Day SLA. Working Group members clarified that the reason Parties are unable to meet the five Working Day SLA and are in supportive of MP154 changes is due to the fact that it is much more efficient to return these in bulk.

Discussion highlighted that this modification does technically facilitate everything required in the process so far with the next step being to take this to Panel where if approved, a Modification Report Consultation (MRC) would be issued to drive out further views on this modification.

One Working Group member asked what is stopping Parties from processing Communications Hubs in single SRs and then returning multiple Communications Hubs at once to the DCC. The difference is only in the volume of SRs being sent to the DCC. SECAS (HJ) highlighted that this is correct and that, the modification is looking to reduce the number of SRs that would be sent and processed. Essentially there should not be anything to stop Parties sending the affected Communications Hubs back in a single SR.

A Working Group member (GS) noted from a cost perspective, the DCC associated costs were roughly £400-£450k plus an annual cost between £5-£10k which, seems significant for a change that at the moment would only benefit one Party.

For clarification, this modification cannot be withdrawn unless the Proposer agrees to do so. If the Proposer does not wish to withdraw this modification, then the usual steps will follow as set out in SEC Section D 'Modification Process'. The DCC (ST) noted the intent for today's discussion was to seek views however, if there are strong views from the Working Group not to progress this modification then the DCC can consider withdrawing. But are minded to proceed to Modification Report Consultation (MRC) phase to give more Parties an opportunity to respond, as it is difficult to tell from a 50/50 split from two Suppliers the wider industry costs and benefits of the modification.

Conclusion

SECAS informed the Working Group of the proposed next steps which will result in this modification being presented to the Panel on Friday 17 June 2021 before issuing for MRC to seek further views. One member asked to make clear in the MRC that Parties will have to assess this modification based on the five WD SLA, irrespective of the fact there is another modification that has been raised to address the timing issue of Communications Hub returns.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to discuss the next steps with the Proposer following the Working Group discussions