

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’

Refinement Consultation responses

About this document

This document contains the full non-confidential collated responses received to the MP141 Refinement Consultation.

Question 1: Do you agree with the solution put forward?

Question 1				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No	<p>This modification appears to be a 'nice-to-have' feature for Suppliers, but it's difficult to see the value in this modification for the day-to-day use or how this could help with issue resolutions for a device, therefore we do not believe the cost is justified.</p> <p>Although only the titles of a SRV are displayed in the SAT, we believe there is no necessary reason for DNO to have visibility of communications between the Meter and the Responsible Supplier. This information can indicate the meter mode type, how often top-ups are made and where debt could have been applied, we believe it's in the best interest of the Energy Consumer to restrict the view of the SRVs to only the Responsible Supplier rather than other SEC Parties.</p>	
EDF	Large Supplier	Yes	<p>EDF don't actively work all alerts, although alerts of this type do contribute to the total volume received and stored in our systems, so more knowledge about them could be useful in two respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide validation that they are of no interest/impact to us which could mean switching them off in our systems and likely saving some database space which could improve system performance/speed 	

Managed by



Question 1				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change could help with fault and meter health investigations if we understand more about them and deem them to be of value to us – assuming the SR's other parties have been sending could be indicative of faults or even cause meter health issues 	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	Yes	We agree with the solution being put forward, we note that it refers to SRV's and Service Response's however we wonder if there is benefit to including alerts.	
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Seeing the SRVs will greatly assisting in triaging and understanding what has taken place in relation to a device.	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The Proposed Solution to allow Supplier Parties and Network Operators to view all the titles of SRVs and Service Responses that have been associated with a Device that they own. This will aid the User in investigating any erratic behaviour of the affected Devices and help identify root cause issues and resolutions.	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The solution proposed will allow us to check the Device for any SRVs sent by other SEC Parties which may help understand the reason for unsolicited alerts being received or communication issues. This solution also	

Question 1				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
			ensures that any confidential data will remain undisclosed to other parties.	

Question 2: Will there be any impact on your organisation to implement MP141?

Question 2				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No	As mentioned in Question 1, the benefit of this modification is unclear.	
EDF	Large Supplier	No	We would expect to use the functionality to view all SRV's on an ad-hoc basis for query management purposes. We do not expect to make any additional changes to access the SSI Service Audit trail	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The Proposed Solution will allow us to access the full list of SRVs and Service Responses a Device has either sent or received	
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	All positive as we will be provided with more information to allow us to investigate issues.	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	No	The proposed solution will be an SSI report and therefore no explicit implementation or ongoing impact for the User.	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	We recognise that these impacts are all positive impacts which increase SRV visibility and further understanding of device behaviour.	

Question 3: Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing MP141?

Question 3				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No	As mentioned in Question 1, the benefit of this modification is unclear.	
EDF	Large Supplier	No	We do not expect any additional costs	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	No	There will be no additional costs to us beyond the implementation costs.	
OVO	Large Supplier	No	Other than the costs we will incur if the Mod is cleared for implementation, although we're confused how the range of the cost is from £0 to £300K? How can this not cost anything and how do we influence this being zero cost to those impacted? 1	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	No	The proposed solution will be an SSI report and therefore no explicit costs for the User.	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	No	None given	

Question 4: Do you believe that MP141 would better facilitate the General SEC Objectives?

Question 4				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No	As mentioned in Question 1, the benefit of this modification is unclear.	
EDF	Large Supplier	Yes	We believe MP141 would facilitate SEC Objective (a) to facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain. Additionally we believe that the change would support SEC Objective (e) the fifth General SEC Objective by facilitating the operation of Energy Networks to the delivery of a secure and sustainable Supply of Energy;	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	Yes	We believe that this proposal will better facilitate SEC Objective (a) by ensuring the efficient provision, installation, operation and interoperability of smart metering systems at energy consumers premises within Great Britain	
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes, as defined in the Mod Report	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The Modification Proposal better facilitates General SEC Objective (a) where it would contribute to the better operation of Devices at a premise that are experiencing unusual activity and require investigating	

Question 4				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	As detailed in the Modification report, we agree that this modification will better facilitates General SEC Objective (a).	

Question 5: Noting the costs and benefits of this modification, do you believe MP141 should be approved?

Question 5				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No	For the reasons already highlighted in Question 1	
EDF	Large Supplier	Yes	The benefits should outweigh the costs, However, we note that the PIA ranges from £0 to £300k which is a very wide estimation of the costs	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	Yes	No response provided	
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	The more information we can obtain in investigating and looking at issues, the better.	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The Proposed Solution to allow Supplier Parties and Network Operators to view all the titles of SRVs and Service Responses that have been associated with a Device that they own. This will aid the User in investigating any erratic behaviour of the affected Devices and help identify root cause issues and resolutions.	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	Due to current issue resolution times and lack of information available related to device messages, we believe this modification should be approved.	

Question 6: How long from the point of approval would your organisation need to implement MP141?

Question 6				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	NA	NA	
EDF	Large Supplier	6 months	This would allow sufficient time to prepare for any changes	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	N/A	We do not have any additional changes to make and therefore do not require any lead time.	
OVO	Large Supplier	N/A	No work is required of us in implementing this change.	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	n/a	The proposed solution will be an SSI report and therefore no explicit implementation or ongoing impact for the User.	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	N/A	N/A	

Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach?

Question 7				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	NA	NA	
EDF	Large Supplier	Yes	We agree that the change should be targeted for the November 2022 SEC Release)	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	Yes	We believe that this modification should be implemented as soon as possible.	
OVO	Large Supplier	No	The Modification report does not define why this SSI only change needs to be linked to a SEC release. The SEC changes are not defined in the Report and there is a possibility this change could cost £0.. so why will it take over a year (17 months from now) to be implemented? What changes do SEC Parties need to make in order to be ready for this Mod to happen? None of this is called out in the Mod report so cannot be considered.	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The Proposed Solution to allow Supplier Parties and Network Operators to view all the titles of SRVs and Service Responses that have been associated with a Device that they own. This will aid the User in investigating any erratic behaviour of the affected Devices and help identify root cause issues and resolutions.	

Question 7				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	We agree with the proposed target dates outlined in the modification proposal.	

Question 8: Do you believe there will be any impacts on or benefits to consumers if MP141 is implemented?

Question 8				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	Yes	As mentioned in Question 1, Energy Consumer information, albeit information taken from titles of an SRV should not be shared unnecessarily with other SEC Parties.	
EDF	Large Supplier	Yes	Consumers could benefit through improve query resolution and dispute management processes.	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	None	We can see that this could benefit consumers in that it will help parties to identify and resolve issues with devices, however we acknowledge that there is not necessarily a direct impact or benefit to consumers.	
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	The inability to see all the SRVs applicable to a device has led to site visits and delays in dealing with issues and problems. This will benefit them by allowing us to obtain more information and establishing, in some situations, the issues faced.	
ENWL	Electricity Network Party	Yes	The Modification Proposal better facilitates General SEC Objective (a) where it would contribute to the better operation of Devices at a premise that are experiencing unusual activity and require investigating. This will lead to more efficient use of the smart meter system.	

Question 8				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	Yes	We believe that this solution may allow for SEC Parties to resolve meter communication issues more efficiently as there will be increased information relating to traffic to and from the device which should assist in quicker resolution.	

Question 9: Are there any additional benefits your organisation would receive from the proposed solution, other than being able to action SRV's and service responses or investigating erratic device behaviour?

Question 9				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No	None given	
EDF	Large Supplier	No	Not that we can immediately think of	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	No	None given	
OVO	Large Supplier	No	None that haven't been drawn out in the Modification working group and DCC DRF discussions on the matter.	
Electricity North West Limited	Electricity Network Party	No	None supplied	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party	No	None supplied	

Question 10: Please provide any further comments you may have

Question 10			
Respondent	Category	Response and rationale	SECAS Response
Utilita	Large Supplier	No further comments	
EDF	Large Supplier	MP141 feels like a good future proofing opportunity	
Western Power Distribution	Electricity Network Party	No	
OVO	Large Supplier	Other than wanting to understand the reason for this Mod being linked directly to a SEC Release meaning it will take longer to be implemented. Understanding that and the work done recently on improving changes to the SEC would be appreciated.	
ENW	Electricity Network Party	None	
SSEN	Electricity Network Party		