

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.

DP178 ‘Removing DSP validation against the SMI join status for SR8.8.x’

Annex A

Request for information responses

About this document

This document contains the full collated responses received to the DP178 request for information.

Question 1: Does the issue identified under DP178 ‘Removing DSP validation against the SMI join status for SR8.8.x’ impact you?

Question 1			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
Hildebrand technology Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	Successful 8.7.2 is not always registered in the DSP, preventing if required, a subsequent 8.8.2. This affects us directly as a 3rd party adding and removing our type 2 IHD/CADs.
British Gas	Large Supplier	No	Our orchestration does not rely on the unjoin being successful when removing a Device (because the command could be failing because the Device is faulty).
Octopus Energy	Large Supplier	Yes	We are supportive of the need to address the unjoin issue, but are concerned as to why the DSP is not receiving the keys in the 2nd 8F12 alert. It appears that the current volumes affected is small (we can confirm that we have had at least 5 issues). A preferred solution to maintain security protocols would be to investigate why a change to SMI incurs a £2,000 cost to DCC. If this cost was at a more sensible level, we could raise incidents to get this small volume resolved by DSP without the need for this validation change.

Question 2: Does the issue identified under this proposal warrant a modification?

Question 2			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
Hildebrand technology Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	Currently there is a very bad experience for the Consumer as it takes weeks to get the DSP to manually update inventory to allow the 8.8.2, an extended support requirements on ourselves.
British Gas	Large Supplier	No	The cost of the modification should be compared to the number of manual corrections being requested by users. £2,000 per correction for a standard database update appears excessive given this is a repeatable update once applied once.
Octopus Energy	Large Supplier	No	This issue does need to be addressed and a solution delivered, but we're not convinced that the cost benefits to the DCC outweigh the security benefits.