

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.

MP107 'SMETS1 Validation of SRV 6.15.1'

July 2021 Working Group – Meeting Summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Holly Burton	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
Piers Garton	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Anik Abdullah	SECAS
Tom Mudryk	SECAS
Tim Newton	SECAS
Remi Oluwabamise	DCC
David Walsh	DCC
Abhijit Pal	DCC
Sarah-Jane Russell	British Gas
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Julie Geary	E.ON
Robert Williams	E.ON
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davies	ESG Global
Terry Jefferson	EUA
Alastair Cobb	Landis + Gyr
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Andy McFaul	Ofgem
Emslie Law	OVO Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Elias Hanna	Smart ADSL
Simon Willcox	Stark
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Julian Hughes	TABASC Chair
Naeem Saleem	UK Power Networks

Rachel Norberg	Utilita
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Kelly Kinsman	WPD

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified by [MP107 'SMETS1 Validation of SRV 6.15.1'](#), the current business requirements, the impact assessment findings, and proposed next steps.

Issue

- To send a Critical Command to a Smart Metering Technical Specifications 1 (SMETS1) Device, the User must be the owner of the relevant Certificate on the Device and the owner of the Device in the Registered Data Provider (RDP) data. The Certificate is held by proxy (not on the Device) by the SMETS1 Service Provider (S1SP). The Data Service Provider (DSP) and S1SP will perform the additional validation against the RDP data when a Critical Command is sent to a SMETS1 Device.
- If an incorrect Network Operator certificate is placed on SMETS1 Device in error, no Network Operator can send any Critical Service Request (SR) including Service Reference Variant (SRV) 6.15.1 to that SMETS1 Device. This means, any attempt to replace the incorrect certificate by issuing SRV 6.15.1 will be rejected.
- On SMETS2 Devices, the issue can be overcome by the Network Operator that has certificates on the Device sending an SRV 6.15.1. This means that the “wrong” Network Operator can place the correct Network Operator’s certificates on the SMETS2 Device.

Solution

The proposed solution is to remove the DSP RDP check for SRV 6.15.1 targeted at SMETS1 Devices specifically where it targets Network Operator Certificates (Requirement 1). This would be an ongoing, enduring solution.

During the Data Communication Company’s (DCC) Full Impact Assessment (FIA) an optional additional solution (Requirement 2) was suggested, which would entail the DCC undertaking corrective action to fix the existing incorrect Network Operator’s certificates as a one-off activity on the SMETS1 Devices’ virtual anchor slots.

Working Group Discussion

SECAS summarised the issue identified by the Proposer and the Working Group agreed that the issue was clear.

SECAS presented a summary of the FIA findings:

- MP107 will be targeted for November 2022 Smart Energy Code (SEC) Release.

- The DCC will require a lead time of six months to implement the change from date of approval.
- The total cost to implement MP107 will be £208,873 which comprises of £147,191 in Design, Build and Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) and £61,681 in estimated release costs.
- If Requirement 2 is approved to be implemented, there will be a further cost of £30,157.

SECAS also provided a summary of the benefits of implementing MP107. The Working Group agreed that at least one of the Proposed Solutions should be implemented in order to allow SMETS1 Alerts to be routed to the correct Network Operator.

A Working Group member asked why part of Requirement 2, the one-off fix, is not costed for one of the three S1SPs, as it is a one-off change and therefore shouldn't be dependent on the number of instances. The DCC advised that the impact of the incorrect certificate data issue could not be identified for the third S1SP due to a very low number of enrolled meters in their cohort, but that this would be revisited and costed in full should Requirement 2 be considered for implementation. The DCC also confirmed that the cost of Requirement 2 would not change due to a change in the volume of instances, apart from the possible inclusion of the cost for the third S1SP.

A Working Group member stated they would support the implementation of Requirement 2, the one-off fix, however queried the benefit of implementing Requirement 1. It was generally agreed that while Requirement 1 would prevent issues arising in future, its effects would be negated by waiting for the conclusion of SMETS1 enrolment before implementing Requirement 2. As SMETS1 enrolment is forecast to be completed by mid-2022, and the timeline for implementation of Requirement 1 is targeted for the November 2022 SEC release, the Working Group indicated they would support the approach to implement the one-off fix.

A Working Group member stated that they believe Requirement 2 would not require a change to the SEC, and so should be handled through the DCC's internal change process. This view was seconded by another Working Group member. The DCC have been asked to consider this view and provide comment.

Following the FIA, the Proposer has requested further information from the DCC before reaching a decision on how to proceed. As the Proposer is a member of the Working Group, SECAS asked group members to advise if they felt MP107 should be returned to the Working Group following this decision. No members requested this, as it was agreed at least one of these solutions was required, however one member requested the Working Group be provided with an update once the decision is reached.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- The DCC is to respond to the specific queries raised by the Proposer.
- The Proposer will decide which solution is to be implemented, and this decision will be fed back to the Working Group.
- Depending on the DCC's response and the Proposer's chosen solution, SECAS will either present MP107 to the Change Sub-Committee for agreement on implementation, or refer to the DCC's internal change process.