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.

MP121 'Commissioning non-commissioned Devices after CoS'

Annex D

Refinement Consultation responses

About this document

This document contains the non-confidential collated responses received to the MP121 Refinement Consultation.

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

Question 1				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	We believe that circa 8% of all SMETS2 devices are not commissioned at installation. These devices show under two different status' on the DCC system, "Installed not Commissioned" and "Pending". We believe it is essential to ensure that these devices can be commissioned at a later date by a supplier who did not install the device. We also believe that any solution proposed must work for any devices left uncommissioned at installation including devices showing as "Installed not commissioned" and ones showing as "Pending" where it is known the device has been installed with relevant industry installation flows sent.	The solution is not intended to include or exclude any specific device statuses – parties will be able to request Install Codes from other parties in any situation where they believe that information will enable them to commission devices
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	Obligations need to be put in place for installing Suppliers to provide the necessary details to gaining Suppliers. We question if the proposed solution is best provided for through the SSI as costs remain significant and to allow for these obligations to be in place as soon as possible, therefore we are in favour of pursuing the alternative solution (via email correspondence).	-

Question 1				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	As having been directly impacted by this issue, we are fully supportive of the proposal presented but have some material concerns with the 5 WD SLA response measure and how this will be managed, monitored and reported upon. Will this be something that will be raised to SEC Panel or managed by the DCC themselves? If so, how? Please see the further questions on this.	The proposed SLA can be discussed and amended as part of the Working Group discussions. The monitoring process would be different depending on the solution option chosen. It is envisaged that non-compliance would be escalated to SEC Panel.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes we agree that a solution to share install codes is needed to avoid unnecessary meter work and enable commissioning of a perfectly fine meter.	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	Northern Powergrid Metering Limited (NPML) believes that the solution is a positive step forward for the following reasons: Working with the assumption raised by the Proposer of 3% of churned in meters being affected by this issue; this will lead to a reduction of up to 3% in unnecessary meter removals, the costs associated with the meter exchange, and the following steps the removed meter takes in its life cycle. Placing a requirement to respond within 5 days for the installing supplier into the SEC and placing the solution into the DCC system will further reduce the risk of a meter having to be removed due to slow communication.	It has been noted by others that only the Proposed Solution will allow tracking and statistical analysis of performance. However, there would need to be escalation routes of any failed obligation with either solution.

Question 1				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
			This solution will also mean that the statistics covering this can be tracked, both the installing suppliers response times, and whether or not the devices have since been commissioned by the gaining supplier.	
Bulb	Large Supplier	Yes	Confidential Rationale	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes - Partially	Ultimately this modification will bring benefits to suppliers that will be greatly welcomed, but it doesn't cover all scenarios for assets that are Installed but Not Commissioned/Enrolled. The Modification focuses on No WAN installations, when we also see plenty of scenarios where there has been an unsuccessful or partial install attempt, but the meter remains at the property. To successfully complete the install it may be necessary to uninstall and start the process again, which won't be possible using the same devices unless the install code is known. Also, as highlighted in the Report by another SEC Party, the modification assumes that all devices will be on ACB certs (or vanilla), when there will be suppliers out there with supplier specific certificates that an install code alone will not be able to resolve.	This modification is not seeking to cover all eventualities that could occur. However, it should encompass any situation where the gaining Supplier only requires the install code in order to Commission the meter.

Question 2: Will there be any impact on your organisation to implement MP121?

Question 2				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	Being able to commission these devices at a later date will ensure that meters are not prematurely removed thus impacting the CBA of the SMIP, consumer experience of smart meters and the cost of smart meters provided to suppliers by MAPs.	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	In preparation for implementation efforts will be needed to ensure the correct process is in place as an installing and CoS gaining Supplier.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	We would need to implement a process to handle any received SSI Incidents and respond to them in the SLA defined. It must be noted it's likely some Users may not have this data easily available and may need to make changes to be able to extract it to respond. Will there be some form of sweep up of historical devices in this state and cleared up? How will that be managed? The legal text, and the SSI process, gives no indication on this.	It is envisaged that the backlog will need to be cleared prior to the implementation of this SEC obligation. Details of how that process will be managed can be discussed at the Working Group but will likely be dependent on the solution chosen.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Depending on the solution used, there will be impacts to us as a gaining and losing supplier. In terms of responding to requests, but also utilising the solution to support customers gained in an uncommissioned state. Both solutions will incur operational costs to support, with	-

Question 2				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
			the potential for some internal development to better utilise the solutions.	
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	As a MAP, this will directly reduce the number of NPML's meters being removed, reduce disruption to the customer and minimise any unnecessary waste caused by their removal.	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	Yes	Confidential Rationale	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	Positives – a way of dealing with meters that churn but are not commissioned, without the need to replace.	-

Question 3: Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing MP121?

Question 3				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	No	As a MAP we will not be required to make any changes for MP121	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	For the reasons highlighted in Q2. Although there is currently an informal process in place, all Suppliers need to ensure these processes are robust to meet the obligation.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Any process changes incur cost, as do any changes made by the DCC. We have to pay.	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Confidential Rationale	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	No	As this modification is targeted at putting responsibilities on Suppliers, and the DCC, there will be no cost impact on implementation of this modification on NPML. NPML will potentially save on costs through the reduction of meter removals caused by this modification, this includes the logistical cost and disposal cost of meters that are unable to be reinstalled.	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	Yes	Confidential Rationale	-
E.ON	Large Supplier		Development costs will be incurred to deliver the following:	-

Question 3				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
			• A process to retrieve install codes in bulk from Supplier systems • An ad hoc method of retrieving individual install codes Cost savings will be achieved by reducing the volume of meter exchanges and potential PRCs in replacing meters that are not faulty, but not installed correctly.	

Question 4: Do you believe that MP121 would better facilitate the General SEC Objectives?

Question 4				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	This modification will better facilitate SEC Objectives (1) and (3)	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	By simply putting the obligations in place MP121 better facilitates SEC Objective (a) and (c), for the reasons highlighted in the Modification report.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	As set out in the Modification Report	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	We agree that this proposal would better facilitate the general SEC objectives	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	NPML agrees with the proposer that this modification better facilitates the General SEC Objectives A and C, as this will allow customers to benefit from the smart meter that is installed at their property.	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	Yes	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	Objectives A and C are facilitated through this modification.	-

Question 5: Noting the costs and benefits of this modification, do you believe MP121 should be approved?

Question 5				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	There is a huge volume of meters that are not currently commissioned correctly and, by default, a large volume of these devices will no longer be with the installing supplier. We need a solution to enable these devices to be made operational as soon as possible and to prevent the volume from continuing to increase.	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	These obligations on Suppliers ensure that Energy Consumers are offered the smart services from their meter.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes as the cost of rectifying the issue, as an industry, far outweigh the costs set out. It must be noted that the costs to just make a change to the SSI seem to be wide ranging and incredibly high. Has a breakdown been provided to establish why this is so expensive for what it is? DCC passing an Incident to the Installing Supplier needs what development work for the DCC to provide? The details of the Design, Build and PIT work needed don't really seem to apply? What system changes, costing in the region of QUARTER OF A MILLION pounds, are needed to DCC systems? For an SSI change. For something done today within the SSI.	The DCC costs will be expanded upon and clarity sought if this modification proceeds to FIA. The alternative solution would be a far cheaper option and a quicker implementation.

Question 5				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes, we agree a solution is needed.	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	This modification will lower overall costs of the smart meter roll out, by reducing the total number of unnecessary removals, reduce the waste that is generated from those removals, and minimise the amount of disruption to end users by reducing the number of visits to site the customer receives in the roll out.	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	Yes	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	The modification is what we want, but it would be good to cover the other areas highlighted in our response in Q1	Please see SECAS Response against Q1.

Question 6: If MP121 is approved, which solution do you believe should be implemented?

Question 6				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Proposed Solution	We would prefer a solution that obligates suppliers to comply rather than a solution outside the SEC which suppliers can opt out of. However, as a MAP, we do not pay SEC charges so our response has not considered the cost of implementing the proposed solution and whether this provides value for money to parties that will be required to pay for the solution. Any solution must cover meters with an “installed not commissioned” status and also meters which retain a “pending” status after installation.	The solution is not intended to include or exclude any specific device statuses – parties will be able to request Install Codes from other parties in any situation where they believe that information will enable them to commission devices
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Alternative Solution	For the reasons highlighted in Question 1.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Proposed Solution	Unfortunately, it would not be possible to define the alternative solution in the SEC as it could not be measured and managed. That would need a process between Suppliers outside the SEC.	If the obligation is put into the SEC then failures could be escalated to SEC Panel as required. There could be potential for this to be included within a Performance Assurance Framework (PAF) to manage performance and escalation through the Operations Group. However, this would be a potential

Question 6				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
				future solution as the PAF is not currently in place.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Proposed Solution	We believe the proposed solution is better as a long-standing solution. However, there is also an argument to potentially implement an alternative solution earlier to gage use and iron out an operational challenges. SSI may not be the best solution given its complexity and lack of usability as detailed in answer to Q3	If the Proposed Solution is deemed not fit for purpose then one option would be to implement the Alternative Solution and then a subsequent modification be raised to continue work on identifying a workable automated solution.
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Proposed Solution	The proposed solution puts the responsibilities on the organisations that are in the best position to resolve this issue. At the same time it also allows for recording of performance via DCC ticket resolution. The alternative solution whilst faster and cheaper to implement relies on email correspondence and transfer of install codes and would require each supplier to develop relations with every other supplier to facilitate this securely. This is something that will be track performance on, which as a MAP we believe is critical to keeping meters on the wall.	The Proposed Solution does have the benefit of improved automation and reporting. As mentioned above, an option to implement the Alternative Solution to place an obligation on Suppliers could be pursued, with a subsequent modification raised
Bulb	Large Supplier	Proposed Solution	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Proposed Solution	The proposed solution offers a cleaner enduring process, however there is no reason why the alternative solution	If the Proposed Solution is deemed not fit for purpose then one option would be to implement the Alternative Solution and

Question 6				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
			couldn't be approved for use until the proposed solution can be delivered.	then a subsequent modification be raised to continue work on identifying a workable automated solution.

Question 7: How long from the point of approval would your organisation need to implement MP121?

Question 7				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	No lead time	As a MAP we would not have to implement any changes	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Approximately 6 months	This is to ensure that all processes are robust, tested and automated where possible.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	6 months	This requires internal process changes but should not require system changes to Users.	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	3-6 months	We would initially implement manual solution and use the learnings from this to build a sustainable long-term automated solution	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	NPML will have no lead time associated with the implementation of this modification	There are no requirements being placed on NPML, as such there is nothing to be implemented by NPML to prepare for the modification	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	Confidential Response	-	-

Question 7				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
E.ON	Large Supplier	3 – 6 months	Time would be required to develop a system that can accommodate requests for information, and also make requests to other suppliers.	-

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach?

Question 8				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	This change needs to be implemented as soon as possible. There are already significant volumes of meters which were not commissioned at installation and this needs to be reduced to deliver smart benefits to consumers.	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	No	If the alternative solution is chosen and preferred, an Ad-hoc SEC release may not be enough time to make sure all processes are robust.	The Alternative Solution could be implemented with agreement from Parties on an appropriate timescale.
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Strangely the implementation approach seems to be based on the amount of work DCC need to design, build and test… but it is unclear what needs building?	The Proposed Solution can only be delivered dependent on DCC timescales. The Alternative Solution can be implemented upon agreement from SEC Parties.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes we agree.	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	No	As this modification will significantly reduce the number of unnecessary meter removals, and significantly reduce the waste generated by the smart meter implementation programme, if the planned earliest implementation date of the November release is not met, this should be implemented as soon as possible following this release, and not incur a further 7 month delay unless that is	The Alternative Solution could be implemented with agreement from Parties on an appropriate timescale. The Proposed Solution is dependent on DCC being able to deliver the requirements.

Question 8				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
			absolutely necessary for delivery of the service via the DCC	
Bulb	Large Supplier	Yes	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	As mentioned above, the proposed solution is the most suitable for the longer term.	-

Question 9: Do you agree that the legal text will deliver MP121?

Question 9				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	-	We have not reviewed the legal text	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	-	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes, although it does not pick up the SLA management.	SLA Management and escalation will need to be determined and added to the legal text and/or Modification Report.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes we agree.	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	NPML believes that the text proposed in the consultation document will sufficiently deliver MP121	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Partially	There is no outline for what will happen if the timeframe (currently 5 business days) is breached.	SLA Management and escalation will need to be determined and added to the legal text and/or Modification Report.

Question 10: Do you believe five Working Days provides a reasonable timescale for installing Suppliers to respond to the request?

Question 10				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	-	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	-	-
OVO	Large Supplier	No	Being that this is setting an explicit precedent against DCC Users which is tighter than the PCO upon then, we would like to question how 5 days was arrived upon and where this was discussed and agreed. There is no other SLA, of this nature, in the SEC so could be challenging depending on the nature of the process to ensure compliance and management. Is this the part that will cost the money DCC has stated in the Consultation?	The SLA can be discussed and determined by the Working Group. The Proposer believes a 10 working day SLA would be reasonable.
British Gas	Large Supplier	No	Complexity to automate would be high and therefore could be high resource required depending on the solution used and issues detailed in answer to Q3. We believe initially the timescale would be 30 days and reduced over a period of time once the solutions used are clearer and volumes known to allow resource to be assigned.	The SLA can be discussed and determined by the Working Group. The Proposer believes a 10 working day SLA would be reasonable. An agreed process to clear the backlog could be carried out before the obligation is implemented and therefore volumes should be lower before implementation.

Question 10				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
				Should a Gaining Supplier send an unreasonable number of Devices then a comparable SLA could be agreed between the parties without the need for escalation.
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	The longer a meter remains un-commissioned following a change of supply event, the more likely that the meter will be removed, and so five Working Days seems a fair amount of time for an installing supplier to respond to the request.	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	No	Without seeing how the internal solution will look like, we don't see five days being a suitable time period, certainly not in its infant stages of implementation.	The SLA can be discussed and determined by the Working Group. The Proposer believes a 10 working day SLA would be reasonable.

Question 11: Do you believe there will be any impacts on or benefits to consumers if MP121 is implemented?

Question 11				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	Delivering MP121 will enable existing meters to be commissioned and thus deliver smart benefits to customers who already have a smart meter installed but not commissioned and thus operating as a dumb meter. It will also improve the general image of smart metering and the benefits it can deliver when functioning correctly thus encouraging more consumers to opt for a smart meter installation.	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes	This gives Energy Consumers a greater possibility of having access to smart services from their meter.	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	The benefits lie in being able to commission gained devices. Unless there is dramatic work done to ensure EVERY Installation commissions on site at the point of Install, this will happen ongoing. Being unable to then complete the commission post CoS must be managed and addressed.	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Where the install code can be used to rectify the situation, this will prevent unnecessary exchanges, and allow smart enablement for customers. However, we are aware that	This modification is not seeking to cover all eventualities that could occur. However it should encompass any situation where the

Question 11				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
			the install code alone won't be the resolution for every case.	gaining Supplier only requires the install code in order to Commission the meter.
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	Yes	There will be a reduction in visits to the premises where the meter is installed, as unnecessary exchanges are mitigated by the modification. The consumer will also have the benefit of being able to use their smart meter in smart mode, following successful exchange of install codes and commissioning. Lastly, the consumer will also benefit from any reduction in waste caused by unnecessary meter removals.	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	Consumers with Smart meters will be able to enjoy the benefits of Smart, and this process should be a much quicker and pain-free process than a full meter replacement which is the only option at the moment	-

Question 12: If you are a Supplier, what percentage of Devices would you estimate are gained in an uncommissioned state?

Question 12			
Respondent	**Category**	**Response and rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	As a MAP, we estimate that circa 8% of all installed SMETS2 meters are affected. These devices are either in an “Installed not Commissioned” state or remain in a “Pending” state even though they have been installed. Both “Installed Not Commissioned” devices and “Pending after installation” devices need to be covered by this modification.	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	40-45%	-
OVO	Large Supplier	Unsure why this is a Yes / No Response in the template. Percentages for this are currently very low but it is not the amount causing the problem, it’s the effort needed to investigate and correct them.	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Confidential Response	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	-	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Confidential Response	-

Question 13: If you are a Supplier, what percentage of Devices would you estimate are installed and left in an uncommissioned state?

Question 13			
Respondent	**Category**	**Response and rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Please see our response to question 12	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	-	-
OVO	Large Supplier	N/A	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Confidential Response	-
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	-	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Confidential Response	-

Question 14: Do you agree that having the ability to raise incidents via the SSI for install code requests in bulk would be a valuable addition for the Proposed Solution?

Question 14				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	Yes	Given the volume of devices affected, a bulk request mechanism would be preferable.	DCC has subsequently advised that a bulk option within the SSI is not possible, therefore the Alternative Solution is currently the only solution with a bulk option.
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	Yes, in an ideal scenario using the SSI would be helping for bulk management – but the cost of the solution needs to be taken into serious account.	As was highlighted in the Working Group, it is questionable if using the SSI is worthwhile if the cost is equivalent to £1 per meter site.	DCC has subsequently advised that a bulk option within the SSI is not possible, therefore the Alternative Solution is currently the only solution with a bulk option.

Question 14				
Respondent	**Category**	**Response**	**Rationale**	**SECAS Response**
OVO	Large Supplier	Yes	Isn't this Question 6?	DCC has now advised a bulk option is not possible within the current SSI and therefore the only solution with a bulk option is now the Alternative Solution.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Needs to be available to make the solution viable	DCC has subsequently advised that a bulk option within the SSI is not possible, therefore the Alternative Solution is currently the only option with a bulk option.
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	-	-	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	There are currently thousands of devices in this state, that would require significant time to go through and raise an incident for each device individually, there needs to be the capability to bulk load requests. This has to be an option.	DCC has subsequently advised that a bulk option within the SSI is not possible, therefore the Alternative Solution is currently the only solution with a bulk option.

Question 15: Please provide any further comments you may have.

Question 15			
Respondent	**Category**	**Comments**	**SECAS Response**
Calvin Capital Ltd	Other SEC Party	-	-
Utilita Energy Ltd	Large Supplier	No further comment	-
OVO	Large Supplier	N/A	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	SSI is a complex system and usability limited and therefore may not be the best solution in its given form of incidents. Further work needed to refine the solution so its usable for suppliers Some systems are locked down so utilisation of install codes will be very manual and complex to process	If the Proposed Solution is deemed not fit for purpose then one option would be to implement the Alternative Solution and then a subsequent modification be raised to continue work on identifying a workable automated solution.
Northern Powergrid Metering Limited	Other SEC Party	-	-
Bulb	Large Supplier	-	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	The Mod looks at a very specific scenario in No WAN installations which will help rectify a large percentage of instances, but it does not go the full way to rectify all installed but not commissioned assets.	This modification is not seeking to cover all eventualities that can occur, however it should encompass any situation where the Gaining Supplier only requires the install code in order to Commission the meter.