

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.

## MP125 ‘Correcting the ESME Variant’

### August 2020 Working Group – meeting summary

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Khaleda Hussain	SECAS
Harry Jones	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Emmanuel Ajayi	SECAS
Nick Blake	Gemserv
David Walsh	DCC
Chun Chen	DCC
Mari Toda	DCC
Remi Oluwabamise	DCC
Hayley Robinson	DCC
Abhijit Pal	DCC
Michelle Bingham	DCC
Sasha Townsend	DCC
Leigh Hill	DCC
Lynn Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Alex Hurcombe	EDF
Nina Lintott	Gilmond
William Wilson	Global 365
Elias Hanna	Landis + Gyr
Mahfuzar Rahman	Scottish Power
Gordon Hextall	SSC Chair
Emslie Law	SSE
Matt Alexander	SEEN
Carolyn Burns	Utiligroup
Andy Knowles	Utilita
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Rachel Norberg	Utilita

## Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified by MP125, the business requirements and items from the TABASC for consideration and discussion.

Issue:

- Service Reference Variant (SRV) 12.2 'Device Prenotification' is used by the Responsible Supplier to set the 'ESMEVariant' upon commissioning Electricity Smart Metering Equipment (ESME). However, it cannot be changed once it has been set, even if the ESME Variant was wrongly notified by the previous Supplier.
- Only the user who added the Device on the Smart Metering Inventory (SMI) can update the details of the device while it is in a "pending" status.
- The Data Communications Company (DCC) have estimated there is 719,000 commissioned ESME Devices that potentially have the incorrect ESME Variant code in the SMI.

Business Requirements:

1. To allow the Responsible Supplier to update the meter variant using SRV 8.4 'Update Inventory'.
2. To allow the Responsible Supplier to remove the restriction of "pending" status on the SMI.

## TABASC considerations:

SECAS advised the Working Group that the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) asked the Working Group to consider the following:

- Whether any other Service Requests that only the installing Supplier can send should be made available to the current Supplier in sending.
- Whether any changes are necessary to Business Processes in the Business Architecture Document in terms of permissions between DCC Users.

In reference to the TABASC's first comment, a member noted that it had previously advised that further Service Requests should be considered for inclusion under this modification. However, SECAS advised that it had not received any further feedback from Parties for any additional Service Request to include under this modification.

## Solution Discussions

The Working Group agreed that the issue was clear and should be resolved. The Working Group raised concerns regarding the figure of 719,000 ESME Devices which the DCC estimate to be listed under an incorrect ESME variant in the SMI. A member questioned how the figure was being captured and suggested if data cleansing activity should take place to rectify the already incorrect ESME Variants. A member also wanted to understand what the error was for the 719,000 incorrect ESME variants and whether they were all due to the same issue or if in fact the code was being entered incorrectly. The DCC advised that the figure may might not be a true reflection as this figure only captured those ESME variants listed as variant 'A'.

Members also suggested an enduring report on ESME variants be produced by the DCC to prevent the issue from re-occurring. However, members agreed the DCC does not necessarily have the data available to be able to produce the report with enough accuracy. Members agreed that Registration data is likely to be more accurate.

Working Group members highlighted that Users (including Registered Supply Agents (RSAs) and other Users) were likely recording EMSE Variants according to how they were using them or using a standard description rather than what the Device was capable of. This would lead to confusion on Change of Supplier when another User may want to use the Device in a different way.

It was also highlighted that this would become more of an issue once the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) Auxiliary Proportional Control (APC)/ Standalone Auxiliary Proportional Control (SACP) functionality becomes available. The Variants would go from the current total of 11 to many more.

The Working Group suggested a Request for Information (RFI) should be carried out to find out how many and types of incorrect EMSE Variant Users were aware of and how they were dealing with them. SECAS agreed this could be done as part of the Refinement Consultation.

A Working Group member suggested that the Central Products List (CPL) could be changed to include more clear information (CPL currently includes UK Metering Forum (UKMF) data in computer language which is not readable by Users). SECAS agreed to investigate if this was feasible.

The DCC stated that they could run a comparison of the SMI and CPL if this would be helpful. Working Group members agreed this should be performed and the results discussed to see if this would be a useful comparison.

Action Points: -

- DCC to provide a report on EMSE variants listed in the SMI against CPL data.
- SECAS to investigate the feasibility of amending the CPL so it displays the ESME Variant. SECAS acknowledged the request and will report back to the Working Group.

Overall, the modification received full support and the Working Group were happy for SECAS to update the business requirements and to request a DCC Preliminary Assessment.

## Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS will update the business requirements and share this with Working Group members before requesting a Preliminary Assessment.
- Once SECAS have accounted for any comments on the business requirements, it will request a DCC Preliminary Assessment.