

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.

## MP178 ‘Removing DSP validation against the SMI join status for SR8.8.x’

### August 2022 Working Group – meeting summary

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Brad Baker	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
Elizabeth Woods	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Anik Abdullah	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
David Rollason	DCC
Robbie Macintosh	DCC
Julie Brown	British Gas
Rochelle Harrison	Centrica
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davies	ESG Global
Martin Bell	EUA
Alastair Cobb	Landis+Gyr
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Lorna Clarke	SMDA
Aiden Way	So Energy
Matt Alexander	SSE Networks
Shuba Khatun	SSE Networks
Audrey Smith-Keary	OVO
George Macgregor	Utilita
Kelly Kinsman	WPD

#### Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, the Business Requirements and Proposed Solution.

## Issue

- Cases observed where the response to the SRV 8.7.2 'Join Service (Non-Critical)' is not received by the Data Service Provider (DSP) despite the join working within the Electricity Smart Metering Equipment (ESME)
- Service User unable to send an Unjoin commands (SRV 8.8.1 or SRV 8.8.2)
- Only Devices joined in the Smart Metering Inventory (SMI) can be un-joined

## Business Requirements

- To remove the Data Service Provider (DSP) validation for Response Code E080801 when in association with the unjoin command (SRV8.8.1 and SRV8.8.2)
- DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) updated to align with other Smart Energy Code (SEC) requirements of not mandating DSP validation of join or unjoin command

## Proposed Solution

- Remove DSP validation of join status in the SMI when sending an Unjoin Service Request
- Will allow the sending of unjoin commands irrespective of the join status held in the SMI
- Suppress the Response Code E080801 from being created in association with an unjoin command

## Working Group Discussion

SECAS provided an overview of the issue, Business Requirements and Proposed Solution.

### Business Requirements

A Large Supplier representative (JB) queried if the business requirement was to remove the Data Service Provider (DSP) validation for both unjoin and join, or just one of them. They felt that to remove both contradicts the problem statement. Working Group members agreed that there is no validation required for a join, only an unjoin, therefore the Business Requirement does not need to state the removal of the validation of the join request.

In relation to the unjoin request there needs to be an association of the Devices on the SMI in order for it to be removed. A Large Supplier representative (JB) agreed removing the unjoin validation will help with stranded Devices and is in favour of this modification as it will help with Device reuse.

### DSP and SMI validation

A Working Group member (DD) queried why the Data Service Provider (DSP) is validating the status on the SMI, as the Device itself knows what it is joined (and what it is not joined to). Working Group members stated that the tracking in the SMI needs to remain, as this is used for other business needs within industry although there are alternative ways to check the status via a Read Device Log. SECAS

(AA) stated that within the Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS), there isn't currently a requirement for the validation of this SRV and therefore queried the reason as to why the current DCC implementation requires it. SECAS (AA) noted that this aspect is worth investigating with the Data Services Provider (DSP), as there could be a genuine reason as to why this piece of architecture exists. The Prosper (DW) advised that during the business requirements workshop held by SECAS, no one was able to advise why it had been included in the design. Furthermore the Proposer also stated that initial discussion with DSP also indicated that the removal of this validation isn't something that will cross impact other parts of the DSP solution. This is something the DCC needs to confirm if this modification progresses to the Preliminary Assessment stage. Working Group members agreed that this modification will need to be reviewed by Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) to provide their views and ensure the removal of the response code does not have any implications.

## Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS will revise the business requirements.
- SECAS will present the business requirements and Proposed Solution to the TABASC for review; and
- Following the review by TABASC, SECAS will request the Preliminary Assessment.