

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’

Annex E

Refinement Consultation responses

About this document

This document contains the full collated responses received to the MP178 Refinement Consultation.

Question 1: Do you agree that the solution put forward will effectively resolve the identified issue?

Question 1				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	No	<p>Although we have no issues with the validation being removed, we do have concerns around when the join doesn't work. In the description it states that there have been instances where the response to the SRV 8.7.2 'Join Service (Non-Critical)' is not received by the DSP despite the join working within the ESME and the SU is unable to send an Unjoin command as only joined devices can be Unjoined, but what if the device doesn't actually join and the SU tries to Unjoin? Will there be no response code to advise of this? response code to advise of this?</p> <p>There have also only been 5 instances of this occurring.</p>	<p>There will be an error code returned as per the current process when a User sends an Unjoin for a Device that is not currently Joined.</p> <p>Although there are only five instances of Users requesting the manual correction by the DCC, Users have noted there are more instances of issue occurring, however no manual correction was requested.</p>
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	<p>We are supportive of this modification. It's a positive change that will benefit Suppliers during I&C when problems arise with device joins</p> <p>The problems that need this solution are more frequent than originally thought when the Mod was raised.</p>	-

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach?

Question 3				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	Yes	-	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Seems sensible	-

Question 3: Will there be any impact on your organisation to implement MP178?

Question 4				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	Yes	How will we know if the device didn't join and an Unjoin is attempted?	Same as the current process of when a User sends a Unjoin and the Device is not joined.
British Gas	Large Supplier	No	This is a DSP only change so DSP will stop applying check/logic. No adaptor upgrade is required.	-

Question 4: Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing MP178?

Question 5				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	-	Unknown	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	No	See above answer to Question 3	-

Question 5: How long from the point of approval would your organisation need to implement MP178?

Question 6				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	Immediately	.	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	-	None	-

Question 6: Do you believe that MP178 would better facilitate the General SEC Objectives?

Question 7				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	No	See answer to Q1	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	We agree with the proposer that this will better facilitate SEC Objective (a).	-

Question 7: Do you believe there will be any impacts on or benefits to consumers if MP178 is implemented?

Question 8				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	No	The number of occurrences is so minimal.	Although there are only five instances of Users requesting the manual correction by the DCC, Users have noted there are more instances of issue occurring, however no manual correction was requested.
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	If an install does stall for this reason, the process to sort it out should be smoother, which will benefit customers who might otherwise have needed a further visit.	-

Question 8: Noting the costs and benefits of this modification, do you believe MP178 should be approved?

Question 9				
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	No	The number of occurrences is so minimal we do not believe that the benefit outweighs the cost.	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	Yes	Yes, subject to checking costs (in the Final Impact Assessment), although costs should be reasonable, as it is only a DSP change. The revised solution should be much more workable than originally scoped.	-

Question 9: Please provide any further comments you may have

Question 10			
Respondent	Category	Comments	SECAS Response
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	-	-
British Gas	Large Supplier	We believe from Working Group discussions that the frequency of issues with this is recognised as being higher than originally in the Mod Report. Can the Mod Report be updated to reflect this, as on first reading it seems that the issues are so infrequent that a resolution shouldn't be required.	SECAS has updated the modification report to reflect this.