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.

MP202 'Enduring Solution for SMETS1 and SMETS2+ PPMIDs'

March 2023 Working Group – Meeting Summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard (AB)	SECAS
Rachel Black (RB)	SECAS
Bradley Baker (BB)	SECAS
Kev Duddy (KD)	SECAS
Ben Giblin (BG)	SECAS
Rainer Lischetzki (RL)	SECAS
Mohammedanwar Sumro (MS)	SECAS
Abhijit Pal (AP)	DCC
Mark Pitchford (MP)	DCC
Christopher Thompson (CT)	DCC
David Walsh (DW)	DCC
Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
Julie Brown (JB)	British Gas
Steve Blackler (SBlac)	E Gas & Electricity
Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG Global
Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
Craig Biffen (CB)	EUA
Kevin McIntyre (KM)	Geo
Stuart Blair (SB)	Northern Power Grid
Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus
Jamie Flaherty (JF)	Ofgem
Audrey Smith-Keary (ASK)	Ovo Energy
Mahfuzar Rahman (MR)	Scottish Power
Jeff Studholme (JS)	Smart Meter Assets
Joanne Rush (JR)	SSE Networks
Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSE Networks

Overview

Issue

The DCC has established that some models of Prepayment Interface Device (PPMID) can work as both a SMETS1 Device and a SMETS2+ Device. The SEC currently differentiates between SMETS1 and SMETS2+ Devices and is drafted so that a Device can be either SMETS1 or SMETS2+, but not both. This means that a PPMID cannot currently be treated as both a SMETS1 PPMID and a SMETS2+ PPMID, even if it is physically able to behave as such.

Solution

The Proposed Solution involves having two rows of the same firmware version for a Device Model included in the CPL: one row for SMETS1 and the other for SMETS2+. The data received via the CPL is stored in the Firmware Version table in the Smart Metering Inventory (SMI). Devices can be pre-notified as a SMETS1 or SMETS2+, but the Data Service Provider (DSP) will use the SMETS version of the Communications Hub (CH) from the relevant Smart Metering System (SMS) to determine which version of SMETS the system is and update the SMI accordingly.

Working Group Discussion

The DCC (AP) provided an overview of MP202, noting the objective of the proposal is to support the 'late-binding' of dual mode PPMID with the Communications Hub, to avoid logistical issues during installations.

The DCC (AP) noted Requirement 7 in the modification, which seeks to allow Over the Air (OTA) firmware upgrades to a dual mode PPMID enrolled in only SMETS2+ SMS. The member asked whether this modification should disallow OTA firmware upgrades to SMETS1 Devices for dual mode PPMID's.

The DCC (AP) also stated that firmware upgrades for SMETS1 PPMIDs have been produced by specific Device Manufacturers and questioned whether there was a need to move toward a generic manufacturer image for consistency to enable a single image to work with different types of SMETS1 cohort.

A Working Group member (KM) responded to the DCC's question and stated they would like to retain the current ability they have to apply OTA firmware upgrades to SMETS1 PPMIDs.

SECAS (RL) explained that Requirement 7 had written in this way because alternative solutions would have required extra metadata in the manufacturer image. RL highlighted there are three potential solutions which could have been used, however this would require three extra pieces of metadata. In turn, this would result in three unique CPL entries because the manufacturer image is different. This because the information sits inside the manufacturer image and this is where the hash is calculated when a firmware upgrade takes place.

SECAS (RL) explained that the reason that this modification sought to remove the existing functionality was because a SMETS1 option would need to be supported on the CPL. Alternatively, the DCC would have to crack the manufacturer image, insert any relevant data and then pass the image on to the relevant Party. They noted issues with how to structure firmware updates to different PPMIDs as there is no functionality to distinguish whether it is targeted at the correct Device type. This could mean that DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS) changes are needed as Parties can only submit one image. If this continues, Parties would need to identify which PPMIDs cannot accept that image prior to sending the upgrade.

The DCC (AP) highlighted that if the modification continues with the current business requirements then this means changes to what industry is currently supporting today, which might be an issue to be discussed outside of the scope of this modification.

SECAS (RL) noted that during discussions when drafting the business requirements that they believed this was not possible, but agreed to have a discussion to see if there was an alternative solution.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS (RL) and DCC (AP) to discuss any potential issues related to Requirement 7 and return to the Working Group if any changes to the business requirements had been agreed.