

MP222 ‘CPL submission efficiency improvements’

Annex A

Business requirements – version 0.1

About this document

This document contains the business requirements that support the solution(s) for this Modification Proposal. It sets out the requirements along with any assumptions and considerations. The Data Communications Company (DCC) will use this information to provide an assessment of the requirements that help shape the complete solution.

1. Business requirements

This section contains the functional business requirements. Based on these requirements a full solution will be developed.

Business Requirements	
Ref.	Requirement
1	Firmware and / or hardware revisions for Devices currently listed on the Central Products List (CPL) are to be submitted in a more efficient manner.
2	A Manufacturer can submit a Hash Image for firmware and / or hardware revisions for Devices currently listed on the CPL following CPA approval without the additional support of a Supplier Party.
3	CPL submission efficiencies will not compromise security and will not force the Supplier Party to deploy the firmware and / or hardware revision.

2. Considerations and assumptions

This section contains the considerations and assumptions for each business requirement.

2.1 General

This solution will be applied to Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS)2 Devices only.

2.2 Requirement 1: Firmware and / or hardware revisions for Devices currently listed on the Central Products List (CPL) are to be submitted in a more efficient manner.

The Proposer has suggested that in order to make CPL submissions that relate to firmware and / or hardware revisions of pre-existing CPL-listed Devices more efficient, the requirement to obtain a Supplier Party endorsement should be removed. The rationale behind this is that the modification will allow updated products to enter the GB Smart Metering market, providing important fixes (operational and potentially security) and new technologies in a more efficient manner. This will allow for a more open marketplace, with new Manufacturers and technologies no longer facing hurdles to provide their products. This is likely to increase as new initiatives and industry challenges arise. An example of this is the design and build of new Devices in order to facilitate the introduction of hydrogen.

2.3 Requirement 2: A Manufacturer can submit a Hash Image for firmware and / or hardware revisions for Devices currently listed on the CPL following CPA approval without the additional support of a Supplier Party.

Currently, if present, a Supplier must present the Hash Image to Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) for CPL submission; it cannot be the manufacturer. This is despite the Manufacturer creating the Hash Image. The Proposer has stated that it would be more efficient to allow the Manufacturer to present the Hash Image that it created as part of the CPL submission.

2.4 Requirement 3: CPL submission efficiencies will not compromise security and will not force the Supplier Party to deploy the firmware and / or hardware revision.

It is the intention of this modification to make the process of submitting new entries to the CPL that are providing either hardware or firmware updates to existing Devices more efficient, however the Proposed Solution should not reduce the current security requirements in place. SECAS and the Proposer will discuss the Proposed Solution with the Security Sub-Committee (SSC). The firmware and / or hardware revisions will also not be mandatory.

3. Solution development

This section contains a must-have, should-have, could-have, won't-have (MoSCoW) analysis for the different requirement components to be considered as part of the solution.

MoSCoW Analysis		
Requirement Ref.	Description	MoSCoW
1	Any proposed CPL submission solutions put forward under MP222 must be more efficient than what is currently in place.	M
2	Allowing the Manufacturer to submit the Hash Image that it has created will be an efficiency improvement.	S
3	The Proposed Solution must not compromise the smart metering security infrastructure.	M

Key

- M = Must have
- S = Should have
- C = Could have
- W = Won't have

4. Glossary

This table lists all the acronyms used in this document and the full term they are an abbreviation for.

Glossary	
Acronym	Full term
CPL	Central Products List
DCC	Data Communications Company
SECAS	Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat
SMETS	Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications
SSC	Security Sub-Committee