

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’

May 2023 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Rachel Black (RBI)	Gemserv
Kev Duddy (KD)	Gemserv
Ben Giblin (BG)	Gemserv
Liz Woods (LW)	Gemserv
Rainer Lischetzki (RL)	Gemserv
David Jones (DJ)	Alt Han Co
Patricia Massey (PM)	BEAMA
Julie Brown (JB)	British Gas
Abhijit Pal (AP)	DCC
Christopher Thomson (CT)	DCC
David Walsh (DW)	DCC
Joe Hehir (JH)	DCC
Robin Seaby (RS)	DCC
Amy Cox (AC)	EDF
Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
Sharon Armitage (SA)	EON
Daniel Davies (DD)	ESG
Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
Matt Roderick (MR)	N3rgy
Kelly Kinsman (KK)	NGED
Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
Audrey Smith-Keary (ASK)	OVO
Mahfuzar Rahman (MRa)	Scottish Power
Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN
Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita

Overview

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

Issue

The DCC has established that some models of Prepayment Interface Device (PPMID) can work as both a Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS)1 and a SMETS2+ Device. The Smart Energy Code (SEC) is drafted in a way that means 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.

Proposed Solution

The Proposed Solution involves having two rows of the same firmware version for a Device Model included in the Central Products List (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 from the relevant Smart Metering System (SMS) to determine which version of SMETS the system is and update the SMI accordingly.

Working Group Discussion

SECAS (BG) provided an overview of the issue and explained why further information is being sought on which Parties are impacted by the current DCC Tactical Interim Solution.

SECAS (BG) explained that as part of the solution to MP202, Over-the-air (OTA) firmware upgrades will only be allowed for dual mode PPMIDs which are enrolled in a SMETS2+ SMS. SECAS (BG) clarified that if OTA firmware upgrades were allowed to PPMIDs enrolled in a SMETS1 SMS then there would be three entries on the CPL for SMETS1 Devices, with another for SMETS2. However, this contradicts one of the business requirements for the modification which is for the DCC to distinguish between a single SMETS1 and single SMETS2 entry. As such, this modification will not allow OTA firmware upgrades to PPMID's in SMETS1 SMS and Parties will lose this ability should it be approved.

A Working Group member (ASK) asked why this modification had been raised if the DCC is implementing a tactical interim solution. SECAS (RL) noted that currently if a Party wants to install a PPMID which can work in a SMETS1 or SMETS2 SMS then the Device needs to be pre-notified for installation. This modification will allow the installing party to use the same PPMID for all installations. They noted that the DCC will be made aware of whether the Device is SMETS1 or SMETS2 when the PPMID is connected to the Communications Hub. This will simplify metering installations as they do not need to check whether they are installing a SMETS1 or SMETS2 PPMID.

Another Working Group member (AH) added that this modification would reduce the risk of installations failing. They noted that they are managing with the DCC current tactical interim solution but there is a higher risk of failed installs than without this modification.

A Working Group member (MB) questioned what would occur if an OTA firmware upgrade is needed on a SMETS1 PPMID but this could not be facilitated, highlighting it could lead to Device exchange. A Working Group member (DD) summarised that if a PPMID was defective it would need an exchange, or if there is a functionality change it would mean that the PPMID cannot have this feature. The DCC (DW) noted that this would be a localised problem and that they had spoken to some PPMID manufacturers who confirmed they do not intend to start releasing firmware upgrades for PPMIDs.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to present the Impact Assessment and RFI responses to the Working Group once it has been received.