

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’

Conclusions Report – version 1.0

About this document

This document summarises the responses received to the Modification Report Consultation regarding approval or rejection of this modification.

Summary of conclusions

Change Board

The Change Board voted to **reject** MP202. It believed the modification did not better facilitate SEC Objective (a) ¹.

Modification Report Consultation

SECAS received five responses to the Modification Report Consultation. Four Parties, all Large Suppliers, believed that the modification should be rejected. They considered the modification did not support SEC objective (a) and (e) ². One Other SEC Party supported the modification, noting they believed this modification better facilitates SEC objective (a).

Modification Report Consultation responses

Summary of responses

Five Parties responded to the Modification Report Consultation. One Party that believed the modification should be rejected noted that as part of the solution to MP202, Over-the-Air (OTA) firmware upgrades will no longer be available to Pre-Payment Meter Interface Devices (PPMIDs) enrolled in a Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) 1 Smart Metering System. They added that they believe this was in opposition to both SEC Objectives (a) and (e) because the

¹ a) to facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain;

² (e) to facilitate such innovation in the design and operation of Energy Networks (as defined in the Data Communications Company Licence) as will best contribute to the delivery of a secure and sustainable Supply of Energy;

Managed by

ability to upgrade SMETS1 PPMID firmware is critical. In addition, if Suppliers lose this functionality this could present substantial operational risks.

Two other Parties that believed the modification should be rejected noted that although the implementation of MP202 would improve their operational processes, they believe the costs associated with the modification were too high. They also noted that the existing DCC tactical interim process works for all Parties and therefore the business case for change was not strong enough to support approval.

The one Party in support of MP202 noted that the modification would facilitate a simpler installation process for consumers, therefore better facilitating SEC Objective (a).

Change Board vote

Change Board vote

The Change Board voted to **reject** MP202 under Self-Governance.

The vote breakdown is summarised below:

Change Board vote				
Party Category	Approve	Reject	Abstain	Outcome
Large Suppliers	0	5	0	Reject
Small Suppliers	0	2	0	Reject
Network Parties	0	2	0	Reject
Other SEC Parties	0	2	0	Reject
Consumer Representative	0	0	0	Reject
Overall outcome:				REJECT

Views against the General SEC Objectives

Objective (a)

The Change Board believed that MP202 would not better facilitate SEC Objective (a).

Change Board discussions

During the Change Board meeting, one member noted that in the coming years a large number of SMETS1 Smart Metering Systems (SMS) will be replaced by SMETS2+ SMS. They questioned if a working PPMID in the SMETS1 SMS could be re-used to prevent wastage of PPMIDs. Another Change Board member noted that this may not be possible as the existing PPMID in the SMETS1 SMS would not be a valid Device combination on the CPL with a SMETS2 SMS.

Another Change Board member noted that they didn't think the pool of SEC Parties trying to use SMETS1 PPMIDs in SMETS2 SMS was very large to consider delaying this modification. They noted that it was more likely that a SMETS2 PPMID would be used in a SMETS1 SMS, noting that the existing workaround is difficult but does work. Another Change Board member noted that a SMETS1

In-Home Display (IHD) would not technically qualify as a PPMID and therefore it couldn't be used on a SMETS2 SMS.

When discussing the business case for approval of MP202, many Change Board members noted that during the modification process, no Parties had expressed an issue with the existing DCC tactical interim solution. As such, there was no business case to justify what they perceived as high costs for implementation of this modification.