

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.

Paper Reference:	TABASC_36_1511_04
Action:	For Decision

Oversight and Input on Industry Developments

1. Background

In October 2018 TABASC agreed that a standing agenda item would be included for TABASC members to highlight and discuss any industry developments that they are aware of and may interest other TABASC members and impact the technical or business architectures.

Additionally, TABASC requested that SECAS sets out the concerns being raised by one member regarding export business processes.

2. Industry Development Discussion

TABASC members are reminded to consider and raise awareness of industry developments that may impact TABASC.

3. Export Business Process

DCC's Design Release Forum (DRF) has developed a set of slides detailing 'export meter business scenarios'. These set out:

- a view of typical business processes that may impact an export supplier; and
- a view of typical export supplier business processes.

The DCC's work has highlighted three areas of challenge. Each relates to situations where there is interplay between the Import Supplier, Export Supplier and / or the Feed-In Tariff Licensee.

3.1 Export Supplier Impacted by Import Supplier Processes

The DCC's analysis has identified situations where an Export Supplier's activities may be enabled or impacted by the actions of an Import Supplier, which may not be immediately obvious. These include:

- installation of a SMETS2 meter;
- decommissioning, or replacement of, a SMETS2 meter;
- replacement of a Communications Hub.

The DCC's analysis has focused on interaction between Devices, DCC and Users and that identification of these events may be possible using alternative industry information flows, without necessarily explicitly defining this information.

Recommendation: three key options exist:

- accept that the work conducted by DCC so far is sufficient and that responsibility for business processes remains with Suppliers;
- DCC, in conjunction with Users, could confirm that all (within reason) Import Supplier business processes that interact with Export Supplier processes are identified and explicitly document necessary data sources that exist outside of DCC interactions;
- TABASC, via SECAS, could document the end-to-end interactions in the next iteration of the Business Architecture Document (BAD) and / or Business Architecture Model (BAM), leveraging the work of the DCC.

SECAS recommends that the DCC's work is completed and then recorded in the BAD / BAM when the opportunity arises, which is likely to be when SMETS1 updates are made.

3.2 Supplier Receipt of Alerts and Log Entries

The DCC's work has led to queries being raised by Users regarding the information available in three scenarios, specifically which alerts and log entries will be received / available:

- where a party is the Import Supplier and Export Supplier;
- by an Import Supplier where they are not the Export Supplier (but Export is set up);
- by an Export Supplier where they are not the Import Supplier

An initial view would suggest that this should be relatively clear, assuming that systems and Devices operate in accordance with DUIS and GBCS, which specify the recipients, contents and triggers for responses, alerts and log entries.

Recommendation:

SECAS considers that DCC is best placed to confirm that the end-to-end systems operate as expected and confirm the alerts and logs received / available in each situation.

3.3 Non-User Feed-In Tariff Licensees

A query has been raised regarding Feed-In Tariff (FIT) Licensees who are not DCC Users. Where this situation exists, the FIT Licensee is likely to require an agreement with the customer to obtain any necessary export and or generation data.

Recommendation:

FIT Licensees should review their obligations and determine how they could fulfil them.

4. Recommendations

The TABASC is requested to **AGREE:**

- whether TABASC, via SECAS, should update the BAD and/or BAM to address the point in section 3.1 when they updated for SMETS1; and
- that TABASC / SECAS take no action regarding the challenges in sections 3.2 and 3.3

Phillip Twiddy

SECAS Team

8 November 2018