

Key:

Guidance, cell completed by RFC Initiator
Guidance, cell completed by Design and Delivery Admin & Secretariat (A&S) Teams
Guidance, cell completed by other SMIP parties

Section 1: Cover Sheet

1.1 RFC Title	Proposed changes to the SEC Subsidiary Document (SSD) – SMETS1 Supporting Requirements (S1SR) to accommodate additional device specific behaviour		
1.2 RFC Reference ID	TBDG CR 79		
1.3 Related RFC Reference IDs	TBDG CR 72; TBDG CR 74		
1.4 RFC Initiator	1.4.1. SMIP party raising request	DCC	
	1.4.2. Change Co-ordinator	Robin Seaby	
	1.4.3 Contact Email Address	Robin.seaby@smartdcc.co.uk	
1.5 Products Impacted by RFC	Consultation to introduce additional changes to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SMETS1 Supporting Requirements (S1SR) (V.013) 		
1.6 Parties Impacted by RFC	SEC Parties, DCC, Energy Suppliers, Network Operators, Other Service Users, and Registered Supplier Agents		
1.7 High Level Indicative Impact Assessment	Initial Assessment by RFC Requestor	Validated Assessment by A&S Teams	
	1.7.1 Impact Level	Low	
	1.7.2 Priority Level	Medium	

RFC Process Tracker (completed by Design and Delivery Admin & Secretariat)

RFC Process Step	Date Step Started	Date Step Finished
Step 1 – Initiation		
Step 2 - Validation		
Step 3 – Consultation		
Step 4 – Decision Making		
Step 5 - Implementation		



Section 2: Detail of Proposed Change

2.1 RFC Summary

DCC has identified a number of changes that need to be made to the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements documentation the proposed changes are set out in more detail in the Release Notes. The proposed changes to the S1SR are driven by the following:

- Content from SRPD consultation CR 76;
- Requirement on S1SP to maintain time on Devices via DCO;
- Clarification on the expected content of a response to SRV6.21;
- An additional Device Specific Behaviour identified as part of testing; and
- Some corrections to errors in the S1SR such as cross-references.

This change request invites views from stakeholders on the proposed amendments to the baselined version of S1SR that are set out in the accompanying Release Notes V013. In particular, we are inviting responses to the following consultation question:

1. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements Document (S1SR)?
2. Are the device specific behaviours proposed in Section 18 of S1SR appropriate in the context of IOC?

The consultation will run from 13 February 2019 to 06 March 2019, with responses due by 17:00 on 06 March 2019.

2.2 Essential Background

In the initial stages of the smart meter roll-out across Great Britain, a number of energy suppliers are installing first generation smart devices (known as SMETS1 devices), in consumers' premises. SMETS1 devices installed by one energy supplier, however, are not always interoperable with and supported by the systems used by another supplier. The Data Communications Company (DCC) has developed a plan and designed a solution for the incorporation of such devices into its national network. It provides important shared benefits for industry and consumers and intends to offer the ability for SMETS1 consumers to maintain their smart services following a decision to switch suppliers.

In November 2017, DCC issued a consultation on amendments of a first tranche of SEC Subsidiary Documents (SSDs) that, in conjunction with amendments to the main sections of the SEC, will define the User impacting elements of DCC's SMETS1 Services. The findings and conclusions of this consultation were shared with industry at the TBDG Enrolment and Adoption (TBDG) Sub-Group in February 2018, and they were added to the design baseline. Since this baselined version there have been various changes that have been made to:

- DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS);
- Message Mapping Catalogue (MMC);
- Service Request Processing Document (SRPD); and
- SMETS1 Supporting Requirements (S1SR)

This RFC covers further proposed changes to the baselined version of S1SR.

The amendments that are being proposed to the baselined version of S1SR are primarily to accommodate further device specific behaviours that have been identified in respect of the IOC cohort. These result from the device issues resolution process which included discussions in respect of device specific behaviours with industry, service providers and manufacturers. These changes are set out in the S1SR Version 0013 Release Notes.



<p>2.3 Options Summary</p>	<p>We are consulting for a three-week period from 13 February 2019 and are seeking views by 06 March 2019. Subject to stakeholder views on the proposed changes, DCC will request at the TBDG sub-group in March 2019 that the updated version of the S1SR is added to the Release 3 design baseline so additional certainty in these elements of the design may be provided, before re-designating these documents at the appropriate point in time as determined by the Secretary of State, pursuant Condition 22 of the DCC Licence and Section X5 of the SEC.</p>
<p>2.4 Recommended Option</p>	<p>Our recommended option is that the updated version of the S1SR is added to the Release 3 design baseline.</p>
<p>2.5 Summary Impact Assessment of Recommended Option</p>	<p>The amendments that are being proposed to the baselined version of S1SR are primarily to accommodate further device specific behaviours that have been identified in respect of the IOC cohort. Updating the baselined version will provide certainty for industry on device specific behaviours</p>
<p>2.6 Summary Impact Assessment of not adopting change</p>	<p>Failure to update the baselined version will result in uncertainty for suppliers on device specific behaviours.</p>
<p>2.7 Other Recommended Next Steps (Optional)</p>	<p>TBC</p>

Section 3: Individual Impact Assessments by other SMIP Parties (if required)

3.1 SMIP Party carrying out Impact Assessment	
3.2 Summary Impact Assessment	

Section 4: Summary of Impact Assessments

<p>4.1 List of SMIP Parties who completed Impact Assessments</p>	<p>E.On SSE EDF CGI</p>
<p>4.2 Summary Impact Assessment</p>	<p>This change request invited views from stakeholders on the proposed amendments to the baselined version of the S1SR. The consultation ran from 13 February 2019 to 6 March 2019, posing two questions. There were four responses from industry who provided some valuable feedback on the proposed changes.</p> <p>We have changed references to MMC to Message Mapping Catalogue as MMC is not a defined term in the SEC</p> <p>There was a query whether it was a strict requirement to complete the items contained in Clause 13.1 prior to migration as well as a query as to what could lead to a delay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have added further clarity in the S1SR. <p>There were several comments relating to the changes that are being made that relate to Threshold Anomaly Detection. Concerns were raised that the section is largely incomplete as follows:</p> <p>It does not cover any other Threshold Anomaly Detection conducted in DSP on SMETS1 Service Requests</p> <p>It does not cover any Threshold Anomaly Detection conducted in S1SP on SMETS1 Service Requests</p> <p>It does not cover any Threshold Anomaly Detection conducted in S1SP on SMETS1 Instructions</p> <p>It does not cover Attribute Anomaly Detection conducted in any of the relevant Service Providers (DSP, S1SP and DCO) on SMETS1 Service requests and on SMETS1 instructions.</p> <p>It does not cover any mechanism in DCO to check SMETS1 instructions against the original SMETS1 Service request (equivalent to correlation in SMETS2)</p> <p>It does not cover any mechanism in S1SP to check that the “signed” SMETS1 instruction returned by the DCO corresponds to the original “unsigned” instruction generated by the S1SP.</p> <p>There were further concerns raised about the Threshold Anomaly Detection, with clarity being sought on the manner in which this will operate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are of the opinion that the section is complete as thresholds set by users are shared across SMETS1 and SMETS2 and that there is no need to specify the points that are raised. Threshold Anomaly Detection will apply to all service requests whether they are related to migration or in live operation of SMETS1 meters. Where DCC as commissioning party commissions devices as part of migration, it will set anomaly detection thresholds for those commissioning requests. The Threshold Anomaly Detection will be carried out by the DSP. This will not impact suppliers other than that they will have to adjust their forecasts in line with the additional devices that have been migrated. <p>For SMETS1, the Attribute Anomaly Detection will be carried out by the DCO and S1SP which is different to SMETS2 where it is carried out by the DSP. The requirement for S1SPs to carry out these checks exists in SRPD, whereas the S1SR deals with DCO requirements.</p>



	<p>There was a query about the clarity of the wording of following line at 22.2: “Where the check fails due to a corresponding value in a SMETS1 Service Request”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have amended the wording to clarify that this Clause relates only to Threshold Anomaly Detection. <p>There was a comment that Section 22.1 refers to the DCO sending instructions to a SMETS1 device and that this is not exact as it sends this instruction back to the S1SP, with a comment that this was not correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agree and have amended the wording accordingly. <p>There was a query which sought clarity around the form that the incident in 22.4 would take seeking details of the reason code for the failure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would form part of an incident in the Service Management System. Accordingly, the reason for the failure would be captured as part of it, but the code is not specifically set out in the S1SR. <p>There was a request for more clarity on the mechanism by which the S1SP will synchronise the time on a SMETS1 Device.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have clarified the trigger for the S1SP to synchronise the time and the parameters within which synchronisation occurs in Section 21.
<p>4.3 Initial Recommendation (Optional)</p>	<p>Having considered the stakeholder comments in response to this consultation, we recommend that the baselined version of the S1SR is updated to include these changes</p>



Section 5: Decision Making

5.1 Record of IMF/TBDG/TSEG/TPMAG/Regulatory Group Review	
5.1.1 Further Analysis Required	
5.1.2 Consensus Reached	
5.1.3 Record of BEIS (Chairperson) decision	
5.1.4 Record of escalation choice made – route and date	
5.2 Record of SMDG Review (if required)	
5.2.1 Consensus Reached	
5.2.2 Record of BEIS (Chairperson) decision	
5.2.3 Record of escalation choice made – route and date	
5.3 Record of SMSG Review (if required)	
5.3.1 Consensus Reached	
5.3.2 Record of BEIS (Chairperson) decision	
5.3.3 Record of escalation date	
5.4 Record of BEIS Decision (if required)	
5.4.1 Record of decision made	

Section 6: Implementation

Implementation Actions	
-----------------------------------	--