Consultation

Consultation on Sharing Supplier Party Data with Meter Manufacturers and Meter Asset Providers

Table of Contents

1.   Introduction

The purpose of this consultation is to invite views on proposals to share installation data owned by Energy Suppliers with Other SEC Parties, specifically Device Manufacturers and Meter Asset Providers (MAPs), where that data relates specifically and only to the Other SEC Party in question.

1.1. Background

In working with Device Manufacturers and MAPs, the Smart DCC Limited (DCC) has discussed the potential of sharing Supplier Party data specific to these Other SEC Parties.

Currently, the following information is shared with industry:

Information	Detail
Central Product List (CPL)	This is a list of Certified Product Assurance (CPA) approved devices by National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) and includes firmware versions of devices. It is available on the SEC Website
Deployed Product List (DPL)	This is a list of device models and vendors deployed in production. It is available on the SEC Website.
Industry wide level installation data	This information is available on the DCC Website and includes: • Total SMETS2 meters on the network. • Number of messages sent across the network in a month. • Increase in SMETS2 installs. • Total SMETS1 meters migrated.
Zigbee, DLMS certified products	These are lists of certified products to the Zigbee and DLMS standards and can be accessed on the respective protocol web pages.
DCC User defects effecting a specific manufacturer	To enable triage, fixes and communication, DCC shares information to specific manufacturers in relation to defects. However, manufacturer defects in their internal test and validation functions cannot be shared with suppliers as this could have commercial impacts.

In order to support and build operational relationships with Device Manufacturers and improve cross industry working, DCC set up a framework; Technical Account Management (TAM). The TAM framework operates by DCC delivering three account management packs to each Device Manufacturer per year followed by bilateral meetings to run through the packs' contents. The pack provides updates on operational and strategic topics relating to Device Manufacturers, for example:

• Communication Hub Update: firmware, hardware, issues status and rollout

• Testing Assurance and test opportunities update

• Programme Update: Enduring Change of Supplier

- Problem and incident records

- Bespoke data: variety of production rollout data

- Legal Update and application of NDA for strategic/commercially sensitive discussions

- Product development plans of new and existing products to be deployed in the DCC's Smart Metering ecosystem.

DCC has also be working with MAPs, particularly the Community of Meter Asset Providers (CMAP), to identify ways in which it can improve engagement and services to facilitate improved collaboration and cross industry working.

Through TAM and engagement with CMAP, DCC and Other SEC Parties have identified the benefit of confidentially sharing Supplier Party Data specific to manufacturers and MAPs.

DCC notes that this information is Confidential Information[1] and owned by the Energy Suppliers and is therefore seeking views on whether it should be shared with Device Manufacturers and MAPs. SEC Section M4 "Confidentiality" states that DCC shall not disclose another SEC Parties Confidential Information to any person. However, it also notes that these restrictions shall not apply where an instruction is made or given in accordance with the Authority's prior written consent or where explicitly allowed under other SEC requirements.

DCC propose that bespoke supplier data is shared with the Other SEC Party that the data relates to:

1. No manufacture/MAP will receive data that is related to another manufacture/MAP.

2. No manufacture/MAP will receive Supplier Party data that is not related directly to their product i.e. ESME/GSME/IHD/PPMID etc.

1.2. Structure of this document

This document comprises of the following sections:

- DCC's proposal.

- Summary of questions asked in this consultation.

- Consultation Process.

- Next steps.

2. DCC's Proposal

2.1. Bespoke Supplier Data

---

[1] means, in respect of a Party other than DCC, the Data belonging or relating to that Party or that otherwise becomes available to the DCC as a result (whether directly or indirectly) of that Party being a party to this Code. (SEC Section A)

The below table sets out the proposed bespoke data to be shared with Other SEC Parties:

Information	Parties	Detail
SMETS1 Migrations	Device Manufacturers MAPs	For each party how many and which of their SMETS1 Devices have been migrated, by which suppliers and in which Region (South, Central or North). Identify Device Type, Manufacturer, Model (hardware) and Firmware versions for devices and current Device status (Commissioned/ Decommissioned etc.) for any Devices migrated into DCC Systems and current Responsible Supplier and Effective From Date
SMETS2 Installations	Device Manufacturers MAPs	For each party how many and which of their SMETS2 Devices are in DCC Systems by which supplier and in which Region (South, Central or North). Identify Device Type, Manufacturer, Model (hardware) and Firmware versions for Devices and current Device status (Commissioned/ Decommissioned/Suspended etc.) for any Devices installed in DCC Systems and Identification of current Responsible Supplier and Effective From Date.
SMETS1 and SMETS2 Additional Information	Device Manufacturers MAPs	For each party broken down by Device Model and Firmware version, Region and attached Comms Hub and Firmware version: • Read performance (success/failure) • Common/Top Alerts and alarms • Top failure – by failing Service Request • OTA success rate • Non-communicating Devices.

Q1: Do you agree that the proposed bespoke Supplier Party data should be shared with Device Manufacturers and MAPs? Please provide rationale for your views.

Q2: Do you consider there to be any additional bespoke Supplier Party data that could be shared with Device Manufacturers or MAPs? Please provide rationale for your views.

2.2. Method of Sharing Bespoke Supplier Data

DCC notes that in accordance with the SEC and DCC Licence, DCC is not able to disclose Confidential Information and cannot restrict, prevent or distort competition.

With this in mind, DCC propose that bespoke supplier data is only shared with the Other SEC Party that the data relates to. Therefore:

3. No manufacture/MAP will receive data that is related to another manufacture/MAP.

4. No manufacture/MAP will receive Supplier Party data that is not related directly to their product i.e. ESME/GSME/IHD/PPMID etc.

DCC also proposes that prior to sharing such information with Other SEC Parties, Non-Disclosure Agreements are required to ensure the confidential information is not passed on to other organisations.

With regards to how the data could be shared with Other SEC Parties, DCC proposes using a secure storage system such as SharePoint. DCC will then be able to manage permissions and access to the data provided.

DCC also proposes that this data should be provided on a pre-defined frequency. DCC considers that providing data on a monthly basis is sufficient but would welcome stakeholder views.

> **Q3: Do you consider there to be any additional mitigations/methods in sharing bespoke Supplier Party Data? Do you support the proposed frequency for data sharing? Please provide rationale for your views.**

2.1. Benefits of Sharing Bespoke Supplier Data

The below table sets out the benefits identified by DCC and its stakeholders.

Benefit	Who	How
Proactive Issue Management	• All DCC Users • DCC • BEIS • Device Manufacturer	Currently manufacturers/MAPs are generally only able to access detailed data on meters when they remain with the installing supplier with which the manufacturer/MAP have a contractual relationship. Once a meter churns to a supplier the manufacturer/MAP may lose access to that data. If manufacturers/MAPS are aware of which devices are operated by which supplier, as well as which region they are installed they can proactively approach suppliers and make them aware of common issues if they choose to. The geographical data would also be beneficial for relationship building between Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and manufacturers on issue related to power and alerts.
Procurement	• MAP's • All DCC User • DCC • Device Manufacturer	If manufacturers/MAPs are aware of which devices are operated by which supplier, it can enable the manufacturer/MAPs to provide direct updates on changes of procurement and general communication links can be improved.

Benefit	Who	How
Manufacturing Issues	• MAP's • All DCC Users • DCC • Device Manufacturer	Faults found post, during manufacturer or a change to manufacturing need to be communicated to the correct parties by manufacturers. Furthermore, manufacturers that pick up on hardware issues related to power alerts post manufacturing have no process of making DNO aware of the issue. Geographical data sharing will help to resolve this issue. DNO's and Gas Transporters can also be approached by manufacturers and kept up to date on issues or changes by the manufacturer.
Reduced DCC Triage	• All DCC users • DCC • Device Manufacturer • MAPs	Proactive approaches from manufacturers/MAPs with this data would reduce the complexity and workload DCC progresses on problems and issues in test and production, including triage efforts. This mean Root Cause Analysis may be completed more efficiently and in quicker timescales.
Working Relationships	• All DCC users • DCC • Device Manufacturer • MAPs	General benefit is that the bespoke data would build trust with manufacturers/MAPs and improve their access to their product data.

Q4: Do you consider there to be any additional benefits in sharing bespoke Supplier Party data? Please provide rationale for your views.

3. Summary of Consultation Questions

Number	Consultation Questions
Q1	Do you agree that the proposed bespoke Supplier Party data should be shared with Device Manufacturers and MAPs? Please provide rationale for your views.
Q2	Do you consider there to be any additional bespoke Supplier Party data that could be shared with Device Manufacturers or MAPs? Please provide rationale for your views.
Q3	Do you consider there to be any additional mitigations/methods in sharing bespoke Supplier Party Data? Do you support the proposed frequency for data sharing? Please provide rationale for your views.
Q4	Do you consider there to be any additional benefits in sharing bespoke Supplier Party data? Please provide rationale for your views.

4. Consultation Process

This consultation closes at 17:00 on Friday 29 January 2021. Please email your response to consultations@smartdcc.co.uk.

Contents of responses may be (where not marked confidential) shared with other stakeholders. Please state whether all or any part of your response is confidential. Please note that responses in their entirety (including any text marked confidential) will be shared with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and may be made available to the Gas and Electricity Markets Authority (the Authority).

If you have any questions in relation to this consultation, please contact regulation@smartdcc.co.uk.

5. Next Steps

Following the closure of this consultation, DCC will consider respondent's views and, subject to the consultation responses received, present these to Ofgem for its consideration.

DCC notes that following engagement with Ofgem, it may be necessary to raise a SEC Modification Proposal to implement this proposal.