

SMETS1 Conclusions on S1SR and UISS Changes for FOC

DCC Conclusions and Report to Secretary of State on
changes to the DCC User Interface Services Schedule
(UISS) and the SMETS 1 Supporting Requirements (S1SR)
to support the FOC Cohort.

Date: 17 December 2020

Author: consultations@smartdcc.co.uk

Classification: DCC Public

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Context	4
2. Stakeholder Engagement.....	4
2.1. S1SR & UISS Consultation (21 October 2020).....	5
2.2. S1SR Consultation (16 November 2020)	5
3. Consultation Questions & Responses	5
3.1. Questions	5
3.2. Responses	6
4. Analysis of Responses.....	6
4.1. S1SR Changes for FOC (S1SR Q1 - 21 October 2020)	6
4.1.1. Respondent View.....	6
4.1.2. Areas of Disagreement	10
4.2. DMVES Changes for S1SR (S1SR Q2 - 21 October 2020)	10
4.2.1. Respondent View.....	10
4.2.2. Areas of Disagreement	11
4.3. UISS Alignment Changes (S1SR Q3 - 21 October 2020).....	11
4.3.1. Respondent View.....	11
4.3.2. Areas of Disagreement	11
4.4. UISS and S1SR Regulatory Change Date (S1SR Q4 - 21 October 2020)	11
4.4.1. Respondent View.....	11
4.4.2. Areas of Disagreement	12
4.5. Device Specific Behaviours (S1SR Q1 - 16 November 2020)	12
4.5.1. Respondent View.....	12
4.5.2. Areas of Disagreement	12
4.6. DMVES (S1SR Q2 16 November 2020)	12
4.6.1. Respondent View.....	13
4.6.2. Areas of Disagreement	13
5. Summary of Drafting Changes	13
6. Conclusions.....	14
7. Next Steps	15

8. Attachments15

1. Introduction and Context

The SMETS 1 Supporting Requirements (S1SR) describes supplementary rules for how the DCC will process SMETS1 Service Requests / Service Reference Variants (SRs / SRVs) and includes the accommodation of behaviours that are specific to particular SMETS1 Device Models. The DCC User Interface Services Schedule (UISS) covers matters related to target response times for SRVs. These documents are included in the Smart Energy Code¹ (SEC) as appendices:

- UISS is Appendix E and the latest version (4.0) was included in the SEC on 27 November 2020;
- S1SR is Appendix AM and the latest version (6.0) was included in the SEC on 04 December 2020.

DCC issued two separate consultations regarding FOC as follows:

- 21 October 2020 – UISS and S1SR - <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/customer-hub/consultations/consultation-on-changes-to-the-smets1-supporting-requirements-document-and-uiss-for-foc/>; and
- 16 November 2020 – S1SR – <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/customer-hub/consultations/consultation-on-further-changes-to-the-smets1-supporting-requirements-document-for-foc/>.

This document considers responses to both consultations consistent with the regulatory requirements for revising the UISS and S1SR.

2. Stakeholder Engagement

This section details DCC's stakeholder engagement that has taken place in relation to the proposed revisions to the UISS and S1SR, with a separate subsection for each consultation.

Stakeholders were invited to respond to the consultation issued on 21 October 2020 by 16:00 on Friday 6 November 2020 using the response template that was provided.

Stakeholders were invited to respond to the consultation issued on 16 November 2020 by 16:00 on Friday 27 November 2020 using the response template that was provided.

These changes to the S1SR have been discussed with the Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG) E&A subgroup.

On 26 November 2020, DCC held an industry session during which the proposed changes in the changes proposed in the consultation of 16 November 2020 as well as the proposed changes in the TMAD consultations were presented.

¹ <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/the-smart-energy-code-2/>.

2.1. S1SR & UISS Consultation (21 October 2020)

On 21 October 2020, DCC published the consultation document titled '[S1SR UISS Consultation for FOC](#)' on the DCC Website and DCC's Service Desk also emailed stakeholders to notify them of its publication.

The scope of the consultation covered the following matters:

- [SEC Appendix E - DCC User Interface Service Schedule v4.1.doc](#);
- [SEC Appendix AM SMETS1 Supporting Requirements v5.1 redline](#);
- [SEC Appendix AM SMETS1 Supporting Requirements v5.1 redline clean](#);
- [S1SR SEC Annex AM51 ANNEX A DMVES](#);
- draft text and proposed timescale for the Secretary of State's direction for the re-designation of the TMAD.

2.2. S1SR Consultation (16 November 2020)

On 16 November 2020, DCC published the consultation document titled '[Further S1SR Consultation for FOC](#)' on the DCC Website and DCC's Service Desk also emailed stakeholders to notify them of its publication.

The scope of the consultation covered the following matters:

- [SEC Appendix AM SMETS1 Supporting Requirements v5.1.3](#)
- [S1SR AM513 ANNEX A DMVES](#)

3. Consultation Questions & Responses

3.1. Questions

The respective consultation templates ([SMETS1 S1SR response template FOC](#) and [SMETS1 S1SR response template FOC](#)) presented the following consultation questions as set out in Table 1.

Consultation	Number	Question
S1SR & UISS (21 October 2020)	S1SR Q1	Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements Document (S1SR) in Section 18 of that document, that have been added to describe the device behaviours specific to the FOC devices?
S1SR & UISS (21 October 2020)	S1SR Q2	Do you agree with mappings of clauses in Section 18 of S1SR to the relevant Device Models in DMVES?
S1SR & UISS (21 October 2020)	S1SR Q3	Do you agree with the proposed changes to SEC Appendix E – DCC User Interface Services Schedule?

Consultation	Number	Question
S1SR & UISS (21 October 2020)	S1SR Q4	Do you agree with the proposed re-designation date of 13 December 2020 (or, if necessary, as soon as reasonably practicable within one month thereafter) for the updates to the S1SR using draft notification at Attachment 1?
S1SR (16 November 2020)	S1SR Q1	Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements Document (S1SR) in Section 18 of that document, that have been added to describe the device behaviours specific to the FOC devices?
S1SR (16 November 2020)	S1SR Q2	Do you agree with mappings of clauses in Section 18 of S1SR to the relevant Device Models in DMVES?

Table 1 – Consultation Questions

3.2. Responses

DCC received a written response from five respondents to the 21 October 2020 consultation on the UISS and S1SR.

DCC received a written response from six respondents to the 16 November 2020 consultation on the UISS and S1SR.

There were three respondents that replied to both consultations.

DCC provided all written responses to the Secretary of State once the consultations had closed.

4. Analysis of Responses

DCC has analysed the feedback provided and views of stakeholders. Subject matter experts within DCC have reviewed every response. Where appropriate, DCC has engaged with respondents to discuss major areas of disagreement to understand if an agreement may be reached.

DCC has structured the analysis of responses by question. Thus, this section presents DCC's analysis by question in several separate subsections; with each structured as:

- an overview of the responses on the topic; and
- areas where DCC disagrees with the view presented by respondents, as the regulation requirements require DCC to report on this.

4.1. S1SR Changes for FOC (S1SR Q1 - 21 October 2020)

DCC sought views on proposals to amend the S1SR for FOC asking ***“Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements Document (S1SR) in Section 18 of that document, that have been added to describe the device behaviours specific to the FOC devices?”***.

4.1.1. Respondent View

Five respondents provided a response to this question.

DCC received detailed technical responses to the consultation questions and consider it appropriate to answer each technical question. Accordingly, DCC consider that providing a table containing the responses and DCC's reply is an appropriate manner in which to respond to the queries. The detailed responses to the consultation and the DCC reply is set out in the table below.

Num	Response	DCC Reply
S1SR Q1	A respondent indicated that they required additional time to assess the impact of the proposed changes.	DCC notes these concerns.
S1SR Q1	A respondent considered that the wording of Clauses 18.1(p) and (q) are not consistent with the rest of the S1SR document.	DCC is of the view that the wording clearly reflects the behaviour of the devices.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that Clauses 18.1(o) and (s) say the same thing but are worded slightly different.	DCC acknowledges the respondent and has amended the drafting accordingly.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that Clause 18.1(t), only refers to ESME devices and the configuration of tariff and non-disablement settings. The respondent sought clarification on the corresponding GSME device behaviour within this specific clause.	DCC is not aware of any such behaviour that affects the GSME in respect of this service request.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that the drafting of clause 18.3(f) makes no reference to any Meter Balance upper limit on the corresponding SMETS1 ESME in an installation, which is different to other 18.3 sub-clauses. The respondent sought confirmation of the ESME Meter Balance upper limit.	DCC is not aware of any such behaviour that affects the ESME in respect of this service request.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought to understand whether Clause 18.4(t)(i) impacted the passive or active Emergency Credit Limit.	<p>For ESME, the value of the EC Balance that is doubled is based on the passive value in the meter which is not currently written-to by the S1SP.</p> <p>Please see new clause for ESME 18.4(v). DCC will consider revisions to this behaviour in a future release of the S1SR.</p>
S1SR Q1	<p>A respondent sought clarification on the following two points relating to Clause 18.4(t):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the activation of emergency credit mentioned in this clause provides 2 x the Emergency Credit Limit (ECL) available to the Customer, but that the Activate Emergency Credit mentioned in the next sentence (starting "For clarity...") is different and refers, not to the meter behaviour on mode change to Prepayment but in response to SR 2.5. What the value of the ECL would be in the response if SRV4.13 was sent immediately after mode a change to Prepayment, and after Activate Emergency Credit.? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> DCC can confirm that the behaviour of the device is to automatically activate Emergency Credit (EC) with 2 x the ECL when the meter is put into prepay mode, and that when EC is activated using the Activate Emergency Credit command then 1 x EC is available to the consumer. For GSME the ECL would be set to the EC Balance which would normally be twice the ECL set by the Supplier.

		<p>For ESME, the device has a default value which is doubled, irrespective of what the supplier has specified in the SRV 2.1.</p> <p>The DCC has added a new clause to S1SR to clarify the ESME behaviour.</p>
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought clarification whether 18.5(cc) means that the L&G ESME only operates in GMT for Non-Disablement Periods?	The behaviour of the end-to-end system is as stated in the clause.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted the changes to 18.1(w) and 18.5(cc) but noted further that other ESME devices in IOC also operate as described and that those meters should also be mapped to this clause.	Noted, and the DCC will investigate, but is not something on which DCC currently have evidence.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that Clauses 18.3(g) and 18.6(a) were documented for ESME but that it should apply to the GSME as well.	DCC has adjusted the drafting accordingly.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought clarification on why there is a reference to activating the emergency credit under Clause 18.4 SRV 1.6 and not under SRV 2.5?	The behaviour of the device is to automatically activate EC with 2 x the ECL when the meter is put into prepay mode, and that when EC is activated using the Activate Emergency Credit command then 1 x EC is available to the consumer.
S1SR Q1	A respondent queried why Clause 17.12 had been overridden compared to all of section 17 being generally covered by this provision.	Clause 17.12 is overridden as the behaviour for specific devices in Clause 18.4 contradict this clause. This is generally not the case.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that for Clauses 18.5(x), 18.5(y) and 18.5(z), the text only refers to ESME devices and the configuration of tariff and non-disablement settings. The respondent sought clarification on whether the corresponding GSME device behaviour falls within these specific clauses.	DCC is not aware of any such behaviour that affects the GSME in respect of this service requests.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that the drafting of Clause 18.6 makes no reference to the treatment of credit top-ups by the target SMETS1 GSME in an applicable installation as part of the SRV2.2 processing. The respondent sought clarification on the corresponding GSME device behaviour within this specific clause.	DCC has amended the drafting to apply the clause to ESME and GSME.
S1SR Q1	Respondents noted a drafting error between 18.7(i) and (j), to 18.1(s), 18.1(v).	Accepted, S1SR and DMVES will be amended accordingly.
S1SR Q1	A respondent was of the view that 18.7(m) is the incorrect clause to reference DebtRecoveryRateCap as this is not set as part of SRV2.3 and that it should instead be Section 18.5 Update Prepayment Configuration (SRV2.1) instead.	Whilst it is not part of the SRV, the device does require it to action this service request. Hence the default value.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought clarification from DCC as to whether it was an error that in Clause 18.7(m) the DebtRecoveryRateCap does not appear to be a parameter for SRV2.3.	Whilst it is not part of the SRV, the device does require this value in order to action this service request, hence the default value.

S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that for 18.7(n) the ESME meter manufacturer documentation confirms that scalar -4 to 0 are supported and not just -5 and that as a consequence, these scalars should also be supported by the DCC solution.	DCC accepts that the point raised is valid and has therefore removed this clause. DCC has removed clause 18.7 (n).
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought confirmation that Clause 18.9(c) will be a priority for a fix as it contravenes GDPR on previous tenant data.	The DCC has now addressed this issue and therefore 18.9(c) has been removed from the S1SR.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that the change to Clause 18.10 will cause difficulties when the log is cleared upon change of tenant.	DCC notes the response.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought clarification of which additional log entries could be included for Clause 18.17(f).	Clause 18.42(g) of the S1SR describes when this occurs.
S1SR Q1	A respondent queried whether Clause 18.18(c) should identify the impact directly rather than refer to Clause 18.17(e).	The approach taken is to avoid duplication where possible and the risk that errors may accordingly be introduced.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought clarification on which additional log entries could be included for Clause 18.18(d).	As per S1SR, Clause 18.42(g) describes when this occurs.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought confirmation as to whether the Daily Read Log in 18.21(c) obtained from the GSME contained the register readings or the consumption for the day, as the meter manufacturer documentation refers to the "Daily Read Log" as containing the consumption for the day (SR 4.17) and not the register reading required for SRV 4.6.1.	DCC can confirm that the response to an SRV 4.6.1 does not contain consumption values for the day but does contain register readings.
S1SR Q1	A respondent queried whether Clause 18.21(d) should identify the impact directly rather than refer to Clause 18.17(e).	The approach taken is to avoid duplication where possible and the risk that errors may accordingly be introduced.
S1SR Q1	A respondent noted that Clauses 18.22, 18.23 and 18.24 signal a delay in the return log entries requested through the specific SRVs. The respondent requested that DCC consider whether separating the delivery of GSME and ESME data would be possible and practical.	Following the approach set out by the respondent would require a firmware upgrade to devices.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought clarification that Clauses 18.22 (4.8.1 active) applies to all devices and that 18.23 (4.8.2 reactive) only impacts the ESME.	DCC confirms that, 18.23 only applies to the ESME as there is no concept of Reactive Power in relation to the supply of gas.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought to understand the changes proposed in 18.22(b), 18.23(a) and 18.24(a) to meet the 24 hour SLA consulted on in UISS) where the L&G ESME response to scheduled 4.8.1, 4.8.2, and 4.8.3 read requests may be in excess of 28½ hours?	UISS documents the timing of responses to Service Requests while the S1SR describes the availability of data to the S1SP.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought confirmation from DCC that any DSP scheduled requests for the SRV 4.8.x that are subject to delay will be processed after the delay window has completed.	DCC can confirm that the DSP waits until 5am before starting to process any scheduled service requests.

S1SR Q1	<p>A respondent set out the following:</p> <p>“During BST, in the current SMSO, the respondent receives the HH profile log up to 23:00 UTC yesterday in the “push window” today</p> <p>During GMT, in the current SMSO, the respondent receives the HH profile log up to 00:00 UTC today in the “push window” today”</p> <p>The respondent sought confirmation that the same log entries will be available using SRV 4.8.1 today.</p> <p>SR 4.8.1 today = up to 23:00 UTC “yesterday” during BST</p> <p>SR 4.8.1 today = up to 00:00 UTC “today” during GMT</p>	The DCC can confirm that the same Log Entries will be available.
S1SR Q1	A respondent considered that the maximum delay for both BST and GMT should be 28.5 hours.	DCC agrees and has amended the, drafting accordingly to align the timings.
S1SR Q1	A respondent queried whether the requirement set out in 18.27(o) should be included in Annex 19 of the DCC User Gateway Interface Design Specification?	Changes to DUGIDS are outside the scope of this consultation. However, DCC will consider whether further clarification is required.
S1SR Q1	A respondent considered that instead of a failure response, as set out in Clauses 17.32 and 18.35(a), either the data should be removed from the response or the SMETS1 Unsupported Value should be in the response.	18.35(b) and 17.32 describe a different circumstance and therefore 18.35(b) accurately describes the behavior.
S1SR Q1	For clause 18.37(e), a respondent requested the default values used by the ESME for LoadLimitPeriod and LoadLimitRestorationPeriod.	As per clause 17.33 this clause is a duplicate and has therefore been removed.
S1SR Q1	A respondent sought to understand whether Clause 18.62(f) means that a replacement PPMID cannot be installed and operated for Customers with enrolled SMETS1 L&G meters / CHs.	This limitation is only present for FOC release 1 and the DCC is planning on making this functionality available for a future FOC release.

4.1.2. Areas of Disagreement

Within the scope of the proposal, there were no areas of disagreement.

4.2. DMVES Changes for S1SR (S1SR Q2 - 21 October 2020)

DCC sought views on proposals to amend the DMVES asking “**Do you agree with mappings of clauses in Section 18 of S1SR to the relevant Device Models in DMVES?**”.

4.2.1. Respondent View

Four respondents provided a response to this question.

One of the respondents combined their comments to questions one and two together, these comments have been addressed in the response to question one above.

Two respondents broadly agreed with the mappings.

One respondent identified a number of typographical errors which DCC has reviewed and amended.

4.2.2. Areas of Disagreement

Within the scope of the proposal, there were no areas of disagreement.

4.3. UISS Alignment Changes (S1SR Q3 - 21 October 2020)

DCC sought views on proposals to amend the UISS to align target response times for SMETS1 and SMETS2 asking ***“Do you agree with the proposed changes to SEC Appendix E – DCC User Interface Services Schedule?”***.

4.3.1. Respondent View

Four respondents provided a response to this question.

One respondent expressed explicit support for the amendment to the UISS without further comment. One respondent indicated they had no objections to the amendments to the UISS.

One respondent expressed explicit support for the amendment to the UISS and sought clarity on how DCC will be able to meet these Target Response Times for FOC given the BST delays described within the S1SR changes. DCC wishes to point out that UISS documents the timing of responses to Service Requests. Whereas the S1SR is describing the availability of data to the S1SP, which are two different things.

One respondent expressed the view that there was a cross-referencing error in Service Reference 7.13. DCC acknowledges that this issue was present in the consulted on version of the S1SR. This reference has been removed in the current designated version. When this version is designated, the only change that will be included to the UISS will be the reference in Section 3 that was consulted on.

4.3.2. Areas of Disagreement

Within the scope of the proposal, there were no areas of disagreement.

4.4. UISS and S1SR Regulatory Change Date (S1SR Q4 - 21 October 2020)

DCC sought views on the planned date for the Secretary of State re-designating the UISS and S1SR asking ***“Do you agree with the proposed re-designation date of 13 December 2020 (or, if necessary, as soon as reasonably practicable within one month thereafter) for the updates to the S1SR using draft notification at Attachment 1?”***.

4.4.1. Respondent View

Four respondents provided a response to this question.

Four respondents expressed explicit support for the proposed schedule for amending the UISS and S1SR. DCC is accordingly of the view that there is support for designating the UISS in line with the proposed dates.

One respondent indicated that it is important DCC ensures sufficient consideration of the responses prior to concluding. DCC notes the view expressed and confirms that appropriate internal review of all responses received has been performed.

Due to the change in the date that the FOC cohort will go live, it will not be possible to designate the S1SR in line with these proposed dates. DCC will consult on a new date for designation.

4.4.2. Areas of Disagreement

There were no areas of disagreement.

4.5. Device Specific Behaviours (S1SR Q1 - 16 November 2020)

DCC sought views on the additional Device Specific Behaviours for FOC asking "***Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the SMETS1 Supporting Requirements Document (S1SR) in Section 18 of that document, that have been added to describe the device behaviours specific to the FOC devices?***".

4.5.1. Respondent View

Six respondents provided a response to this question.

Four of the respondents expressed general support for the proposed changes, with one of the respondents emphasising the need for DCC to provide an enduring solution. DCC would like to emphasise that it is looking to resolve this issue as soon as possible.

One of the respondents that expressed support sought clarity on whether the affected FOC meters that do not allow Profile Consumption and Export data to be retrieved will be addressed in future. A second respondent raised its concern that the issue with the ability to retrieve profile data should be solved as soon as possible. DCC can confirm that it is looking to address this issue as a priority in further releases.

A respondent raised concerns relating to the impact of the late changes and the defects that were being identified in testing. The respondent further sought clarity on the scope of FOC release 1 as they were of the opinion that little information has been provided in this regard. The respondent emphasised that the release should be rescheduled rather than rushing the delivery of a sub-optimal solution that is not fit for purpose.

DCC notes the concerns that have been raised. These concerns appear to be directed at the go-live for FOC and not the content of the consultation. DCC is subject to a rigorous governance process which culminates in a BEIS approval to go-live. Stakeholders have the right to raise these issues during this governance process and DCC is therefore of the opinion that these concerns will therefore not be considered as part of the conclusion of this consultation. DCC will only seek to go live with a solution that DCC is confident will meet DCC's objectives.

4.5.2. Areas of Disagreement

There were no areas of disagreement.

4.6. DMVES (S1SR Q2 16 November 2020)

DCC sought views on changes to the DMVES asking "***Do you agree with mappings of clauses in Section 18 of S1SR to the relevant Device Models in DMVES?***".

4.6.1. Respondent View

Six respondents provided a response to this question.

Four respondents agreed with the mappings with one respondent stating that it alleviated their concern that the changes would, potentially, impact other devices.

Two respondents raised a concern relating to Clause 18.22a. One specified that there is no mark against any Landis+Gyr device even though the drafting change is highlighted in this FOC S1SR consultation and additionally, while the legal text in the S1SR Clause 18.22a refers to "the target SMETS1 GSME or SMETS1 GPF", the only DMVES markers are for ESME devices.

DCC would like to reiterate that 18.22a is, an Aclara behaviour. The new FOC behaviour is documented in S1SR and DMVES as 18.22c. DCC is accordingly of the opinion that no changes are required as a result of this comment.

4.6.2. Areas of Disagreement

There were no areas of disagreement.

5. Summary of Drafting Changes

The consultation process gave rise to a limited number of drafting changes (compared to the consultation versions) which are detailed in this section.

There are a few minor drafting changes within the legal drafting to amend typographical errors and improve clarity. Additionally, an overview of key changes is presented in

7	18.7	Drafting now clarified to show that the debt recovery rules apply to GSME and ESME
8	18.22	Drafting now corrected to clarify the access to historic data before the Aclara GSME was migrated Drafting also clarified around the availability of a whole days worth of profile data
9	18.23 18.24	Drafting clarified around the availability of a full days worth of profile data
10	18.37	Duplicate drafting now removed
11	18.64	Correction of a typographical error

Table 2 below. Please note that the Clause references in

7	18.7	Drafting now clarified to show that the debt recovery rules apply to GSME and ESME
8	18.22	Drafting now corrected to clarify the access to historic data before the Aclara GSME was migrated Drafting also clarified around the availability of a whole days worth of profile data

9	18.23 18.24	Drafting clarified around the availability of a full days worth of profile data
10	18.37	Duplicate drafting now removed
11	18.64	Correction of a typographical error

Table 2 are based on conclusion versions attached to this document.

No.	Reference	Description and Rationale for Change
1	17.36	The reference in the clause has now been corrected.
2	18.1	There were a number of duplicate clauses that have now been corrected
3	18.3	Drafting now clarified to show that the debt recovery rules apply to GSME and ESME
4	18.4	Clarifications to the amount of emergency credit made available to the consumer when emergency credit is activated automatically when changing to prepayment mode
5	18.5	Clarifying that the same rules for seasons tariffs also apply to non-disconnect calendars
6	18.6	Drafting now clarified to show that the debt recovery rules apply to GSME and ESME
7	18.7	Drafting now clarified to show that the debt recovery rules apply to GSME and ESME
8	18.22	Drafting now corrected to clarify the access to historic data before the Aclara GSME was migrated Drafting also clarified around the availability of a whole days worth of profile data
9	18.23 18.24	Drafting clarified around the availability of a full days worth of profile data
10	18.37	Duplicate drafting now removed
11	18.64	Correction of a typographical error

Table 2 – Drafting Changes

6. Conclusions

DCC is of the opinion that it has had appropriate consultation with industry regarding these changes to the UISS and S1SR. The industry session on 26 November 2020 was well received with

one party expressing appreciation at the efforts of DCC to provide information to industry on the changes. None of the parties that were present at the call expressed any reservations about the proposed changes.

DCC has, where necessary, addressed the comments that have been received from industry and where appropriate has sought additional feedback from respondents. DCC does not believe that the views expressed result in fundamental amendments to the UISS and S1SR and as such further consultation is neither necessary nor appropriate.

It is DCC's view that it has met its SEC obligations.

The UISS and S1SR revisions are in line with the overall solution design for the SMETS1 Service and other relevant documents.

DCC considers that:

- the revised UISS and S1SR are defined to a sufficient level of detail for re-designation into the SEC;
- the revised UISS and S1SR provide an overarching framework which sets out clearly and unambiguously parties' rights and obligations which are consistent / and aligned with the rest of the SEC requirements in relation to SMETS1 Services; and
- the revised UISS and S1SR are materially complete, and the content is technically accurate.

In summary, DCC considers that the revised UISS and S1SR are fit for purpose.

7. Next Steps

As a result of issues that have been identified in User Testing, DCC will be consulting on a new version of the S1SR. DCC will align this consultation with the new plan for go live of the FOC cohort.

As a further consequence of the new plan to go live for the FOC cohort, DCC would like to note that it will be necessary to reconsult on the designation date which will align with this new plan. DCC will then submit the S1SR to the Secretary of State in line with the new dates.

DCC is submitting the UISS to the Secretary of State for designation into the SEC.

8. Attachments

Attachment	Title
1.	SEC Appendix AM SMETS1 Supporting Requirements-v6.1 clean
2.	SEC Appendix AM SMETS1 Supporting Requirements-v6.1 marked
3.	Appendix AM - Annex A - DMVES v6_1
4.	SEC Appendix E - DCC User Interface Services Schedule v4.1 clean

Attachment	Title
5.	SEC Appendix E - DCC User Interface Services Schedule v4.1 clean
6.	Draft Direction for designation of UISS

Table 3 – Attachments

Attachment 1

This attachment contains the text that BEIS plans to use for direction of changes to the UISS.

UISS Draft Direction Text

This direction is made for the purposes of the smart meter communication licences granted under the Electricity Act 1989 and the Gas Act 1986 (such licences being the "DCC Licence") and the Smart Energy Code designated by the Secretary of State pursuant to the DCC Licence (such code being the "SEC").

Words and expressions used in this direction shall be interpreted in accordance with Section A (Definitions and Interpretation) of the SEC.

Pursuant to Condition 22 of the DCC Licence and Section X5 (Incorporation of Certain Documents into this Code) of the SEC, the Secretary of State directs that, with effect from [DD MM YYYY], the DCC User Interface Services Schedule previously designated and incorporated into the SEC as Appendix E is hereby re-designated and incorporated in the form set out in Annex [XX] to this direction.

For the avoidance of doubt such re-designation of the DCC User Interface Services Schedule shall be without prejudice to anything done under the DCC Licence or the SEC on or after this document first being designated, or to the continuing effectiveness of anything done this document prior to its re-designation (which shall have effect as if done under the re-designated document).

This direction is also being notified to the SEC Administrator.