

DCC Sub-Group 1: Scope & Services Workstream

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Minutes of Meeting 1 of the SSSG | From Date and time of Meeting Location | Ofgem 10 September 2010, 10am Ofgem | 13 September 2010 |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|

1. Present

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Dora Guzeleva (DG, Chair) | OFGEM |
| Pau Castells | DECC |
| Rosie McGlynn | British Gas |
| Dave Crookes | EDF Energy |
| Neil Beckwith | ElectraLink Ltd |
| Chris Rowell | Elexon |
| Jon Spence | Elexon |
| Dave Shattock | ENA |
| Alex Travell | Eon-UK |
| Jeremy Guard | First Utility |
| Jill Ashby | Gemserv |
| Paul Edwards | GTC |
| Richard Street | ICoSS |
| Richard Moore | Ofcom |
| Alex Hurcombe | RWE Npower |
| Jamie Dunnett | Scottish Power |
| Martin Edwards | SSE |
| Mark Knight | SSE |
| Prashant Sharma | Utilita |
| Steve Nunnington | Xoserve |
| Jeff Studholme | AMO |
| Tom Chevalier | AMO |
| Simon Harrison | ERA |
| Alastair Manson | ERA |
| Richard Pomroy (am only) | ENA |
| Tim Newton (PM only) | Eon |
| Nick Slocombe (PM only) | EDF Energy |
| Steve Burns (PM only) | ENA |
| Alan Claxton (PM only) | ENA |
| Andy Evason (AE) | OFGEM |
| Colin Sawyer (CS) | OFGEM |

2. Apologies

2.1. No apologies received

3. Agenda Item 1: Introductions, Context and Workplan

CS presented slides summarising the terms of reference of this sub-group as amended by the DCG.

4. Agenda Items 2&3: 'Initial Scope' option

4.1. CS introduced the task for this meeting as being to define key features of the 'initial scope' option, the key principles of which were described in the Prospectus. The objective is to develop a set of options for which costs and benefits can then be estimated, covering DCC and all industry parties (including new entrants). Teamwork discussions were informed

by context diagrams provided by ScottishPower and overview presentations by Elexon and xoserve. It was noted that these were to be used as starting points for discussion and were only individual parties' views of the future industry model.

4.2. The meeting split into two teams for discussion on the 'initial scope' option.

Team 1 – Gas

4.3. In reviewing the 'as is' situation, the gas group indicated that Project Nexus has been launched by xoserve to consult with the gas industry on future IT investments, including the potential replacement of UK Link. An allowance was made in GDPCR1 for a like-for-like replacement to UK Link although the scope and timing of any such development has yet to be decided. The existing systems can continue to provide robust operations until well after 2013 and, accordingly, it should not be assumed that UK Link will have been replaced by the target Go Live date for DCC (i.e. late-2013). Decisions taken by the Smart Metering Programme in relation to registration will form an important input to the scoping work undertaken by Project Nexus.

4.4. The initial scope option should include the following assumptions for gas:

- In undertaking its authentication processes, DCC will be able to access supplier details from the GT Agent's registration system.
- CoS reads will be held by the GT's agent.
- Meter reads should be collected by DCC and forwarded to suppliers.
- When a meter is exchanged the new smart meter will 'self register': notification of this should be passed to the relevant industry parties.
- Meter validation: the SDG should consider whether UNC requirements for validation could be met by functions incorporated into the meter.
- To authorise service requests from suppliers and others, DCC will need to initiate messages to the GT Agent's register and to any separate registers maintained by IGTs. The form of messaging to be employed for this has yet to be decided.

Team 2 – Electricity

4.5. Specific assumptions / issues identified in discussion were as follows:

- All communications to/from the meter and/or premise should be via the DCC.
- The DCC may need to hold information about which suppliers / entities the customer has consented to have access to the customer's data and at what level of access. How this information will get to the DCC needs to be investigated.
- If agents such as the MAM require access to meter information when acting on behalf of a supplier, then DCC will need to know that the MAM or other agent is working on behalf of the relevant supplier in order to grant access to the meter data.
- The supplier will manage the meter configuration via the DCC.
- The MOP may or may not need access to meter configuration data for the meters it is operating / supporting. Further investigation of the implications of this is required.
- Agents may be sent information from meters directly by the DCC rather than the information being sent by the DCC to the supplier and from the supplier to the agent. Alternatively the DCC could be sufficiently flexible to allow suppliers that wish to retain existing data flows and agent / entity responsibilities/relationships to do so while allowing other suppliers to reconfigure/redesign their supply chains – for example by undertaking several roles themselves.

4.6. Changes needed to 'as-is' arrangements to accommodate the DCC initial scope of activities may include:

- Settlement process data flows may change.

- The DCC could send data as the data retriever or the DCC could send the data to the supplier which then sends the data as the DC.
- Prepayment processes and data flows may change significantly as new flows will be required: for example, to top-up credit balances.
- Identifying who will perform site / safety visits as the data retriever will no longer be visiting premises.
- Identifying process and data flows for installing, registering and maintaining communications units.

Note that the last three bullet points apply equally to electricity

5. Agenda Items 4&5: WAN Service Levels and Requirements

5.1. The meeting discussed the performance requirements of various services as described in the Services Catalogue of the Statement of Design Requirements.

5.2. With regards to meter reads:

- Recurring programmed reads should be received by DCC within 6 hrs of the programmed read;
- Ad hoc programmed reads (e.g. on change of tenancy, with read specified to take place at a certain time), message to be sent to the supplier within 3hrs of the scheduled read time;
- 'On demand' reads – information should be provided within 10s. The 10s is assumed to start from the time that the helpdesk agent requests the read, as such it includes the time for the message to go from the supplier to the DCC and on to the meter, and for the reading to be sent back to the supplier from the meter via the DCC. It is assumed that delays within the supplier's systems can be ignored – so the time is from the read request message getting to DCC and the read message being ready to send from the DCC.
- On demand reads are likely to peak at the start of the roll out programme.

5.3. Self-registration messages should be received by DCC within 2 minutes of issue (to allow for field service engineers to validate the install without having to wait long periods and thus suffer reduced productivity).

5.4. Meter configuration, tariff updates, messages to IHDs and some other services should be programmed for activation by the meter at a specified date and time.

5.5. PAYG services should be received by the meter within 2 minutes of issue by DCC (to ensure that PAYG customers are not disconnected due to a late top-up).

5.6. Smart grids: a number of requirements were discussed:

- Ad hoc programmed power quality reads – within 6 hours of the programmed read taking place;
- Loss of supply alarms – to be received by the network operator / supplier within 2 minutes of supply failure;
- Ad hoc validation of 'on supply' – 2 minutes (to include the time from the network operator initiating the request to the point at which the response is sent from the DCC to the network operator).
- While no requirement for millisecond reporting of power quality was identified at the meeting (or in the ENA's work to date), it was thought sensible to investigate the impact of this requirement in order to understand the possible cost of 'future proofing' the communications capability against this type of service requirement.

5.7. WAN availability: requirements should be driven by the needs of PAYG and vulnerable customers. The WAN requirements need to be developed in conjunction with requirements PC.4 / PC.5 in the SODR. For other services, the required level of network availability will increase over time as greater use is made of dynamic tariffs, bulk load shedding and similar functions. The view during the meeting was that periods of non-availability of a few hours could probably be tolerated, though this would result in reduced productivity in call centres (as meters cannot be interrogated) and for field engineers seeking to install or replace meters.

5.8. Network availability between DCC and service users: the expectation of the group was that availability of the DCC's WAN should be specified at a similar level to that for DTN (i.e. 99.999%).

6. Actions

- 6.1. CS to review with the SM Design team whether the smart meter technical specifications will cover UNC requirements for meter validation.**
- 6.2. Suppliers to provide data on patterns of on demand reads following the installation of a smart meter.**
- 6.3. Suppliers to review the existing SM trials and provide information on packet sizes for the services listed in the catalogue.**
- 6.4. AE to update the 'services matrix' and circulate to all attendees and then all to review the response requirements for each service as input to the next meeting.**