



***Response to DECC: Consultation New Smart Energy Code Content and Related Supply Licence Amendments - July 2015.***

***General Comments***

We are generally comfortable with the majority of the proposals.

We are pleased that the re use of comms hub in certain circumstances has been recognised. We are disappointed that no steps are being taken to develop rules and processes to mitigate the requirement to only re use a comms hub in a gas Network operator's area with the same security key credentials. This restriction adds further and unnecessary logistical operational costs to supplier's processes to ensure the comms hub are repatriated to the correct region for redeployment.

The suggestion to require DCC to offer testing services for Non Gateway Suppliers seems sensible. However, we note that DECC are reviewing the benefits and costs of providing the Non Gateway Supplier interface. We remain of the view that any such service should be required for a limited period only, and that commercial and regulatory pressures should provide sufficient incentive for all suppliers to achieve full DCC User status as quickly as possible.

We are also pleased to see progress being made towards using the enduring SEC modification process and a move away from transitional governance arrangements and direct government intervention, it's important that this is enabled as soon as possible to enable industry to manage changes to the SEC appropriately.



**Answers to Specific Questions:**

**DCC Enrolment Mandate – Chapter 3**

**Question 1:** *Do you agree with the legal drafting of the proposed amendment to the electricity and gas supply licence conditions? Please provide a rationale for your views.*

Yes, although for clarity the drafting should refer to meters that form part of SMETS2 metering system.

**Question 2:** *Do you agree that this legal duty should take effect when DCC's enrolment services are first available? Please provide rationale for your views.*

Yes, although at the time of responding, it is worth noting that it remains unclear as to when DCC Enrolment Services will be available. We are aware that DCC is planning to be "live" from April 2016 but it is not at all clear if suppliers will be able to install commission and enrol meters from this date or how soon thereafter. Whilst the drafting therefore may be reasonable, it's not clear when this service may be operational.

**DCC Enrolment and Communication Services – Chapter 4**

**Question 3:** *Do you have any comments on the proposed drafting in these new subsidiary documents?*

No.

**Question 4:** *Do you have any specific comments on the proposed revised approach to dealing with Post-Commissioning Obligations including the proposal to delete Sections M2.7 and M2.8?*

No.

**Consent for joining and un-joining Consumer Access Devices – Chapter 4**

**Question 5:** *Do you have any comments on the proposed approach?*

This would appear consistent with the policy intent.



#### **Consequential Changes to Sections F2, G, M2 and A – Chapter 4**

**Question 6 :** *Do you have any comments on the proposed drafting changes to Sections F2, G, M2 and A?*

These seem sensible.

**Question 7:** *Do you agree with the proposal to move some of the technical details in F2 into a subsidiary document in line with the approach taken in relation to Sections H4,5 &6?*

Yes this is a sensible approach.

#### **SEC amendments to support Smart Metering Testing – Chapter 5**

**Question 8:** *Do you support the proposed changes to Section T to ensure that the testing objectives reflect a more up to date version of the SEC?*

Yes this is sensible and removes any potential ambiguity.

**Question 9:** *Do you agree with the proposal that the DCC should offer a testing service for prospective Non-Gateway Suppliers?*

Whilst this seems sensible, we note that DECC are reviewing the benefits and costs of providing the Non Gateway Supplier interface. We remain of the view that any such service should be required for a limited period only, and that commercial and regulatory pressures should provide sufficient incentive for all suppliers to achieve full DCC User status as quickly as possible.

**Question 10:** *Do you intend to test only Devices (and not User Systems) against the DCC Systems? If so, how and when do you intend to do this? Is it your intention to: become a SEC Party and establish a DCC Gateway Connection; rely on other parties to interact with the DCC for the purposes of testing Devices; or another means (e.g. direct connection without being a SEC Party)?*

N/A – we are already a SEC Party and have a DCC connection in place.

#### **Public Key Infrastructure – Chapter 6**

**Question 11:** *Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting in relation to the SMKI Recovery Procedure Guidance document? Please provide a rationale for your view.*

Yes.



**Question 12:** *Do you agree with the proposed drafting on how changes to the SMKI Recovery Key Guidance are managed, or do you think it should be a SEC Subsidiary Document and open to the SEC modification process? Please provide a rationale for your response*

It would seem sensible that the SMKI PMA should retain responsibility for the document and consult with appropriate parties where change is required. We do not consider this should be another subsidiary document.

**Question 13:** *Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting in relation to the SMKI Recovery Procedure Liabilities? Please provide a rationale for your view.*

Yes this seems sensible.

**Question 14:** *Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting to use IKI for communications over the NGI and in relation to TAD? Please provide a rationale for your view*

Yes.

**Question 15:** *Do you agree that it is necessary for the PMA to be able to require Parties to nominate Key Custodians? Please provide a rationale for your response.*

Yes.

**Question 16:** *Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting to make clarificatory changes to the SMKI Certificate Policies? Please provide a rationale for your view.*

Yes, this seems sensible.

**Question 17:** *Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting to allow the DCC to become an Eligible Subscriber for certain SMKI Organisation Certificates for the purpose of signing Registration Data? Please provide a rationale for your view.*

Yes.

**Question 18:** *Do you agree with the legal drafting to oblige Network Operators to establish their Organisation Certificates prior to DCC Live? Please provide a rationale for your view*

Yes.

**Question 19:** *Do you agree with the proposal and legal drafting in relation to the miscellaneous changes to the PKI content? Please provide a rationale for your view.*

Yes.



#### ***Security Independence Requirements – Chapter 7***

***Question 20:*** Do you have any comments on the proposed drafting regarding the CIO independence requirements?

No further comment, this seems sensible.

#### ***Re-use of previously installed Communications Hubs – Chapter 8***

***Question 21:*** Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting (including the proposed changes to the CHIMSM at Annex D), which would permit Suppliers to re-use Communications Hubs that they have removed from consumer premises in certain circumstances?

We are pleased that the re use of comms hub in certain circumstances has been recognised. Re-using equipment is well established in the industry to reduce unnecessary waste reduce operating costs.

We are disappointed that no steps are being taken to develop rules and processes to mitigate the requirement to only re use a comms hub in a gas Network operator's area with the same security key credentials. This adds further and unnecessary logistical operational costs to supplier's processes to ensure the comms hub are re patriated to the correct region for redeployment.

#### ***Obligation for Energy Suppliers to engage with DCC queries on compliance with the Communications Hub Support Materials – Chapter 8***

***Question 22:*** Do you agree with the proposal, and associated legal drafting, for an obligation for Supplier Parties to respond to any reasonable request from the DCC for information pertaining to compliance with the CH Support Materials and for a reciprocal obligation to be placed on the DCC?

Yes providing reasonable notice is provided this should not be an issue however as stated many times in development of the Communication Hub support materials we would like some element of reciprocity.

Given that the Communications Hub manufactured and provided to suppliers for installation is such a critical element of the smart metering system, we would like to understand more about how these are manufactured and how DCC ensures these are to the right standards and quality (ISO accreditation etc) in the same way a supplier would of any product it procured directly.

***Question 23:*** Do you agree with the proposals, and associated legal drafting (including the proposed changes to the CHIMSM at Annex D), relating to visits by the DCC to consumer premises?



The principle is reasonable although it is not clear how the DCC would determine which premises it wishes to attend.

There also appears to be a restriction in the time of day when a visit may be agreed with the customer. The drafting suggests attendance may only be between 09:00-17:00 on a Working Day which may cause an issue for some customers. It may be better for the Supplier to agree a mutually convenient time with the customer for all parties to attend if required.

It is also important that the DCC attends at the arranged time and date. Suppliers are subject to Guaranteed Standards which they must pay to customers for failed appointments. If the appointment is missed due to the DCC failing to attend at the right time, suppliers should be able to recover the costs of the Guaranteed Standard payment that would be paid to the customer from the DCC.

#### ***Failure of Parties to accept delivery of Communications Hubs – Chapter 8***

***Question 24: Do you agree with the proposal, and associated legal drafting, for Parties to be liable for all reasonable costs and expenses incurred by the DCC as a result of a delivery of Communications Hubs being prevented from taking place in accordance with the SEC, due to a breach of the SEC by that Party?***

Yes

#### ***Consequential changes to the SEC for alignment with the Communications Hub Support Materials – Chapter 8***

***Question 25: Do you agree with the proposals and associated legal drafting for the consequential changes to the SEC arising from the Communications Hub Support Materials?***

Generally yes, we note the DCC is only required to provide coverage within 90 days of a report of no Wide Area Network communications, 99% of the time. This will mean some customers are disappointed and suppliers and the wider programme may be subject to adverse publicity.

#### ***Miscellaneous Communications Hub issues – Chapter 8***

***Question 26: Do you agree with the proposals as described under the heading of "Miscellaneous Communications Hub issues" above and the associated legal drafting?***

Yes.

#### ***Incident Management – Chapter 9***

***Question 27: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Incident Management? Please provide a rationale for your views***

Yes these appear reasonable.



#### ***Governance of Error Handling Strategy – Chapter 9***

***Question 28:*** Do you agree with the proposed approach to provide a more flexible governance for the Error Handling Strategy, set out above?

Yes.

#### ***Further Activation of the SEC Modification Process – Chapter 10***

***Question 29:*** Do you agree with the proposals in relation to the timing of the further activation of the SEC Modification Process? Please provide a rationale for your response.

Yes. It is important that the enduring modification process is enabled as soon as possible.

***Question 30:*** Do you agree with the proposals and legal text in relation to the manner in which the SEC Modification Process is further activated, including the temporary performance of certain enduring Authority functions by the Secretary of State? Please provide a rationale for your response.

Yes this seems sensible, we are pleased to see movement towards formal SEC governance and ownership by industry.

#### ***Scope of the Threshold Anomaly Detection Procedures document – Chapter 11***

***Question 31:*** Do you have any comments on the proposed drafting regarding the scope of the Threshold Anomaly Detection Procedures?

No.

#### ***Appeals of Panel Decisions relating to SMETS non-compliance – Chapter 11***

***Question 32:*** Do you agree with the proposed additional text to F3 to provide affected Supplier Parties or the DCC with the ability to appeal (to Ofgem) SEC Panel decisions relating to device non-compliance with the Technical Specifications and any associated remedial plan?

Yes.



**Section A Definitions - Chapter 11**

**Question 33:** *Do you agree with the proposal, and associated legal drafting in relation to amending the definitions in preparation for the future introduction of technical specifications into the SEC? Please provide a rationale for your view.*

Yes.