



SMETS1 Conclusions Closure 2 – Part B Remaining TMAD Changes

A SMETS1 conclusion on proposals by DCC: to exclude certain categories of SMETS1 Installations from Migration; unblock Migration of SMETS1 Installations.

Filename: CON_2B_TMAD_SMETS1_Conclusion_Closure2_PUBLIC

Date: 15 March 2023

Author: consultations@smartdcc.co.uk

Classification: DCC Public

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Context	4
2. Stakeholder Engagement.....	4
2.1. Questions	4
2.2. Responses.....	5
2.3. Analysis of Responses	6
3. Deregister Dormant PPMID for FOC (BG) (Closure 2 Q2)	6
3.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....	6
3.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement	6
3.3. Summary.....	6
4. Early Closure – Removing 12 Months from the last EPCL	
Entry requirement for IOC and FOC (NP) (Closure 2 Q3)	7
4.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....	7
4.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement	9
4.3. Summary.....	9
5. Proposal to Refine ‘Excluded Category – Five Retries	
Attempting Migration’ to extend to the FOC cohorts	
(Closure 2 Q4)	9
5.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....	9
5.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement	10
5.3. Summary.....	11
6. Proposal to Refine ‘Excluded Category – Five Retries	
Attempting Migration’ to Remove System Errors	
(Closure 2 Q5)	11
6.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....	11
6.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement	12
6.3. Summary.....	12
7. Unblocking change to account for Incorrect Certificates	
(Closure 2 Q6)	12

- 7.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....12
- 7.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement13
- 7.3. Summary.....13
- 8. Amended Excluded Category 'Dormant not due to Change of Supplier' for 'split Active/Active' SMETS1 Installations (Closure 2 Q7)..... 13
 - 8.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....13
 - 8.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement14
 - 8.3. Summary.....14
- 9. Excluded Category – Firmware Upgrade / Configuration Failure where GroupID = “DA”, “EA”, or “EB” (Closure 2 Q8) 14
 - 9.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....14
 - 9.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement15
 - 9.3. Summary.....15
- 10. Summary of Drafting Changes 15
- 11. Conclusions..... 16
- 12. Next Steps..... 16
- 13. Attachments 17

1. Introduction and Context

A number of energy suppliers have installed first generation smart devices (known as SMETS1 devices) in consumers' premises across Great Britain. The Data Communications Company (DCC) has designed a solution for the enrolment of SMETS1 devices into its network. Part of DCC's plan to deliver SMETS1 Services involves an approach for migrating SMETS1 Installations into DCC's systems.

The detailed technical and procedural requirements of the migration approach are set out in the SMETS1 Transition and Migration Approach Document (TMAD). The TMAD is Appendix AL of the Smart Energy Code¹ (SEC). In this document DCC concludes on its proposals to amend the TMAD in support of SMETS1 service delivery.

The Closure 2 Consultation² was issued on 16 December 2022 with responses due by noon on 10 February 2023. This document provides a response to that consultation consistent with the regulatory requirements for amending the TMAD. DCC will be concluding on the Closure 2 matters in several separate parts:

- the Closure 2 Part A Conclusion³ covering the TMAD amendment for partial Migration was published on 15 February 2023 and the TMAD was subsequently re-designated⁴ by the Secretary of State on 21 February 2023;
- this Closure 2 Part B Conclusion covers the remaining TMAD changes set out in the Closure 2 Consultation; and
- later in March 2023, DCC will bring forward separate conclusions covering closure of the respective Requesting Parties for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts.

2. Stakeholder Engagement

This section details DCC's stakeholder engagement that has taken place in relation to the proposed regulatory changes.

2.1. Questions

The consultation set out eleven questions across a range of topics. The Part A Conclusion provided a response to Closure 2 Q1 (covering partial Migration), and Closure 2 Q11 (re-designation of the TMAD). Separate subsequent conclusions will provide a response to Closure 2 Q9 (covering closure of the IOC cohort) and Closure 2 Q10 (covering closure of the FOC (NP) cohort). This Part B Conclusion provides a response to the remaining seven questions. Table 1 below details these seven questions as presented in the public consultation.

¹ The current version of the SEC is available from <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/the-smart-energy-code-2/>

² <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/consultations/smets1-consultation-closure-2/>

³ <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/consultations/smets1-conclusion-closure-2-part-a/>

⁴ <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/latest-news/sec-v68-0-implemented-to-support-the-dcc-smets1-service/>

Number	Question
Closure 2 Q2	Do you support the proposal to de-register the SMETS1 PPMID for SMETS1 Installations for the FOC BG cohort containing Dormant Meters to provide for alignment to an entry on the EPCL? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in Clauses 4.26D and 4.26E of the TMAD and the amendment to Clause 18.12? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Closure 2 Q3	Do you support the principle of amending Clause 7.2 of the TMAD to allow early closure of the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Closure 2 Q4	Do you support the principle of amending the Excluded Category titled 'Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration' (Clause 18.8 of the TMAD) to be applicable to the FOC cohort? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Closure 2 Q5	Do you support the principle of amending the Excluded Category titled 'Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration' (Clause 18.8 of the TMAD) to remove some failures related to system issues? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Closure 2 Q6	Do you support the principle of disregarding the incorrectly provided certificate where it has prevented successful Migration at least five times as per the new Clause 4.32A in the TMAD? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Closure 2 Q7	Do you support the principle of amending the TMAD to amend Clauses 18.2A and 18.14 to exclude SMETS1 Installations that were previously 'split Active/Active' from the scope of the Excluded Category titled 'Excluded Category - Dormant not due to Change of Supplier'? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Closure 2 Q8	Do you support the principle of amending the TMAD to include Clauses 18.17 to exclude firmware upgrade and configuration failures for the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts where firmware upgrade and / or the steps in Clause 4.26 (to reconfigure Dormant Meters and associated Devices) by the relevant SMETS1 SMSO have persistently failed? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.

Table 1 – Consultation Questions – Closure 2 – Part B Conclusion

2.2. Responses

Stakeholders were invited to respond to the consultation by noon on Friday 10 February 2023 using the response template⁵ that was provided.

DCC received a written response from eight respondents regarding this consultation. Six respondents were energy suppliers and two respondents were Meter Asset Providers (MAPs).

⁵ <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/media/0ldfs5ok/smets1-consultation-closure-2-response-template-v2.docx>

One respondent only gave DCC a few comments and did not provide an explicit response to any of the questions. This respondent expressed broad support for the proposals outlined in the consultation document. This respondent also stated that they had no objections to raise. This respondent stressed the importance of DCC exhausting all retry mechanisms and unblocking activities prior to a SMETS1 Installation being in an Excluded Category.

Following closure of the consultation, DCC has spoken to two of the respondents to confirm some aspects of their responses.

2.3. Analysis of Responses

DCC subject matter experts have reviewed each response and analysed the respondents' feedback to the consultation. DCC has structured the analysis of responses by question, providing an overview of the comments received and DCC's reply including a statement on any areas of disagreement. These are now presented in the following sections by question.

3. Deregister Dormant PPMID for FOC (BG) (Closure 2 Q2)

For the FOC (BG) cohort, DCC sought views on de-registering the SMETS1 PPMID such that Migration of the SMETS1 Installation could be attempted as well as including an amendment to provide clarification for the Excluded Category 'Excluded Category - Data Issues' in Clause 18.12 of the TMAD. These changes were covered by the following question: *"Do you support the proposal to de-register the SMETS1 PPMID for SMETS1 Installations for the FOC BG cohort containing Dormant Meters to provide for alignment to an entry on the EPCL? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in Clauses 4.26D and 4.26E of the TMAD and the amendment to Clause 18.12? Please provide a rationale for your views."*

3.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Seven respondents provided a response to this question with six expressing broad support. The remaining respondent stated that they had no opinion on this matter.

Two respondents expressed support without further comment.

One supportive respondent (that is an energy supplier) set out that they can offer insights to their customers via an app if communication with the SMETS1 PPMID cannot be re-established.

One respondent that supported this change also stated they are supportive of any change which will allow additional migrations to be attempted.

One supportive respondent stated that they consider the de-registration of SMETS1 PPMIDs to be a pragmatic way of aligning SMETS1 Installations with the EPCL.

One respondent that expressed support indicated that they considered the revised TMAD drafting to be correct.

3.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

n/a

3.3. Summary

DCC concludes it is appropriate to amend Clauses 4.26D, 4.26E, and 18.12 of the TMAD.

The Closure 2 Consultation set out that, at the time of publication, there were 966 SMETS1 Installations containing solely Dormant Meters for the FOC (BG) cohort impacted by this issue; noting that this figure was subject to change. To date, DCC has no evidence to suggest that this information may be inaccurate and will continue closely working with relevant parties to undertake due diligence on this.

DCC proposes that the Secretary of State re-designates the relevant amendments to the TMAD to allow for deregistering of the SMETS1 PPMID within a SMETS1 Installation containing Dormant Meters (for the FOC (BG) cohort) where otherwise DCC is unable to attempt to Migrate due to issues with the SMETS1 PPMID.

4. Early Closure – Removing 12 Months from the last EPCL Entry requirement for IOC and FOC (NP) (Closure 2 Q3)

DCC sought views on a proposal to amend Clause 7.2 of the TMAD to allow the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts to close earlier than 12 months from the last EPCL entry for these cohorts. These changes were covered by the following question: “*Do you support the principle of amending Clause 7.2 of the TMAD to allow early closure of the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.*”.

4.1. Respondents’ Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Seven respondents provided a response to this question with five expressing broad support.

One respondent expressed support without further comment

One respondent set out that they supported this change and wished to understand how it would apply to the FOC (BG) and MOC (Secure) cohorts. DCC discussed this point with the respondent. DCC outlined that this change is a cohort specific change to allow for closure of IOC and FOC (NP). DCC explained that it will need to consult on a similar change for the FOC (BG) and MOC (Secure) cohorts if the 12-month period from the last EPCL entry has not expired at the point each of these cohorts are considered for closure. The respondent accepted DCC’s explanation of this point and had no further concerns.

One respondent expressed caveated support; stressing the importance that all actions have been taken by DCC to validate data and exhaust attempts to Migrate or else exclude. This respondent also noted the importance of DCC informing impacted Energy Suppliers of the final SMETS1 Installations which cannot be enrolled. DCC accepts these points. DCC can confirm that DCC worked with SMETS1 SMSOs and Energy Supplier to resolve a substantive percentage of the data discrepancies allowing additional SMETS1 Installations to be Migrated for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts. DCC can also confirm that it is focused on exhausting Migration attempts prior to the application of the Excluded Category titled ‘Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration’. As described in the Closure 2 Consultation, DCC’s operational experience across all cohorts indicates that the improvement in successful Migration of SMETS1 Installations is less than 0.5 % after the fifth valid Migration attempt. Additionally, DCC reports every SMETS1 Installation in an Excluded Category to the relevant Responsible Supplier each month as per Clause 18.3 of the TMAD.

One supportive respondent stated that they wish to see the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts closed and support amendments that can achieve this.

One respondent expressed support stating that they support the principle of removing the 12-month closure restriction for IOC and FOC (NP) as the firmware / configuration and Migration attempt evidence clearly demonstrates reasonable steps have been taken to update and Migrate sites. This respondent also indicated that continuing to apply this restriction would increase costs to the industry with no tangible benefit to consumers. They specifically indicated support for the amendment to Clause 7.2 of the TMAD.

One respondent didn't express either support for the proposal or state an objection. This respondent stressed that it is important to be clear that Migrations are 'complete' for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts. This respondent set out that it is important for DCC to work closely with Energy Suppliers to ensure cohort numbers are aligned. There are now no remaining Active Meters for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts; DCC can confirm it previously worked closely with Energy Suppliers with the remaining Active Meters to ensure the data for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohort was correct. DCC is also working closely with the SMETS1 SMSOs (rather than the Responsible Suppliers⁶) to ensure the data for remaining Dormant Meters is correct.

One respondent (which is a MAP) objected to any change that will enable the early closure of the IOC cohort. This respondent considers there is a risk that meters will be removed prematurely due to data inconsistency issues. The respondent stated that there have been multiple instances where DCC has found that meters have failed to be populated within the DCC master enrolment data. As set out in the Closure 2 Consultation, DCC is aware that there are some SMETS1 meters that are not currently (and may have never been) registered within the appropriate SMETS1 SMSO and thus not able to be planned for Migration. DCC works closely with each SMETS1 SMSO to ensure data issues are resolved wherever possible to allow additional Migrations to be attempted. In some circumstances, it may not be possible to resolve the data issues. In such cases, the relevant Excluded Category would apply to such meters as DCC considers it to be very unlikely to be technically and economically viable to seek to Migrate these meters. The Closure 2 Consultation also set out the envisaged need for site visits for the necessary commissioning activities within the SMETS1 SMSO prior to any Migration attempt. DCC received no additional evidence that would indicate this is an incorrect assumption in relation to the Closure 2 Consultation. This respondent indicated that DCC's delivery of SEC Modification 181⁷ (MAP Reporting) will allow MAPs to access this data. DCC can confirm that SEC Modification 181 has been implemented and the first reports to MAPs were issued in February 2023. These reports provide MAPs with information on enrolled SMETS1 and SMETS2+ devices. Any MAP that is interested should note that they need to subscribe to this service and there is an annual fee payable. Further details about the service are available by contacting dccopsreporting@smartdcc.co.uk.

DCC discussed these objections with the respondent. DCC explained that the amendment to Clause 7.2 of the TMAD was proposed because without this change the earliest the IOC cohort could close would be December 2023; setting out that this wasn't considered an economic or efficient outcome. The respondent expressed general concerns that a decision to close a cohort could be made without a clear assessment of the economic trade-off being made. The respondent is particularly concerned that SMETS1 Installations might not be Migrated purely due to administrative errors. DCC explained that it is focused on getting as many SMETS1 Installations as possible Migrated. Furthermore, DCC has clear TMAD obligations (in Clause 1 of the TMAD) to bring forward unblocking changes to resolve matters and DCC has had previous material successes in this area. DCC also explained that each closure decision is made by the Secretary of State (based on DCC's recommendation).

⁶ DCC is not working with the Responsible Suppliers as they don't have any knowledge of these SMETS1 Installations given that the Meters are currently not being operated to provide smart services.

⁷ <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/modifications/meter-asset-provider-and-device-manufacturer-access-to-asset-related-data-held-by-the-dcc/>.

DCC explained that there are four key closure criteria (as set out in the Closure 2 Consultation) that will form the basis of the subsequent letter recommending closure (noting that some commercially confidential matters may be redacted). The respondent accepted the need for an economic trade-off between carrying on or closure and understands this will be made by the Secretary of State. Following this discussion, this respondent is still of the view that no changes should be allowed to enable early closure of the IOC cohort.

4.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

The process for amending the TMAD set out in Section N6 of the SEC places an obligation on DCC to reach an agreed position with any stakeholders raising objections to the proposed TMAD amendment. As described in section 4.1 above, DCC engaged with one respondent who objected to the amendment to Clause 7.2 of the TMAD. DCC was unable to reach an agreed proposal with the respondent who remains of the view that no changes should be allowed to enable early closure of the IOC cohort.

4.3. Summary

DCC concludes it is appropriate to amend Clause 7.2 of the TMAD. DCC considers that, in principle, DCC should be able to recommend that Requesting Party services for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts close earlier than a period of time based on the last EPCL entry for each cohort, where it considers that such closure would be economically efficient. The 12-month period for EPCL Report 27 (and earlier ones) will have expired before the proposed closure dates for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts. Without this amendment, DCC would not be able to recommend a RP Decommissioning Date earlier than 15 December 2023 for the IOC cohort⁸ (12 months from EPCL Report 28 as described in the Closure 2 Consultation) but the FOC (NP) cohort is not impacted. Thus, failure to amend Clause 7.2 of the TMAD would mean that closure of the IOC cohort would be delayed for the very limited number of SMETS1 Installations covered by EPCL Report 28.

DCC proposes that the Secretary of State re-designates the relevant amendments to the TMAD to allow the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts to close earlier than 12 months from the last EPCL entry for these cohorts. As set out above, there will be separate conclusions covering closure of the respective Requesting Parties for the IOC and FOC (NP) cohorts.

5. Proposal to Refine ‘Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration’ to extend to the FOC cohorts (Closure 2 Q4)

DCC sought views on extending ‘Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration’ to the FOC cohort. These changes were covered by the following question: *“Do you support the principle of amending the Excluded Category titled ‘Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration’ (Clause 18.8 of the TMAD) to be applicable to the FOC cohort? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.”*

5.1. Respondents’ Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Seven respondents provided a response to this question with six expressing broad support.

⁸ The EPCL Report 28 unblocked 208 SMETS1 Installations containing Active Meters for the IOC cohort and there were no additional entries for the FOC (NP) cohort.

Two respondents expressed support without further comment

One respondent expressed support, stating that all cohorts should have a consistent approach.

One respondent expressed support for the proposal to extend five strikes to the FOC cohorts. This respondent queried what would happen if the Migration process failed in a 'non-standard' way. DCC discussed this point with the respondent to explain the intention is that such failures would not count towards five valid attempts due to the changes proposed to Clause 18.8 (e) of the TMAD. The respondent accepted DCC's explanation of this point and had no further concerns.

One respondent expressed support for this change; indicating that the return from further retries is limited. This respondent expressed the view that DCC's efforts should be focused on areas where the returns are greater. DCC understands and agrees with this view.

One respondent expressed support indicating that they have seen minimal success above five Migration attempts with their SMETS1 Installations containing Active Meters. This respondent confirmed their support for the new legal drafting for Clause 18.8(a) of the TMAD.

One respondent (that is a MAP) expressed concern that no cost justification was provided for the TMAD amendment to extend the existing Excluded Category (covered by Clause 18.8 of the TMAD) to the FOC cohort. This respondent stated that they haven't seen any cost justification for DCC stopping Migration attempts after a certain point and recommended this type of analysis is undertaken. As set out in the Closure 2 Consultation, DCC is proposing this Excluded Category is extended to the FOC cohort on the basis of operational evidence i.e. there is very limited additional success Migrating after five valid attempts. This respondent also indicated that MAPs are yet to see a list of meters within an Excluded Category which makes it difficult for them to consider the most effective approach. DCC can confirm that MAPs don't have direct access to details on Meters within each Excluded Category; this information is provided monthly to each Energy Supplier as per Clause 18.3 of the TMAD. DCC also has an obligation to provide information to Energy Suppliers on the extent of likely impact when new Excluded Categories are proposed as per Clause 1.6 (a) (ii) of the TMAD. The DCC discharged this obligation during the Closure 2 consultation. DCC would encourage MAPs and Energy Suppliers to liaise accordingly regarding these data.

DCC discussed these objections with the respondent. DCC explained that the proposal was to extend this Excluded Category to the FOC cohort based on operational evidence and that it already applies to the other cohorts. The respondent remained of the view that their objection relates to the principles underpinning this Excluded Category. The respondent's view is that, in principle, any decision to exclude a SMETS1 Installation should be based on a clear economic trade off. DCC advised that operational experience indicates very limited improvement after the fifth valid migration attempt. Following this discussion, the respondent is still of the view that the Excluded Category 'Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration' should not be extended to the FOC cohort.

5.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

The process for amending the TMAD set out in Section N6 of the SEC places an obligation on DCC to reach an agreed position with any stakeholders raising objections to the proposed TMAD amendment. As described in section 5.1 above, DCC engaged with one respondent who objected to the amendment to Clause 18.8 of the TMAD to extend the Excluded Category titled 'Excluded Category - Five Retries Attempting Migration' to the FOC cohort. DCC was unable to reach an agreed proposal with the respondent who remains

five valid attempts due to the changes proposed to Clause 18.8 (e) of the TMAD. The respondent accepted DCC's explanation of this point and had no further concerns.

One respondent expressed caveated support; stressing the importance that all actions have been explored by DCC. This respondent stressed the importance of regular Excluded Category reporting.

One supportive respondent stated that they supported the principle of removing some technical migration failures related to system issues. This respondent also noted that while this increases the total number of migration attempts, technical failures should be removed from the valid retry totals as they are not valid attempts. This respondent confirmed support for amending Clause 18.8 of the TMAD.

6.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

n/a

6.3. Summary

DCC concludes it is appropriate to amend Clause 18.8 (e) of the TMAD.

DCC proposes that the Secretary of State re-designates the relevant amendments to the TMAD such that a range of administrative errors are not included as valid Migration attempts.

7. Unblocking change to account for Incorrect Certificates (Closure 2 Q6)

DCC sought views on a proposal to allow DCC to attempt Migration where provision of the incorrect certificate is consistently preventing Migration from proceeding. These changes were covered by the following question: "*Do you support the principle of disregarding the incorrectly provided certificate where it has prevented successful Migration at least five times as per the new Clause 4.32A in the TMAD? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.*".

7.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Seven respondents provided a response to this question with all seven expressing broad support.

Three respondents expressed support without further comment.

One respondent stated their support and expressed the view that this change addressed a very specific case that will have minimal negative impact and maximise migrations. DCC agrees with their view.

One supportive respondent stated that they are supportive of any change which will allow additional Migrations to be attempted.

One respondent expressed support for the change, stating that they considered the drafting in the new Clause 4.32A of the TMAD to be acceptable.

One supportive respondent stated that this change would not have a significant impact on the operations of the Gas Transporter.

7.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

n/a

7.3. Summary

DCC concludes it is appropriate to include Clause 4.32A in TMAD.

DCC proposes that the Secretary of State re-designates the relevant amendments to the TMAD to disregard the incorrectly provided certificate for the Gas Transporter.

8. Amended Excluded Category ‘Dormant not due to Change of Supplier’ for ‘split Active/Active’ SMETS1 Installations (Closure 2 Q7)

DCC sought views on an amendment to the existing Excluded Category titled ‘Excluded Category - Dormant not due to Change of Supplier’ set out in Clause 18.14 of the TMAD. This amendment addresses an edge case related to exclusions covering ‘split Active/Active’ SMETS1 Installations. These changes were covered by the following question: “*Do you support the principle of amending the TMAD to amend Clauses 18.2A and 18.14 to exclude SMETS1 Installations that were previously ‘split Active/Active’ from the scope of the Excluded Category titled ‘Excluded Category - Dormant not due to Change of Supplier’? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.*”.

8.1. Respondents’ Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Seven respondents provided a response to this question with all seven expressing broad support.

Three respondents expressed support without further comment.

One respondent expressed support for the proposed change to the ‘split Active/Active’ SMETS1 Installations. This respondent stressed that they would want the standard Migration rules to apply were the other Energy Supplier to terminate their arrangements with the SMETS1 SMSO in the MOC (Secure) cohort such that the SMETS1 Installation became ‘split Active/Dormant’. DCC can confirm that the standard Migration rules for ‘split Active/Dormant’ SMETS1 Installations would apply i.e. the SMETS1 Installation would be attempted for Migration once the Energy Supplier for the Active Meter provides an authorisation.

One supportive respondent stated that they are supportive of any change which will allow additional Migrations to be attempted.

One respondent expressed support for the change and stated that they considered the drafting in Clause 18.2 and 18.14 of the TMAD to be acceptable.

One respondent expressed support for the proposal. This respondent queried why issues related to ‘split Active/Active’ SMETS1 Installations are now subject to consultation. This respondent stated that ‘split Active/Active’ SMETS1 Installations should have been part of the initial design for SMETS1 enrolment. DCC discussed this matter with the respondent. DCC explained that ‘split Active/Active’ matters are already part of the Migration regime. DCC highlighted that Migration for each ‘split Active/Active’ SMETS1 Installation is covered by the provisions of Clause 4.19 of the TMAD. DCC explained the purpose of ‘Excluded Category - Dormant not due to Change of Supplier’ as set out in Clause 18.14 of the TMAD

to the respondent. DCC added that the consultation was only focused on an edge case within this Excluded Category. DCC advised that this Excluded Category could now only apply to the MOC (Secure) cohort. The respondent confirmed that their query regarding the general approach to 'split Active/Active' SMETS1 Installations was resolved.

8.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

n/a

8.3. Summary

DCC concludes it is appropriate to amend Clauses 18.2A and 18.14 of the TMAD.

DCC proposes that the Secretary of State re-designates the relevant amendments to the TMAD to address the edge case related to 'split Active/Active' SMETS1 Installations in the context of the existing Excluded Category titled 'Excluded Category - Dormant not due to Change of Supplier'.

9. Excluded Category - Firmware Upgrade / Configuration Failure where GroupID = "DA", "EA", or "EB" (Closure 2 Q8)

DCC sought views on introducing a new Excluded Category titled 'Excluded Category - Firmware Upgrade / Configuration Failure where GroupID = "DA", "EA", or "EB"' that would apply to the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts where there is a persistent failure to upgrade firmware and/or configure devices. These changes were covered by the following question: *"Do you support the principle of amending the TMAD to include Clauses 18.17 to exclude firmware upgrade and configuration failures for the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts where firmware upgrade and / or the steps in Clause 4.26 (to reconfigure Dormant Meters and associated Devices) by the relevant SMETS1 SMSO have persistently failed? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting in the TMAD? Please provide a rationale for your views."*

9.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Seven respondents provided a response to this question with all seven expressing broad support.

Two respondents expressed support without further comment.

One respondent set out support for exclusion based on firmware failure for the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts. This respondent indicated it was sensible to carry on attempting upgrade for MOC (Secure) where Migrations are still possible to be attempted.

One respondent set out their support for exclusion based on firmware failure for the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts. This respondent expressed concern that MAPs may have residual concerns and suggested on-going communication with MAPs to ensure awareness and agreement (where possible). DCC agrees that communication with MAPs is important and would encourage Energy Suppliers to carry on with these dialogues.

One respondent expressed caveated support; stressing the importance that all actions have been taken by DCC to validate data and exhaust attempts to Migrate or else exclude. This respondent also noted the importance of DCC informing impacted Energy Suppliers of the final SMETS1 Installations which cannot be enrolled. DCC accepts these points.

One respondent express support stating that the evidence provided demonstrates that reasonable steps have been taken by all parties to update firmware and configure in line with the EPCL. This respondent expressed support for the new Clause 18.17 and highlighted a typographical error in 18.17 (e) (i). DCC agrees there is a typographical error and will amend the TMAD drafting to address it.

One respondent (that is a MAP) stated that multiple failed attempts to update firmware or configuration are acceptable reasons to exclude meters from enrolment, noting that this will lead to additional cost to industry. This respondent stated that data to identify these meters should be provided to MAPs to allow for them to give an accurate contribution to the discussion. DCC can confirm that MAPs don't have direct access to details on meters within each Excluded Category; this information is provided to each Energy Supplier as per Clause 18.3 of the TMAD. DCC would encourage MAPs and Energy Suppliers to liaise accordingly regarding these data. This respondent also stated that the consultation did not explain why these failures are occurring; noting that if the cause of the firmware/configuration failures is down to environmental conditions rather than meter issues, then there is a high chance that such exclusions are unnecessary. Also, this respondent expressed the view that this exclusion is in the financial interest of the DCC as it shifts the costs of these sites away from the SMETS1 Programme and ensures long term income from a new SMETS2 comms hub (noting that it will likely need to be replaced again with a 4G hub). This respondent believes that the correct option for these meters should be to take the future costs associated with these sites into consideration and identify what the cheapest solution is to consumers. Notwithstanding that the respondent had expressed acceptance for this proposal, DCC discussed the respondent's wider concerns as expressed in response to Closure Q8. DCC explained that the proposed extension for the Excluded Category to cover the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts is based solely on technical or operational barriers. DCC highlighted to the respondent that such failure to upgrade / configure devices was due to technical issues (related to communication issues in many cases) rather than a financial decision. DCC also advised the respondent that it doesn't make any margin on external costs such as SMETS2 comms hubs which was accepted by the respondent.

9.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

n/a

9.3. Summary

DCC concludes it is appropriate to amend the TMAD to include Clause 18.17.

DCC proposes that the Secretary of State re-designates the relevant amendments to the TMAD to include Clauses 18.17 such that SMETS1 Installations for the MOC (Secure) and FOC cohorts are excluded where there are persistent firmware upgrade and configuration failures.

10. Summary of Drafting Changes

There is a change to the TMAD arising from the comments received regarding the matters set out in this conclusion document; the typographical error in Clause 18.17 (e) (i) of the TMAD has been corrected.

Typographical errors were also corrected in Clauses 1.9 and 18.8 (c) of the TMAD.

Minor drafting changes to improve clarity were also made to Clause 4.32A and 18.17 of the TMAD.

Please note that the proposed TMAD changes have been transposed into the latest version of the TMAD that was re-designated¹⁰ on 21 February 2023.

11. Conclusions

DCC is confident that, in consulting on the proposed TMAD changes, it has met its SEC obligations. DCC believes that it has undertaken appropriate consultation with industry regarding the proposed changes to the TMAD. Where necessary, DCC has addressed the comments that have been received from industry respondents and, where appropriate, sought additional feedback from them. DCC does not believe that the respondents' feedback to this consultation result in fundamental amendments to the TMAD. As such further consultation is not necessary or appropriate.

DCC is confident that the TMAD version submitted to the Secretary of State for re-designation reflects the requirements for document submission (as per Section N of the SEC) and considers the revised TMAD to be fit for purpose as it:

- is defined to a sufficient level of detail for re-designation into the SEC and is materially complete, and the content is technically accurate;
- contains revisions that continue to align it with the overall solution design for the SMETS1 Service and other relevant documents; and
- continues to provide an overarching framework that 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.

In summary, DCC considers that the revised TMAD is fit for purpose.

12. Next Steps

DCC has submitted this conclusions report to the Secretary of State on the date of publication of this document. DCC will publish its conclusions report on DCC's website and notify SEC Parties.

DCC expects the Secretary of State to decide on whether and when to re-designate the revised TMAD into the regulatory framework for the amendments in the scope of this consultation.

The Closure 2 Consultation sought views on re-designating the TMAD between 21 February 2023 and 21 March 2023 and explained that elements of the TMAD might be changed at different times to each other. The Closure 2 Part A Conclusion concluded that it is appropriate to re-designate the TMAD between 21 February 2023 and 21 March 2023. Thus, DCC notes that the earliest date when the TMAD could be re-designated to include the amendments (as set out in this document) is 21 February 2023. The latest date for re-designating the TMAD without requiring a further consultation on the designation date is 21 March 2023.

¹⁰ <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/latest-news/sec-v68-0-implemented-to-support-the-dcc-smets1-service/>

13. Attachments

Attachment	Title
1.	TMAD v25.C2B draft delta against current version v24.0
2.	TMAD v25.C2B draft clean

Table 2 - Attachments