

SMETS1 Conclusions Various 1 Part 2

A SMETS1 conclusion on a proposal by DCC that certain DMCs are uneconomic to test under the DMCT Process and a corresponding exclusion for the impacted SMETS1 Installations

Filename: CON2_SMETS1_Conclusion_Various1Part2_ISSUED

Date: 31 October 2022

Author: consultations@smartdcc.co.uk

Classification: DCC Public

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Context	3
2. Data Changes Since Consultation.....	3
3. Stakeholder Engagement.....	5
3.1. Questions	5
3.2. Webinar	5
3.3. Responses.....	5
4. Analysis of Responses	5
4.1. Uneconomic to Test under the DMCT Process (Various 1 Q6)	6
4.1.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....	6
4.1.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement.....	8
4.1.3. Summary.....	8
4.2. Proposed Excluded Category - Uneconomic to Test (Various 1 Q7)	9
4.2.1. Respondents' Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications.....	9
4.2.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement.....	10
4.2.3. Summary.....	10
5. Summary of Drafting Changes	10
6. Conclusions.....	10
7. Next Steps.....	11
8. Attachments	11

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 a detailed 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 SEC Variation Testing Approach Document for SMETS1 Services (SMETS1 SVTAD) sets out the rights and obligations for a range of SMETS1 testing matters including Systems Integration Testing (SIT) and the DMCT Process. The SMETS1 SVTAD also provides the framework for the Migration Testing Approach Document (MTAD) which sets out the rights and obligations for Migration Testing (MT). The SMETS1 SVTAD is Appendix AK of the Smart Energy Code¹ (SEC) and the TMAD is Appendix AL of the SEC. The procedural and technical details related to the enduring Testing Services provided by DCC are set out in the Enduring Testing Approach Document (ETAD). The ETAD is Appendix J of the SEC. The latest version of the SEC was published on 12 October 2022 as v64.0.

In December 2020, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) consulted² on changes to the TMAD to provide a framework to develop options for the Migration of SMETS1 Installations comprising Device Model Combinations (DMCs) which DCC considers currently blocked. In February 2021, BEIS concluded³ on these changes, introducing Clauses 1.4 to 1.9 in the TMAD which provide a transparent process for promptly assessing SMETS1 Installations currently blocked for Migration.

On 25 October 2021, DCC published the Various 1 Consultation⁴ which sought views on a range of regulatory matters related to SMETS1. The 'Various 1 - Part 1' conclusion was published⁵ by DCC on 30 November 2021 as a response to this consultation which concluded on most aspects of the Various 1 Consultation, including some amendments to the exclusion process. However, the proposal that certain DMCs are uneconomic to test under the DMCT Process (Various 1 Q6) and a corresponding exclusion for the impacted SMETS1 Installations (Various 1 Q7) were deferred. The relevant amendment to the TMAD was therefore not included in the part 1 conclusion.

This document now provides a 'Various 1 - Part 2' response to the consultation to address Various 1 Q6 and Various 1 Q7.

2. Data Changes Since Consultation

As part of the 'Business as Usual' review of data related to the DMCT Process, DCC has refreshed the data that was presented in the consultation. This has resulted in changes to the data presented in Section 8 of the Various 1 Consultation document (related to these uneconomic to test proposals).

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

² The BEIS consultation is available via <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/latest-news/secretary-of-state-direction-on-the-smets1-tmad-and-further-smets1-tmad-consultation/>

³ The BEIS conclusion is available via <https://smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/latest-news/sec-v35-0-implemented-to-support-the-dcc-smets1-service/>

⁴ <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/customer-engagement/smets1-consultation-various-1/>

⁵ <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/consultations/smets1-conclusion-various-1-part-1/>

The number of SMETS1 Installations against each of the DMCs represented in the consultation has changed as per the points below:

- the circumstances for some SMETS1 Installations now being different, e.g. where some SMETS1 Installations have already been replaced;
- for DMC1, two Responsible Suppliers with Active Meters have confirmed to DCC that they are not planning to migrate any of their SMETS1 Installations against DMC1 (and thus accepting these need to be replaced with SMETS2) and thus the number of planned migrations for this DMC have been reduced;
- testing of DMC2 is no longer required as there are no longer any SMETS1 Installations that have this DMC; and
- having initially considered DMC4 to be uneconomic to test, DCC discussed this DMC with an Energy Supplier that responded to the consultation; following this discussion, DCC agreed that it was an error not to include DMC4 as substantively equivalent and that it can be added to the EPCL based on Substantive Equivalence using the DMCT Process; DCC has reviewed the remaining DMCs and is confident that there are no other such errors.

As a consequence of the changes in data, there are now only four DMCs in the scope of the DMCT Process that would require testing (DMC1, DMC3, DMC5 and DMC6) which means the total cost of the DMCT Process testing is reduced to £556,000. There are 25 SMETS1 Installations impacted as per the conclusion element of the table below (in yellow). This is not a direct proportional reduction as these costs are a combination of fixed and variable costs and thus if calculated per DMC the cost per DMC would be slightly higher. The updated figures are presented in Table 1 and DCC remains confident that it is uneconomic to test DMC1, DMC3, DMC5 and DMC6.

DMC	Various 1 Consultation Version				Conclusion Version		
	EPCL Entries	SMETS1 Installations that are eligible for migration based on testing the DMC	Estimated Testing Cost per DMC	Estimated Testing Cost per SMETS1 Installation	SMETS1 Installations that are eligible for migration based on testing the DMC	Estimated Testing Cost per DMC	Estimated Testing Cost per SMETS1 Installation
DMC 1	9	41	£111,700	£2,700	17	£139,000	£8,200
DMC 2	1	1	£111,700	£111,700	0		
DMC 3	1	7	£111,700	£16,000	2	£139,000	£69,500
DMC 4	5	8	£111,700	£14,000	N/A		
DMC 5	2	5	£111,700	£22,300	5	£139,000	£27,800
DMC 6	1	1	£111,700	£111,700	1	£139,000	£139,000

Table 1 - Updated Summary Data

DCC notes that there is a small possibility that the uneconomic to test outcome may need to be revisited should a material number of further SMETS1 Installations be identified that align to these DMCs, however, DCC considers this to be an unlikely edge case. As set out earlier, should this edge case come to fruition and it is considered appropriate, DCC will propose further amendments to the regulatory framework to bring such DMCs back in scope of the process.

3. Stakeholder Engagement

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

3.1. Questions

Table 2 below details only those questions that were presented in the public consultation and are relevant to this Part 2 conclusion.

Various 1 Q6	Do you agree with DCC's proposal that it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process for the DMCs specified in Attachment 2 (of the consultation) consistent with Clause 20.7 of the SMETS1 SVTAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.
Various 1 Q7	Do you agree with DCC's proposal to exclude SMETS1 Installations where it is decided by the Secretary of State that it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process, subject to the Secretary of State not directing otherwise, as captured by Clause 18.5 of the TMAD? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting? Please provide a rationale for your views.

Table 2 - Consultation Questions

3.2. Webinar

Given the broad range of matters within the Various 1 Consultation, DCC held a stakeholder briefing webinar⁶ on the matters covered by this consultation on 3 November 2021 between 14:30 and 15:30 via Microsoft Teams. The purpose of the webinar was:

- to enhance the effectiveness of the consultation;
- to provide a high-level overview of the range of topics covered; and
- to offer stakeholders an opportunity to obtain any clarifications.

3.3. Responses

Stakeholders were invited to respond to the consultation issued by 16:00 on Friday 12 November 2021 using the response template⁷ that was provided.

DCC received a written response from ten respondents regarding this consultation.

4. Analysis of Responses

DCC has analysed the feedback provided and the views of stakeholders. Subject matter experts within DCC have reviewed each response.

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.

⁶ The slides from the webinar are available via https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/media/6559/various1_workshop_3nov2021_website.pdf

⁷ https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/media/6554/smets1_consultation_various_1_response_template.docx

4.1. Uneconomic to Test under the DMCT Process (Various 1 Q6)

DCC sought views on the proposal that it was uneconomic to test certain DMCs asking: “*Do you agree with DCC’s proposal that it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process for the DMCs specified in Attachment 2 (of the consultation) consistent with Clause 20.7 of the SMETS1 SVTAD? Please provide a rationale for your views.*”.

4.1.1. Respondents’ Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Nine of the respondents provided a response to this question. Eight of these respondents agreed with the principle of not testing where it was uneconomic.

Three respondents agreed with the DCC proposal that these DMCs were uneconomic to test. One of these respondents sought confirmation that substantive equivalence (under the DMCT Process) is considered within the DMCT Process before it is proposed that a DMC is uneconomic to test. DCC can confirm that substantive equivalence has previously been considered for these DMCs but was determined not to be appropriate (this is explained in more detail below in this section). However, DCC notes it has since changed its view on DMC4 and the ability to treat it as substantively equivalent, as set out further below.

One respondent did not express an opinion in its response to this question but asked whether unaccounted for SMETS1 Devices⁸ were considered in the context of the proposal that testing under the DMCT Process was uneconomic. DCC receives data on meters to be enrolled from Energy Suppliers (in the case of Active Meters) and SMETS1 SMSOs (in the case of Dormant Meters). The 63 SMETS1 Installations set out in the Various 1 Consultation are based on available data. DCC has dealt with the unaccounted for SMETS1 Devices via a separate RFI process⁹ following a BEIS request. DCC has reviewed this information in conjunction with the relevant SMSOs and there is only one unaccounted for site that aligns to DMC1, thus if this unaccounted for site was capable of being migrated, the economics involved in this decision would not change the recommendation.

Three respondents expressed support for the principle that DCC should control SMETS1 costs and not make material commitments to testing related to a limited quantity of SMETS1 Installations. However, these respondents expressed concern that DCC had not presented sufficient insight into the costs to allow these respondents to conclude that it was uneconomic to test for these six DMCs. These respondents wanted to understand if the costs provided in the consultation represented known costs for this testing or were an estimate. These respondents also queried whether substantive equivalence could be an appropriate route for these EPCL entries. One of these respondents also proposed two alternative approaches to migrating these 63 SMETS1 Installations.

Option 1 : De-register the PPMID, moving the SMETS1 Installation on to a valid EPCL entry. The PPMID may not be in use; something that may be able to be identified from the SMETS1 SMSO’s Comms Hub device log.

Option 2 : DCC could reclassify the PPMIDs associated with these combinations as IHDs, which have a lower security standard and do not need to be tested for compatibility in the same way as PPMIDs.

Another respondent also supported the principle of uneconomic to test but expressed concern that substantive equivalence to add DMC4 to the EPCL was prematurely ruled out. DCC discussed this matter with the respondent and having further considered it, has

⁸ These ‘Unaccounted SMETS1 Devices’ do not appear on the data provided to DCC by the SMETS1 SMSOs.

⁹ In December 2021 DCC issued an RFI on Unaccounted SMETS1 Devices

<https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/consultations/smets1-request-for-information-unaccounted-smets1-devices/>

concluded that DMC4 can be progressed to the EPCL under substantive equivalence. DCC is now progressing DMC4 via the DMCT Process on this basis (via EPCL Report 28).

DCC notes the support for the principle that DCC should consider whether it is uneconomic to test. The costs DCC presented were an estimate based on actual costs of prior testing under the DMCT Process and are therefore considered a reasonable approximation. The figure per DMC is presented as an average cost for testing a dual fuel DMC with an attached PPMID. There is no variation of testing cost due to device manufacturer, though it should be noted that single fuel DMCs are cheaper to test than dual fuel, and DMCs without a PPMID are cheaper to test than those with a PPMID. Whilst the costs might be slightly lower in some circumstances, DCC considers that the costs under any plausible testing scenario far outweigh the costs of replacing the SMETS1 Installation with SMETS2+ Devices and undertaking testing is therefore not in consumers interests given the limited number of SMETS1 Installations that are under consideration.

DCC can confirm that it has determined that the listed DMCs (as set out in the Various 1 Consultation document) either require testing or could be added to the EPCL via substantive equivalence¹⁰ to another of the listed DMCs that require testing. DCC has discounted the application of substantive equivalence (other than DMC4) for these DMCs to existing EPCL entries as the DMCs in question all have a PPMID from a manufacturer whose PPMID has never been through the DMCT Process in combination with those meters. DCC does not consider that such PPMIDs can be progressed on the basis of substantive equivalence as DCC knows there are differences between manufacturers in their ZigBee implementations. Specifically, DCC has seen issues where PPMIDs from different manufacturers behave differently with the same meter model. Accordingly, DCC does not believe these DMCs can be added to the EPCL via substantive equivalence.

DCC discussed the alternative options for Migration with the respondent that proposed them. DCC explained that the alternative approaches to migrating the 63 SMETS1 Installations¹¹ that were proposed by that respondent have some merit for Active Meters but not for Dormant Meters as set out below.

- Option 1 (de-register the PPMID), and
- Option 2 (reclassify as IHD)

Option 1 is a possibility for Active Meters for both the IOC and FOC cohort, as for these SMETS1 Installations, the Energy Supplier could instruct their SMETS1 SMSO to de-register the SMETS1 PPMID. Where the Energy Supplier for an Active Meter chooses to do this, the DCC notes that there are already EPCL entries that contains the DMC(s) without the SMETS1 PPMID.

For the IOC cohort, where the SMETS1 Installation contains solely Dormant Meters, this would require a solution / regulatory change as DCC doesn't have the right / ability to instruct a SMETS1 SMSO to de-register a PPMID for a Dormant. Within the scope of this consultation, there are two (2) installations that are impacted for the IOC cohort. DCC accordingly does not consider that consulting on an amendment to the TMAD and the associated solution change would be a proportionate outcome for the IOC cohort. As DCC is also seeking to close the IOC Requesting Party down, DCC is further of the view that there is a potential that these regulatory changes / system changes would delay the close down of

¹⁰ Full guidance on Substantive Equivalence is available here: [Search Results | Smart DCC](#)

¹¹ These are the 63 SMETS1 Installations originally proposed in the Various 1 consultation - <https://www.smartdcc.co.uk/customer-engagement/smets1-consultation-various-1/>

the Requesting Party for IOC, which will result in further significant cost which additionally outweighs the benefits from enrolment of these extra SMETS1 Installations.

For the FOC cohort, where the SMETS1 Installation contains solely Dormant Meters, this would require a regulatory change (but a solution change is not required) as DCC doesn't have the right / ability to instruct a SMETS1 SMSO to de-register a PPMID for a Dormant Installation. Within the scope of this consultation, in the case of dormant only FOC installations, there are currently none that have a PPMID that could be de-registered. Stakeholders should note that this change is being progressed for the FOC (BG) cohort as it will allow other SMETS1 Installations to be unblocked. DCC will be proposing a TMAD change within the planned Closure 2 Consultation which is expected to be published later this year.

Option 2 is not zero cost as there would need to be a solution change to facilitate this change for IOC and FOC and given the limited number of sites, DCC is of the opinion that this is uneconomic.

When DCC discussed these two options with the respondent that proposed them, that respondent stressed that they remain concerned regarding the need for early replacement of any SMETS1 Installation. DCC reiterates that they are endeavouring to migrate as many SMETS1 Installations into the DCC System as possible.

One respondent agreed with the proposal on the basis that DCC had contacted impacted Suppliers to confirm the numbers within each DMC category are a true representation of installations within that DMC. This proposal is based on data provided to DCC by Energy Suppliers and SMETS1 SMSOs. Thus, DCC considers it reasonable to assume that these 25 Installations (as per the newest data) are a fair representation of the SMETS1 Installations that would be unblocked were testing under the DMCT Process to be undertaken. DCC notes that this number may fluctuate by a very small margin as the numbers can change slightly as additional information is provided by Suppliers and SMSOs. DCC notes that there is a small possibility that the uneconomic to test outcome may need to be revisited should a material number of further SMETS1 Installations be identified that align to these DMCs, however, DCC considers this to be an unlikely edge case. As set out earlier, should this edge case come to fruition, and it is considered appropriate DCC will propose further amendments to the regulatory framework to bring such DMCs back in scope of the process.

DCC also notes that no responses to this consultation suggested changes to the DMC data presented in the Various 1 Consultation. Please note the changes that are referred to in Section 2 – Data Changes Since Consultation.

4.1.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

There were no remaining areas of disagreement with DCC's proposal that it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process for the DMCs specified in Attachment 2 (of the Various 1 Consultation).

4.1.3. Summary

In summary, DCC is progressing DMC4 through the DMCT Process via substantive equivalence and there is no longer any need to progress DMC2. DCC recommends that it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process for the remaining 4 DMCs proposed in the Various 1 Consultation document. These remaining 4 DMCs on which DCC is seeking a decision from the Secretary of State are presented in Attachment 2.

4.2. Proposed Excluded Category – Uneconomic to Test (Various 1 Q7)

DCC sought views on the proposal for an Excluded Category where it is uneconomic to test under the DMCT Process asking: *“Do you agree with DCC’s proposal to exclude SMETS1 Installations where it is decided by the Secretary of State that it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process, subject to the Secretary of State not directing otherwise, as captured by Clause 18.5 of the TMAD? Do you have any detailed comments on the relevant changes to the legal drafting? Please provide a rationale for your views.”*

4.2.1. Respondents’ Comments / DCC Analysis / Clarifications

Nine of the respondents provided a response to this question. Three of these respondents supported the proposed Excluded Category where it is uneconomic to test.

Two respondents expressed support for the proposed Excluded Category without further comment.

One respondent expressed concern about the quantity of testing under the DMCT Process given that new SMETS1 firmware could be released in future years that would require testing. DCC discussed this concern with the respondent. DCC explained that the ‘migration’ testing element drives the expense given the need to include various service provider activity over about six weeks to test the range of activity within Migration. DCC has taken efficiency steps to streamline such costs by testing only the Dormant version of a DMC and then relying on other test evidence which has significantly reduced testing costs. The respondent’s concerns were focused on the on-going testing of new firmware in the years ahead once all migrations are complete. DCC explained that such testing falls into the scope of PPCT (an enduring testing service under the ETAD). Post enrolment, new firmware is tested via PPCT which is much narrower (as it excludes elements related to migration) and costs are considerably lower. The respondent accepted DCC’s explanation regarding the DMCT Process vs PPCT and the respondent’s concerns were resolved.

One respondent sought confirmation whether substantive equivalence could be used for all of these DMCs that were the scope of the uneconomic to test proposals in the Various 1 Consultation document. DCC can confirm that substantive equivalence has been previously considered for these DMCs but was deemed not to be appropriate (this is explained in more detail in Section 3.1.1 above), except in the case of DMC4 where that position has now changed (as explained in Section 4.1.1).

One respondent indicated that DCC should refer to their response to Q6 and did not present any further information in response to this question.

One respondent repeated their response to Q6. This respondent agreed with the proposal on the basis that DCC had contacted impacted Suppliers to confirm the numbers within each DMC category are a true representation of installations within that DMC. DCC can confirm that the information that is contained in this consultation response is based on the most recent information available from Suppliers and SMSOs. This matter is discussed in Section 3.1.1 above.

Three respondents suggested that any further DMCs considered uneconomic to test should be presented to the BEIS Technical and Business Design Group (TBDG) subgroup on SMETS1 enrolment to allow for review of the conclusion, prior to any final Secretary of State decision. The existing process for assessing if DMCs are uneconomic to test under the DMCT Process is captured via Clause 20.7 of the SMETS1 SVTAD which requires public consultation with stakeholders prior to DCC making a formal recommendation to the Secretary of State which may include further stakeholder engagement on areas of disagreement. DCC does not consider it efficient to introduce a further regulatory step in

the DMCT Process whereby a draft proposal is made to a transitional governance forum prior to a formal proposal by DCC to the Secretary of State.

4.2.2. Areas of Unresolved Disagreement

DCC considers that the DMCT Process already provides sufficient consultation / stakeholder engagement. On this basis, DCC concludes that the SMETS1 SVTAD should not be amended to mandate an additional review role for the TBDG or its E&A subgroup within the DMCT Process related to uneconomic to test.

4.2.3. Summary

In summary, DCC recommends that an Excluded Category is added where it is uneconomic to undertake the DMCT Process for a DMC. DCC considers that it is prudent to include this Excluded Category to account for the circumstance where DMCs are considered as uneconomic to test.

5. Summary of Drafting Changes

There are no drafting changes to the TMAD resulting from consultation feedback.

The TMAD version used for the consultation was based on v16.0. However, there have been subsequent changes to the TMAD and the current version is now v21.0. Thus, the changes proposed within this conclusion are presented as v22.v1p2 draft as a delta version against the latest v21.0.

Clause 18.5 from the consultation version of the TMAD has been subject to minor drafting changes following legal review and is now split into two new Clauses which are added as Clause 18.15 and 18.16. There is also text included in Clause 1.9 in line with the consultation version.

6. Conclusions

This conclusions report constitutes a proposal to the Secretary of State by the DCC pursuant to Clause 20.7 of the SMETS1 SVTAD that the DMCs listed in Attachment 2 should not be tested on the grounds that it is not economic to test. In making such a proposal, DCC can confirm that it has complied with the procedural requirements set out in Clause 20.7.

This conclusion document also confirms DCC's proposed associated changes to the TMAD. DCC is confident that the version of the TMAD submitted to the Secretary of State reflects the requirements for document submission.

DCC is of the opinion that it has undertaken appropriate consultation with industry regarding these changes to the TMAD.

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

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

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

DCC considers that:

- the revised TMAD is defined to a sufficient level of detail for re-designation into the SEC;
- the revised TMAD provides 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 TMAD is materially complete, and the content is technically accurate.

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

7. Next Steps

DCC has submitted this conclusions report to the Secretary of State on the date of publication of this document.

DCC expects the Secretary of State to make a decision on whether it agrees with the DCC proposal that the DMCs set out in Attachment 2 to this conclusion document should not be tested on the grounds that it is not economic to test.

Should the Secretary of State agree, the amendment to the TMAD would also need to be made to make those DMCs the subject of an Excluded Category. However, given the delay in concluding, a further consultation is required on the date for re-designation of such a TMAD amendment. This designation date consultation will be progressed separately. Also, the planned Closure 2 Consultation (which is expected to be published later this year) will include an amendment to the TMAD to permit DCC to instruct the SMETS1 SMSO to de-register the SMETS1 PPMID for FOC (BG) where there are Dormant Meters.

8. Attachments

Attachment	Title
1.	Supporting Data In Respect of DMCs Considered Uneconomic to Test
2.	DMCs for which a decision is sought from the Secretary of State
3.	TMAD v22.v1p2 draft delta against current version v21.0

Table 3 - Attachments

Attachment 1 – Supporting Data In Respect of DMCs Considered Uneconomic to Test

The table below provides supporting data for the list of DMCs that DCC is proposing it is not economic to test, and therefore should be excluded.

Cohort	DMC #	Hub HW	Hub FW	ESME HW	ESME FW	GSME HW	GSME FW	PPMID Manufacturer	PPMID HW	PPMID FW	Operating Status	Installs
IOC	DMC 1	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BKG4	00-10-94	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2.07.00	Dormant	2
IOC	DMC 1	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BKG4	00-10-94	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2.11.01	Dormant	6
IOC	DMC 1	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BKG4	00-10-94	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2.11.01	Mixed	5
IOC	DMC 1	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BKG4	00-10-94	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2-11-01	Dormant	2
IOC	DMC 1	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BKG4	00-10-94-RT	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2.11.01	Mixed	1
IOC	DMC 1	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BKG4	00-10-94-RT2	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2.11.01	Mixed	1
IOC	DMC 3	Elster AM110R	3-07-09-P53-REV09	Elster AS300P	60250	Elster BK-G4 V2 E15.03	02-06-17	Chameleon	IHD3-MS	2.11.01	Dormant	9
FOC-EB	DMC 5	SEAP-2001-V	2.2.8	E470 MK1	23.07.01.00	G370	03.00.01.67	Geo	Duet II	2.0.1.9.61	Active	3
FOC-EB	DMC 5	SEAP-2001-V	2.2.8	E470 MK1	23.07.01.00	G370	03.00.01.67	Geo	Duet II	2.0.1.9.61	Dormant	2
FOC-EA	DMC 6	SEAP-2001-V	2.2.8	E470 MK1	23.07.01.00	G370	03.00.01.61	L+G	P450 Pebble	4.21.0.0	Active	1

Table 4 – Supporting Data In Respect of DMCs Considered Uneconomic to Test

Attachment 2 – DMCs for which a decision is sought from the Secretary of State

The DMCs that DCC is proposing are uneconomic to test pursuant to Clause 20.7 of Appendix AK to the SEC - SEC Variation Testing Approach Document for SMETS1 Services are set out in the yellow columns in the table below.

DMC title used for reference in this document	CH Device Model					ESME Device Model					GSME Device Model					PPMID Device Model				
	Manufacturer identifier	Model identifier	Hardware version.version	Hardware version.revision	Firmware version	Manufacturer identifier	Model identifier	Hardware version.version	Hardware version.revision	Firmware version	Manufacturer identifier	Model identifier	Hardware version.version	Hardware version.revision	Firmware version	Manufacturer identifier	Model identifier	Hardware version.version	Hardware version.revision	Firmware version
DMC 1	10:57	01:10	01	10	2EDBE909	10:57	03:00	01	01	0401EB5A	10:57	05:73	00	00	00000446	10:E0	00:03	05	00	00021101
DMC 3	10:57	01:10	01	10	2EDBE909	10:57	03:00	01	01	0401EB5A	10:57	05:74	01	01	00005089	10:E0	00:03	05	00	00021101
DMC 5	10:C7	00:03	02	00	22080000	10:63	00:02	01	01	23070100	10:63	37:71	00	01	03000167	10:90	00:03	01	00	2001093D
DMC 6	10:C7	00:03	02	00	22080000	10:63	00:02	01	01	23070100	10:63	37:71	00	01	03000161	10:63	00:90	01	01	04210000

Table 5 – DMCs for which a decision is sought from the Secretary of State