

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

MP242 'Change to Operational Metrics to Measure on Success'

July 2023 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Rachel Black (RBI)	SECAS
Kev Duddy (KD)	SECAS
Bradley Baker (BB)	SECAS
Rainer Lischetzki (RL)	SECAS
Abhijit Pal (AP)	DCC
Christopher Thompson (CT)	DCC
David Walsh (DW)	DCC
Tom Rothery (TR)	DCC
Alex Hurcombe (AH)	EDF
Sharon Armitage (SA)	EON
Martin Bell (MB)	EUA
Rachael Prosser (RP)	National Grid
Joey Manners (JM)	Octopus Energy
Ralph Baxter (RB)	Octopus Energy
Audrey Smith-Keary (ASK)	OVO
Mahfuzar Rahman (MRa)	Scottish Power
Shuba Khatun (SK)	SSEN
Kevin Clark (KC)	Utilita

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, and the proposed business requirements.

Issue

- [MP122A 'Operational Metrics'](#) introduced Target Response Times into the Smart Energy Code (SEC).
- The Data Communications Company (DCC) cannot measure Target Response Times without a huge spend (as indicated in the [MP217 'Obtaining Timestamps to allow Target Response Time Measurements'](#) Preliminary Assessment).

Impact

- Currently, the DCC is measuring Round Trip Times and reporting against the Target Response Times within SEC Section H ‘DCC Services’.
- This reduces the value of current reporting to the Operations Group (OPSG) and as part of Ofgem’s Operational Performance Regime (OPR).

Proposed Solution

- Intent – This modification will capture the consumer experience and pinpoint areas of concern through determining the success or failure of an agreed set of Service Reference Variants (SRVs).
- Solution – To agree a definition of ‘Success’ and ‘Failure’ for the SRVs captured within six business processes. The DCC will then provide additional reporting against these metrics.
- Rationale – The OPSG and Working Group did not recommend that MP217 is progressed due to the high associated costs. The Proposer and other Parties have stated that current reporting does not necessarily reflect the consumers’ experience.

Business requirements

Business Requirements		
Ref.	Requirement	Responsible for delivery
1	This modification will capture the consumer experience and pinpoint areas of concern through determining the success or failure of an agreed set of SRVs.	DCC
2	The Data Communications Company (DCC) is to measure the success of the SRVs of the following six Business Processes captured in SEC Section H13.1A: • Install and Commission¹ • Change of Supplier (Gain) • Pre-Payment • Update Device Firmware • Meter Reads • Tariff Updates	DCC
3	The DCC will measure against the following conditions to determine success: • <i>See matrix below. To be agreed following Working Group, OPSG and TABASC discussions.</i>	DCC

¹ Note, although some of the SRVs listed under Install and Commission are applicable to SMETS1, the rollout of SMETS1 Devices has ended and therefore the overall Install and Commission business process is not applicable to SMETS1.

Business Requirements		
Ref.	Requirement	Responsible for delivery
4	The conditional success / failure will be agreed by the Working Group before the commencement of the DCC Full Impact Assessment and any additional conditional status will be agreed by the Panel (delegated to the SEC Operations Group (OPSG)).	Working Group
5	If a timeout occurs before an SRV is received by the User, it will automatically be categorised as a failure.	DCC
6	The DCC will continue to report at the same frequency for the SRVs included within the six Business Processes included within requirement 2 as per SEC Section H13.4.	DCC
7	The data included in the report will be classified as a Performance Measure / Business Process Indicator (<i>To be determined following Working Group, OPSG and TABASC discussions.</i>).	Working Group / OPSG

The DCC's initial matrix for requirement 3:

Scenario	DUIS Response Code	GBCS Execution Status	DCC Outcome	Business Outcome
SRV passes DSP validation	I99	N/A	ACK	n/a
SRV fails DSP validation	E1 – E100 (not E20 or E21)	N/A	Success	Failure
SRV failed to send to CSP/S1SP	E20	N/A	Failure	Failure
No response from CSP/device	E21	N/A	Failure	Failure
Response received – GBCS Success	I0	Success	Success	Success
Response received – GBCS Failure	I0	Failure	Success	Failure

Working Group Discussion

SECAS (BB) provided an overview of the issue, the intent of the modification and the proposed business requirements.

DCC Success / Failure matrix

The DCC (DW) provided the Working Group with an overview of the first iteration of a matrix that sets out the success and failure of SRVs. They stated that their column headers (DCC Outcome and

Business Outcome) will be separate points in which the DCC will use to determine whether or not an SRV has been successful or not. The DCC added that the reporting will show if the SRV has been successful from a DCC perspective as well as from a User's perspective. For example, if an SRV fails Data Service Provider (DSP) validation, it will be deemed a success for the DCC, but a business failure for the User.

The DCC informed the Working Group that the matrix is still being developed and that it is currently investigating timeout parameters.

The Working Group noted the update and provided no further comments.

Business requirements

SECAS (BB) asked the Working Group if it approved the business requirements presented. A Working Group member (RB) queried whether the solution could be delivered in a more cost-effective manner compared to previous and other current reporting modifications. They advised that it would be advantageous not to end up in a similar situation to MP217 where the solution is too costly to implement. The DCC (DW) stated that the costs will be investigated during the Preliminary Assessment. They added that this modification differs from MP217 as it is looking to identify where issues occur across an SRV's journey, rather than introducing timestamps to accurately measure SRV performance. The current Proposed Solution is expected to be a DSP-only change.

The Working Group agreed with the business requirements, and supported the modification's next steps.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to present the modification to the TABASC.
- SECAS to present the modification to the OPSG.
- SECAS to request the DCC Preliminary Assessment.