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.

Paper Reference:	**SECP_72_1309_05**
Action:	**For Information**

TABASC Effectiveness Review (third iteration) Issue

1. Purpose

SEC Section F1.4 requires the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), on behalf of the Panel, to review and report on the effectiveness of:

(e) the End-to-End Technical Architecture;

(f) the Business Architecture; and

(g) the HAN Requirements.

The SEC Panel meeting on 12 August 2016 approved the Panel directions for TABASC to undertake the three reviews.

TABASC undertook surveys in April and September of 2018. With the installed base of SMETS2 smart meters approaching 1.5 million, with the concomitant move from an installation to an operational focus, the TABASC agreed that the time was appropriate for a third iteration of the survey, and this will be issued on 9 September.

The purpose of the exercise is to help identify areas in the current service where attention may be required.

The purpose of this paper is to inform the Panel of the current status of that third iteration, and of the next steps. A copy of the word version of the questionnaire has been included as Appendix A.

2. Logistics

Who? The survey will be issued to SEC Parties, operational DCC Users or those undergoing the User Entry Process.

When? It will be issued 9 September 2019 and recipients will have one month to respond.

Where? It will be an online survey (Survey Monkey) with a printable version available to collect responses within an organisation.

The questionnaire has been simplified since the previous iteration to make it easier to complete and encourage participation.

3. Survey Content

The survey focuses on seven key areas of Service performance:

- DCC Connectivity & Functionality;
- HAN & Device Performance;
- Firmware Issues;
- System Performance;
- Business Process Issues;
- Security and PKI; and
- Any other Issues the Party is experiencing.

4. The Review Process

The process for collecting and analysing response is shown below.

Figure 1: The Review Process

Depending on responses to the questionnaires, the TABASC may recommend that the Panel formally request the OPSG Data Quality Issue Sub-Group to conduct a more in-depth analysis of the issue.

5. Recommendations

The Panel is requested to **NOTE** the contents of this paper.

Alan Bateman

SECAS Team

6 September 2019

Appendix A: Questionnaire Format

TABASC Effectiveness Review Questionnaire on Live Operations

Context and Purpose

Who?

The Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) is engaging with SEC Parties and DCC Users, with a focus on operational DCC Users or those undergoing the User Entry Process.

What?

This questionnaire has been issued to SEC Parties.

The findings will be shared with the SEC Panel and its Sub-committees only to inform whether further work is required in relation to the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture, Business Architecture, HAN requirements and any operational issues affecting the User experience with the End-to-End processes including those managed and provided by the DCC.

One questionnaire response is requested per organisation. Each organisation response should include feedback from the technical and operational aspects of each organisation.

Where an issue results from a known defect then there is no need to describe that in detail.

Why?

On direction from the SEC Panel and in accordance with SEC Section F1.4 the TABASC is required to review the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture, Business Architecture and the HAN requirements. The questionnaire findings will help inform whether further investigation is required.

When?

The questionnaire is open for responses for 1 month from it being issued and will close on 9 October 2019. It should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Where?

This questionnaire has been made available here via SurveyMonkey (it can also be printed for review internally before providing a single response online).

Confidentiality

It is recognised that any information you provide may have commercial sensitivity and will be treated in confidence for analysis, and any resulting recommendations reported to the SEC Panel.

The survey is being undertaken by SECAS on behalf of the TABASC. All information will be treated in confidence.

However, if a DCC User identifies an emerging problem, it might be necessary for the TABASC to obtain further details for clarification. For this reason, the Questionnaire asks for the name of your Organisation and Contact details (for any necessary follow-up).

1. Organisation details

Full name:	
Company:	
Email:	
Telephone Number:	

Number of Commissioned Devices:

0	1 - 50	51 - 500	501 - 5000	>5000
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

What percentage of your installed smart metering systems include pre-payment Devices?

0%	1 - 10%	11 - 25%	26 - 50%	>50%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. DCC Systems, Services and Processes

How satisfied are you with the systems, services and processes (including those associated with the Communications Hub) provided by the DCC for your business operations? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	

Have your business operations been adversely affected by the performance of the DCC Systems, services or processes? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High, or leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

If the adverse performance issues have arisen from the below, please indicate the severity of the impact:	**Impact**
Poor network connectivity to the DCC using the Gamma link	
Poor application connectivity using the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS)	
Overall system response times	

Connectivity with Communications Hubs in the CSP North Region	
Connectivity with Communications Hubs in the CSP Central and South Regions	
Incidents and problems relating to the technical architecture	
DCC business services or processes	
A lack of technical functionality available now	
A lack of functionality in the overall system	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

If you have experienced any of the below, please indicate the severity of the impact:	**Impact**
Data quality issues when using the DCC services or processes e.g. discrepancies between data held by your organisation compared to that held within/by the DCC	
Disruptions to services as a consequence of data quality issues?	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

Have you identified any other areas of DCC systems, services and processes that require improvement? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed:

3. Home Area Network (HAN) and Device Performance

How satisfied are you with the performance of the HAN and associated Devices? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	

Have your business operations been adversely affected by HAN or Device performance? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High or leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

If the performance issues have arisen from the below, please indicate the severity of the impact:	**Impact**
Responsiveness of Devices on the HAN	
The range of 2.4GHz connectivity (does coverage meet expectations)	
The range of 868MHz (Dual Band) connectivity? (does coverage meet expectations)	
Problems with integrating In Home Displays or Pre-Payment Interface Devices	
Problems with interoperability between Devices on the HAN, e.g. different versions of specifications or where more than one Supplier is involved	
Problems with interchangeability, e.g. when inheriting equipment on churn	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

If the HAN or Device problems had an apparent link to installations, please indicate the severity of the impact:	**Impact**
In the North CSP region	
In the Central CSP region	
In the Southern CSP region	
Involving Mesh Networks	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

If you have identified any areas for improvement in HAN and Device performance, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed:

4. Firmware Upgrades

Do you have experience of Firmware Upgrades via the DCC? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High or leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

What percentage of firmware updates are completed successfully?

<40%%	40 - 60%	61 - 80%	81 - 90%	>90%
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If the firmware upgrade issues have arisen from the following, please indicate the severity of the impact:	Impact
Firmware Upgrades to the ESME	
Firmware Upgrades to the GSME	
Firmware Upgrades to the Communications Hub in the North Region	
Firmware Upgrades to the Communications Hub in the Central and South Regions	
The process used by the vendor to provide ESME or GSME Firmware to the Supplier	
The process used by the Supplier to provide ESME or GSME Firmware to the DCC	
The listing of the Firmware version in the Central Product List (CPL)	
The distribution of the Firmware Upgrade by the DCC (e.g. within expected timescales)	
Activation of the Firmware Upgrade (e.g. did it happen as expected)	
The quality and effectiveness of Firmware in live operation (e.g. errors encountered)	
Any other causes	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

If you have identified any areas relating to firmware upgrades for improvement, please specify and indicate how they are being progressed:

5. System Performance

How satisfied are you with the system performance to date? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	

Have installation rates been adversely affected by overall system performance? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High or leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

If the problem has arisen from any of the below, please indicate the severity of the impact:	Impact
DCC Commissioning systems and processes not working effectively (e.g. preventing the meter being commissioned by the Supplier)	
User Installation systems and processes challenges (e.g. use of HHT to install)	
User Commissioning systems and process challenges (e.g. allowing Devices to be Commissioned and SMKI Certificates changed)	
User Commissioning systems and process challenges (e.g. allowing Devices to be Commissioned and SMKI Certificates changed)	
Service Requests not being processed quickly enough (end to end)	
Not receiving the information you need from the system quickly enough	
Incorrect or missing alerts	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

What proportion of aborted installations are due to the above issues?

0%	1% - 25%	26% - 50%	51% - 75%	>75%	No installs undertaken
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please include any supporting details below indicating how the issue is being progressed.

If you have identified any areas relating to System Performance for improvement, please specify and indicate how they are being progressed:

6. Business Processes

How satisfied are you with the current business processes? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	

Have your business operations been adversely affected by the smart metering business processes? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High or leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

If the problem has arisen from any of the below, please indicate the severity of the impact:	Impact
Installations being delayed due to a technical issue(s) in the DCC Systems affecting business processes	
Installations being delayed due to a technical issue(s) in User Systems affecting business processes	

Business as Usual (BAU) operational processes taking longer or needing more resources due to technical issues	
Specific business processes not performing as planned (e.g. Change of Supplier)	
Submission of Threshold Anomaly Detection values	
The release of quarantined messages	
The processes affecting the consumer experience (e.g. requiring consumer contact or manual processing to complete readings, billings and changes of circumstances)	
Service Requests not supporting the User obligations	
The technical architecture not being capable of supporting smart home services	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

If you have identified any areas related to business performance for improvement, please specify and indicate how they are being progressed:

7. Issues related to SMKI, DCCKI, and / or IKI

How satisfied are you with the operation of SMKI, DCCKI and IKI to date? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	

Have your business operations been adversely affected by any key infrastructure issues? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High or leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

If the problem has arisen from any of the below, please indicate the severity of the impact:	**Impact**
The use of SMKI Keys, Certificates or process involving Senior Responsible Officers (SRO) and Authorised Responsible Officers (ARO)	
The use of DCCKI processes for DCC connectivity	
The use of IKI processes for file-signing (e.g. Threshold Anomaly Detection)	

Please describe the nature and extent of these or any other problems:

If you have you identified any areas related to SMKI, DCCKI and/or IKI for improvement, please specify and indicate how they are being progressed:

8. Any other issues

If you have any other issues that you would like to bring to the attention of the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), please specify and indicate how they are being progressed: