

This document is classified as **White**. Information can be shared with other SEC Parties and SMIP stakeholders at large, but not published (including publication online).

# Operations Group Meeting

## OPSG\_22\_0207, 2 July 2019

### 10:00 – 16:30

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

## Final Minutes

### Attendees:

Category	Operations Group Members
Operations Group Chair	Dave Warner
DCC	Steve Stathakis
DCC	Alex Henighan
Network Party	Jeremy Meara (Alternate)
Network Party	Matt Alexander
Large Supplier	Rachael Anderson (Teleconference)
Large Supplier	John Noad (Alternate) (Teleconference)
Large Supplier	Tony Shanahan (Alternate)
Large Supplier	Rochelle Harrison (Alternate)
Large Supplier	Mark Lewis
Large Supplier	Mark Field
Large Supplier	Paul Clark
Small Supplier	Kate Barnes
Small Supplier	Heidi Wilbor

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Darren Robbins
DCC	Mo Asif (Part)
DCC	Wendy Liddell (Part)
DCC	Penny Brown (Part)
DCC	Richard Cooper (Part)
DCC	Courtney O'Connor
DCC	Rob Dickson (Teleconference)
DCC	Gary Fairclough (Teleconference)

Managed by

Telefonica	Stephen Easto (Part)
Telefonica	Tim Parker (Part)
SECAS	Alan Bateman (Part)
SECAS	Tim Hall
SECAS	Tim Newton
SECAS	Huw Exley
SECAS	Veronica Asantewaa
BEIS	Natasha Free (Part)
BEIS	Fahad Akhter
Ofgem	Michael Walls (Teleconference) (Part)

### Apologies:

Representing	Name
Network Party	Tom Pollock
Large Supplier	Endika Enes
Other SEC Party	Geoff Huckerby
Other SEC Party	Elias Hanna
Small Supplier	Simon Dowse
TABASC	Julian Hughes

## 1. Previous Meeting Minutes

The Chair welcomed the Members to the 22nd Operations Group (OPSG) meeting and invited comments regarding the Draft Minutes for OPSG\_21.

A Large Supplier (LS) Member noted that a link should be provided in the minutes to the SECAS website where Major Incident Reports are published. No further comments were made and the OPSG **AGREED** that the minutes would be published as final with the above addition.

## 2. Panel Feedback Report

SECAS provided a verbal update on feedback that had been received at the June SEC Panel meeting. The Chair reported he also provided a presentation to the Smart Metering Delivery Group (SMDG), and the SMDG had subsequently requested a monthly update from the OPSG in the form of a dashboard report. The Chair confirmed that he, together with SECAS and DCC are developing the format for such an update.

### 3. Actions Outstanding

SECAS presented the actions outstanding table from previous OPSG meetings. Actions were noted as completed where appropriate.

Action ID	Action	Owner
<b>OPSG 16/02</b>	The DCC to provide the approved and new cost comparison information as soon as possible and confirm which costs had been included in the indicative charging statement, for Production Proving	DCC
<p>This action was originally closed due to anticipated discussions at the Quarterly DCC Finance Update Forum, the DCC noted that during this forum questions regarding cost were not asked by Users. OPSG Members requested the action to be reopened, as they believed that the Finance Update Forum was not appropriate for discussions bringing together costs and benefits. It was noted that SECAS and the DCC will discuss offline to establish the best approach to address the concerns.</p> <p><b>Action Status: Open</b></p>		
<b>OPSG 20/06</b>	DCC to confirm how the 'Power Outage Events' Performance Measures are defined and if they are being reported correctly for the measurement period.	DCC
<p>The Chair noted that further clarification is required on this Metric. The DCC noted that it was working with individual Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) and would provide a further update at the August OPSG meeting.</p> <p><b>Action Status: Open</b></p>		
<b>OPSG 21/09</b>	SECAS and DCC to discuss the current forecast reporting process and DCC to provide an update at the July meeting.	DCC
<p>The DCC provided slides noting that they have addressed the errors which lead to them incorrectly identifying Parties as not having submitted forecasts when in fact they had. OPSG Members noted that the DCC's interpretation of the SEC regarding the calculation of Service Request and Certificate Signing Request numbers differed from their own, leading to the discrepancies currently</p>		

Action ID	Action	Owner
<p>seen between forecasted and actual numbers of both. OPSG Members noted that, given the DCC's interpretation, it was difficult to see how Parties could make an accurate forecast.</p> <p>The Chair requested this issue to be added to the Operations Issues Log and that an approach to manage the issue is developed as soon as possible. <b>Action Status: Closed</b></p>		
<b>OPSG 21/14</b>	DCC to work with Suppliers to improve the Firmware Update process and initiate this by 18 June 2019.	DCC
<p>A LS noted that the update given by the DCC for this action was about communication of the update process, however the action covered the entire Over the Air (OTA) firmware process (this Action had followed on from a presentation by an OPSG Member at a previous meeting which raised queries and concerns about various aspects of the process) . The Chair requested that the DCC urgently arrange a workshop with DCC Users to review the process as a whole.</p> <p><b>Action Status: Open</b></p>		

#### 4. Incident Lifecycle

The DCC presented the OPSG with a high-level overview of the Major Incident lifecycle, detailing the communications issued to Users.

The Chair questioned whether the DCC would produce a procedural document to accompany the process. The DCC confirmed that they would and agreed to share this document with the OPSG prior to the August OPSG meeting.

A BEIS representative noted that Category 1 and 2 Incidents have an associated Problem Record and that this should be included in the closure communications of each such Incident.

A Small Supplier (SS) queried whether it would be possible for SEC Parties to join the Post Incident Review (PIR) calls hosted by the DCC following each Major Incident. The DCC noted the highly technical nature of the calls and highlighted fears of disruption if the calls are over-subscribed. The Parties however noted attendance would be useful and a max number of attendees on a first come first served basis was suggested.

The DCC noted that the process outlined within the lifecycle would be fully operational within two weeks of the meeting. The Chair noted that it would be useful to add measurement points to the lifecycle showing the metrics seen at each point.

The OPSG noted the much-improved clarity and content of the process as presented by DCC.

**ACTION OPSG 22/01:** The DCC to produce a user guide and user procedure for the Incident management process and distribute to OPSG Members prior to the August OPSG meeting.

## 5. Operational Dashboard

The DCC presented their draft Operational Dashboard for the OPSG to review. The OPSG noted that they are happy with the initial scope of the draft. The OPSG suggested various possible amendments and additions to the dashboard that could increase usefulness such as inclusion of SMETS 1 data. The DCC noted that the dashboard is open to change, and it was noted that OPSG Members should send any feedback SECAS. It was agreed that the DCC should begin presenting the dashboard to the OPSG from the OPSG August meeting.

**ACTION OPSG 22/02:** OPSG Members to provide any further comments on the Operational Dashboard to SECAS by 11 July.

## 6. DCC Operational Update

The DCC introduced the Communications Service Provider (CSP) South and Central, who presented an explanation of their recent operational performance and acknowledged to the OPSG that they had not provided an adequate service in April and May 2019. The CSP assured the OPSG that the issues had been resolved and that a number of improvements had been made across their system to mitigate any risk of reoccurrence. SECAS noted that the apparent lack of monitoring of their service was concerning, as service issues should be picked up prior to impacting the live service.

The CSP representatives informed the OPSG that they are undertaking a comprehensive independent review of their End to End architecture. The OPSG welcomed this and requested that they and the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) receive the Terms of Reference for the review and the full report. The DCC said that they would consider if this was possible.

The Chair, supported by OPSG Members, strongly emphasised that after a long period of live operation the CSP was still not delivering a stable and satisfactory service and that, in the view of the Members, this was not acceptable.

## 7. PMR Report

SECAS presented a summary of the April Performance Measurement Report (PMR) and informed the OPSG that the report had had to be reissued as, originally, Service Levels were not reported to the right accuracy. The final issue of the report was published five days later than stipulated in the SEC. A LS Member requested that the DCC investigate whether this issue was a singular occurrence or had been present in previous reports, and whether the error was just one of reporting or existed in the supporting calculations.

It was noted that the Code Performance Measure 1 (CPM1) was below target for the fifth consecutive month. The OPSG expressed their disappointment that the Service Level Agreement (SLA) had not been achieved. The Chair noted that this issue should be escalated to the SEC Panel. The DCC stated that this is due to the failure of the OTA firmware upgrades for meters rather than firmware upgrades for Communications Hubs (CHs). The OPSG requested further confirmation of this and DCC agreed to separately report the OTA and CH upgrades performance to give a more detailed view of the issue, recognising this was information would not be considered part of the formal PMR. The OPSG noted that it still requires clear confirmation that the poor performance in regard to CPM1 has no implications for the forthcoming Release 2.0 CH firmware upgrade programme.

SECAS also noted that there had been a significant increase in the number of PMR exceptions reported in April. It was agreed that there should be an item on the August OPSG meeting agenda to give a detailed view of CH Exceptions definitions, how these are applied and the status of the CHs in each of these categories.

**ACTION OPSG 22/03:** SECAS to escalate CPM1 to the SEC Panel as it is below target for the fifth consecutive month.

**ACTION OPSG 22/04:** DCC to provide separate measurements of the OTA for CH and meter upgrades and reconfirm there are no implications for the Release 2.0 firmware upgrade programme.

**ACTION OPSG 22/05:** DCC to produce an explanation of the figures and trends of CH exceptions at the August OPSG meeting.

## 8. PMR Issues and Review of Metrics

SECAS and the DCC presented the OPSG with a proposed approach to reviewing PMR issues. This would involve SECAS logging tickets with the DCC Service Centre Management mailbox, where these would be logged and triaged appropriately. A LS queried whether the DCC would retrospectively reissue reports. The DCC responded that they would try to avoid this but would need to consider on a case by case basis dependent on the severity of the issue and consequent amendment to the PMR.

SECAS further informed the OPSG that it was developing a project plan and definition to review the current metrics, based on operational experience; SECAS would be proposing an initial workshop to collect User views. The OPSG requested that the workshop be held in August. The Chair noted that the greater the involvement of OPSG Members in the process the better.

SECAS **AGREED** to propose dates for a workshop in August 2019.

**ACTION OPSG 22/06:** SECAS to propose dates for a workshop to discuss the review of metrics in August.

## 9. SEC Panel Reports

SECAS presented a summary of the DCC reports they had reviewed. SECAS presented their review of the Network Enhancement Plan (NEP) Report for Quarter 1. It was noted that it would be useful to have sight of interim milestones prior to the overall 2020 coverage targets, to monitor progress. One suggestion was that such milestones could be added to the newly proposed Operational Dashboard.

The OPSG noted that for the first time, the Certificate Signing Request Forecast Variance reported values that were within the required tolerances.

**ACTION OPSG 22/07:** OPSG Members to provide comments on the SEC Panel reports paper by 4 July.

## 10. Comms Hub Returns

The DCC presented slides on the CH returns process. It was noted that the Quarterly Communication Hub report shows that only a limited number of CHs have been triaged through the process.

OPSG Members expressed extreme frustration that the current process does not meet their requirements for bulk returns as set out in the SEC. This has been raised at numerous OPSG meetings and other industry forums. Members noted that the DCC have failed to provide a response to the OPSG as to when this service will become available. This shortcoming is inhibiting the return of CHs, since it is impractical to return significant volumes using the current process.

SECAS noted that at the April DCC Customer Forum it had been suggested that a bulk returns process would be included in part of the Order Management System (OMS) development. However, the DCC noted that this was still yet to be developed and that it was not included in the current plan.

A LS explained that they have approximately 8000 CHs to return and additional LS Members also expressed that they have similar volumes. The LS explained that these volumes will lead to potential costs to Users, the impact of which was not being considered. The DCC noted that they would work with their Service Managers in order to gain understanding of the scale of the issue for Users.

The OPSG **AGREED** to request the Panel to urge the DCC to develop a bulk returns process in accordance with the SEC requirement. Furthermore, the OPSG requested that the DCC look to immediately engage with its Users to understand their concerns about the current process. This should be done by hosting a workshop to identify improvements.

**ACTION OPSG 22/08:** DCC to host a workshop to engage customers to identify immediate improvements in the CH returns process.

**ACTION OPSG 22/09:** OPSG to request the Panel to urge the DCC to develop a bulk returns process in accordance with the SEC requirement.

## 11. Customer Perspective: Review of SEC Panel Reports

A LS proposed holding an additional monthly OPSG teleconference meeting to review SEC Panel reports. The LS member noted that as per the OPSG Terms of Reference (ToR) reviewing DCC reporting is a key responsibility of the OPSG and noted the benefit of a separate meeting which would allow more time in the OPSG meetings themselves to consider other issues and priorities.

OPSG Members discussed when in the month such a meeting would be most appropriate considering availability of Members and when the reports are published. It was noted that the third week of the month seemed most appropriate, however it was noted that SECAS and the DCC would agree a schedule for approval by OPSG. It was **AGREED** that the additional meeting will commence in September.

**ACTION OPSG 22/10:** SECAS and the DCC to map out a schedule for an additional teleconference meeting to cover DCC reporting.



## 12. Planned Maintenance

The DCC provided an update on their Planned Maintenance trial launched in April 2019, which has a risk based approach to implementing Planned Maintenance changes.

The DCC noted that the trial has been very successful to date and the OPSG agreed. The DCC explained that the trial ends in September. Before this date however the DCC confirmed that they will begin the formal SEC Modification process. It was noted that should the SEC Modification process not conclude before the end of the trial in September, then the DCC would need to ask the Panel for an extension to the trial.

## 13. DCC Ecosystem – Ecosystem Management Framework (EMF)

The DCC presented slides on their Ecosystems Management Framework proposal and the benefits they envisaged arising from a coordinated view of change across the DCC Customers and Service Providers. The DCC described the pilot project which is underway.

The DCC noted that if multiple occurrences of customer driven change occur simultaneously, this can cause disruption to the service. A LS requested that the DCC provide examples of when change has caused disruption to the service noting such examples would help drive customer engagement with the proposal.

The DCC noted that data would be required to be sent by all Users in order to make the process useful, and therefore a Modification may be required to ensure that Users are obliged to participate. Not all OPSG Members were in agreement with this assumption and approach.

The OPSG Chair queried whether dates for wider industry change, for example Master Registration Agreement (MRA) changes, would also be included.

The OPSG queried how regularly the data would be required and the DCC noted that the more often the better, but it was envisioned as monthly.

OPSG Members expressed some surprise and concern regarding some comments from DCC: for example, the envisaged frequency of data updates (which would have resourcing implications for Users), and that planned business changes such as tariff updates were expected to be included (noting the commercial confidentiality of such changes).

OPSG Members asked the DCC to consider whether it was necessary to collect all the data they envisaged or whether the great majority of the envisage benefits could be achieved from less data (such as simply the date and magnitude of changes).

OPSG Members noted that no indicative cost/benefit analysis had been presented and asked that the DCC provide such an analysis, encompassing not just the DCC but all Parties.

The Chair asked how many data items were envisaged to be included in the data to be collected, but the DCC were unable to give any indication of the magnitude.



The Chair noted that the outline project plan that the DCC had presented did not mention the development of an industry process, which would be needed since the EMF project in effect proposed the coupling of change management processes across all Users.

The Chair noted that the data sets required would need to be clearly defined so that all Users understood what was being asked. Members agreed that the DCC would circulate the slides, send out a data information pack of what they require from Users and investigate the cost benefit analysis.

The OPSG expressed concern that the DCC were making this new initiative at the same time as existing service requirements such as the Order Management System and the CH Returns Process, which are not being satisfactorily delivered.

**ACTION OPSG 22/11:** DCC to send out a data information pack of what data is required from Users.

**ACTION OPSG 22/12:** DCC to investigate the cost benefit analysis of the Ecosystems Management Framework.

## 14. Process for Risks / Issues

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting on 3 August.

## 15. Data Quality Issues

SECAS provided an update on the Data Quality Issues on behalf of the Data Quality Issues Resolution Sub-Group (DQIRSG).

The OPSG **AGREED** the following recommendations:

- To close the issue of “Incorrect Information in D0010 flows”, “Incorrect SMETS labelling in industry records” and “Smart Meter Inventory Update Frequency”.
- To add the issue of ‘SSI Audit Trail’ to the issues list; and
- If OPSG Members had any further issues they wish for consideration, these should be submitted to SECAS by 16 July 2019.

SECAS on behalf of the DQIRSG proposed a summary report to the Panel. The OPSG **APPROVED** the submission of the DQIRSG Paper to SEC Panel on behalf of the OPSG.

**ACTION OPSG 22/13:** DQIRSG to add ‘SSI Audit Trail’ issue to the Data Quality issues list.

**ACTION OPSG 22/14:** OPSG Members to submit any further issues to be considered for the Data Quality issues list to SECAS by 16 July 2019.

## 16. SSI Transition /Sprint

The DCC provided an overview of the new process as a result of [SECMP0058 ‘Changes to the governance of the Self-Service Interface’](#). The DCC noted they would be issuing the first consultation

under the new process immediately and that responses from Parties would be reviewed at the August OPSG meeting.

BEIS noted that the time stated to provide costs for the Impact Assessment (IA) was lengthy and queried whether there is potential to shorten the timescales. SECAS advised that “t shirt” sizing estimates were to be provided in the consultation and if consultation responses all suggested this should be progressed, then there could be a means by which the IA could be expedited. It was noted that this was the first time the process would be used and that lessons would be learnt and applied in future.

The Chair noted that a paper from the DCC regarding the outcome of the consultation will need to be provided by the OPSG paper day (30 July) to seek approval at the next OPSG meeting in August.

## 17. Live Service Criteria (LSC) Process for Review

SECAS outlined the schedule and overall scope of the OPSG’s involvement in the review of Live Service Criteria (LSC), following publication of the LSC EPCL<sup>1</sup> expected on the 5 July. The OPSG review of the LSC is to take place on 12 July 2019. The Panel is expected to make its recommendation to BEIS on 19 July 2019.

SECAS explained the process that would be followed at the meeting on 12 July. The Chair noted that this could potentially be a long meeting with complex matters to be considered and therefore it would be important to adhere to the meeting process. The Chair informed Members that they could attend the meeting in person or via teleconference and that alternates could attend in their place if they were not available. Papers for this meeting will be circulated on 5 July and any questions on the content may be sent to SECAS before the meeting.

## 18. New Draft Proposals and Modification Proposals

OPSG Members were asked to provide further comments on the New Draft Proposals and Modification Proposals to SECAS by 16 July 2019.

**ACTION OPSG 22/15:** OPSG Members to provide comments on New Draft Proposals and Modification Proposals paper by 16 July to SECAS.

## 19. Any Other Business

There was no further business and the chair closed the meeting.

### Next Meeting: 6 August 2019

Members are asked to note the additional meetings to consider LSC EPCL:

- **12 July 2019**

---

<sup>1</sup> Live Services Criteria for the initial first entry onto the Eligible Product Combination List (EPCL) for SMETS1’