

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.

<b>Paper Reference:</b>	<b>SECP_74_1511_27</b>
<b>Action:</b>	<b>For Information</b>

## DCC Reporting

### 1. Purpose

This paper details which reports are provided by the DCC for the SEC Panel to review, as required by the Smart Energy Code (SEC).

The Panel is also asked to note the observations raised by the Operations Group (OPSG) against the reports currently delegated to them.

### 2. DCC Reports

The following report has not been delegated to the OPSG and remains a SEC Panel responsibility:

- Post Commissioning Information Report (September 2019)

This report has an **AMBER** classification and distribution is limited to the SEC Panel only and those who have a need to know in order to take action.

### 3. Operations Group Reports Summary

Annex A to this paper provides the full list of reports that were reviewed by the OPSG at its October 2019 DCC reporting teleconference and the observations raised. Below are the key observations.

#### 3.1 Performance Measurement Report

The OPSG reviewed the August 2019 Performance Measurement Report (PMR).

Metrics for the SMETS1 Service Providers have been included for the first time this month. Whilst OPSG welcomed the inclusion of this data, the DCC do not appear to have followed the SEC process for additions to the PMR.

Three Code Performance Measures (CPMs) were below Target Service Level: CPM 1 '*response times for on-demand Service Requests*' at 92.42%, CPM 3 '*Percentage of Alerts delivered within the applicable Target Response Time*' at 98.37% and CPM4 '*Percentage of Incidents which the DCC is responsible for resolving and which within incident Category 1 or 2 that are resolved in accordance with the Incident Management Policy within the target response time*' at 33.33%.

The failure of CPM1 was driven by the underlying Performance Measure (PM) 2 '*Percentage of Category 1 Firmware Payloads completed within TRT*' which was below Target Service Level in both Communication Service Provider Central and South (CSP C&S) regions. However, it was above target in CSP North. This is the eighth time this CPM and underlying PMs have been below Target Service Level in nine months. This issue has previously been escalated to the SEC Panel and the

OPSG are monitoring the issue each month. At the November OPSG meeting representations were given by all three CSP regions on how this issue will be addressed by the end of December.

Service Provider PM 3.2 '*Percentage of Category 3 Alerts delivered to the DCC WAN Gateway Interface within the relevant Target Response Time*' was below Target Service Level in the CSP North (N) region and responsible for the failure of CPM 3. This is the fourth month in a row that this PM has been below target. CSPN are aware of the issue and are working with Service Users to resolve it.

### Category 1 Major Incidents

There were two Major Incidents (MIs) reported in the period. One was a result of the nationwide power disruptions in August which caused a failure within the DSP data centre. Mitigations have been put in place and a review instigated. The other was a failure of the Change of Supplier service. Both Incidents exceeded the Target Resolution Time, causing the failure of CPM4. The DCC has taken action with the Data Service Provider (DSP) to address the resolution times.

### CH Exceptions

The number of CH exceptions continues to grow in both the CSP C&S and CSP N regions. The largest number of exceptions are once again attributed to '*Communications Hubs where no incident has been raised for outage*' in CSP N and '*There were no, or incomplete address details provided by the Service User*' in CSP C&S. There continues to be incorrect CH variants being installed in the CSP C&S. The DCC are following this up with individual SEC Parties.

The number of aged Incidents is increasing month on month, the large majority of which are assigned to Service Users and associated with CH Exceptions.

There is an outstanding action (Action OPSG 12/06) for the DCC to explain how Exceptions are agreed and what actions are being taken to address them. Work between the DCC, the Technical Operations Centre (TOC), CSPs, BEIS and SECAS continues with regular updates provided at OPSG meetings and a fuller report planned for the December OPSG meeting.

### 3.3 Service Request Variance Report and Certificate Signing Request Variance Reports

OPSG members observed that there continue to be Users consuming DCC Services that are not submitting forecasts. For September there were 15 Users that are consuming Certificate Signing Services that have not submitted forecasts and 14 Users submitting Service Requests that have not completed forecasts. One Large Supplier is included in both of these figures.

## 4. Recommendations

The Panel is requested to **NOTE** the OPSG observations in relation to DCC reports delegated to them.

Huw Exley

SECAS Team

8 November 2019

### Attachments:

- **Appendix A – Post Commissioning Information Report (September 2019) (AMBER)**

## Annex A: DCC SEC Panel Reports

	Report Name and Purpose	Delivery per SEC	Ops Group Observations of last paper
1	<b>Performance Measurement Report</b> Sets out the Service Levels achieved in respect of each Performance Measure set out in SEC Section H13.1 and SEC Section L8.6. August 2019	SEC H13.4 – Monthly - 25 working days following end of month. Late.	<p>The overall performance level this month has deteriorated following the trend of the last nine months. This is demonstrated by the increased number of failed Code Performance Measures (CPM) as seen below.</p> <p><u>CPM</u></p> <p>Three CPMs were below Target Service Level. These were CPM 1 (<i>Percentage of OnDemand Service Responses delivered within the applicable Target Response Time</i>). This was again driven by Service Provider PM 2 (<i>Category 1 Firmware Payloads completed within TRT</i>) which failed to meet target in CSP C&amp;S Regions. Additionally, PM1.1, a SMETS1 measure, drove it down further. CPM 3 (<i>Percentage of Alerts delivered within the applicable Target Response Time</i>) is also below target level driven by Service Provider PM 3.2 (<i>Percentage of Category 3 Alerts delivered to the DCC WAN Gateway Interface within the relevant Target Response Time</i>). CPM 4 (<i>Percentage of Incident which the DCC is responsible for resolving and which within incident Category 1 or 2 that are resolved in accordance with the Incident Management Policy within the target response time</i>) is below Minimum Service Level. This was caused by the failure to resolve two Category 1 Incidents in Service Level Agreed time. The DCC have provided a remediation plan that includes when CPM1 is expected to reach Target Service Level consistently.</p> <p><u>Service Provider Performance Measures</u></p>

			<p>DSP Performance Measures 2.7 ('Service availability - Test services') was below Target Service Level at 97.99%.</p> <p>Once again there were over 50,000 Comms Hubs exceptions reported in August. The DCC have been actioned with explaining these, and work continues with SECAS and the CSPs to better understand the issue.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> The July PMR report was re-issued at the request of the OPSG to remove references to SEC Parties within the body of the report.</p>
2	<p><b>DCC Responsible Communications Hub (CH) Returns Report</b></p> <p>Details the number of CHs for which the reason for return, loss or destruction, is determined to have been a CH Pre-Installation DCC Responsibility, or a CH Post-Installation DCC Responsibility.</p>	<p>SEC F9.15 – Quarterly - the SEC does not prescribe when after end of quarter the report is provided.</p>	<p>No report to review this month.</p>
3	<p><b>DCC Network Enhancement Report</b> (Network Enhancement Plans - NEP)</p> <p>A report to the Panel and SEC Parties on any ongoing Network Enhancement Plans and those that were completed during the previous quarter.</p>	<p>SEC F7.21 - Quarterly - within a reasonable period of time following each quarter that ends prior to 1 January 2021.</p>	<p>0 NEPs completed in the quarter.</p> <p>The DCC have been asked to report to the OPSG on the progress toward their 2020 milestone for coverage.</p>
4	<p><b>Registration Data Provider (RDP) Incident Report</b></p> <p>A report provided to the SEC Panel and Network Parties on the time it has taken to resolve incidents where the DCC is responsible for resolution, but activity is required by RDP's.</p>	<p>SEC Appendix AG 2.5.10 – Monthly - timing not specified.</p>	<p>September 2019</p> <p>23 Incidents reported as resolved within the month and six records reported as outstanding. There was a spike in RDP Incidents noted in August. The DCC presented a slide at the October Reporting meeting noting that this was due to issues changing two of the RDP's DCCKI certificates after their three-year expiry. All Incidents relating to this issue are now closed. However, the count was once again high this</p>

			month and the DCC are investigating if this is a hangover from the certificate issue or something else.
5	<b>Certificate Signing Request (CSR) Variance Report</b> The report that sets out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the actual number of CSRs against the forecasted volumes</li> <li>details of the Authorised Subscribers whose actual volumes of CSRs submitted were greater than, or equal to, 110% of their forecasted volumes.</li> </ul>	SEC L8.9 – Monthly - 10 <sup>th</sup> Working Day following month end. Report on time.	September 2019: A new format of the report has been published this month due to confusion with the headline figures. This was caused by exclusion of the CSRs that were sent without accompanying forecasts, in the calculation of the Variance, which was not made clear. The new format is improved but work between SECAS and the DCC continues to improve this. 4,473,570 requests were sent versus a forecast of 3,931,194, 104.8% of the forecast (non-forecasted CSRs removed). 15 Users are consuming service without submitting a forecast including a Large Supplier.
6	<b>Service Request (SR) Variance Report</b> The report sets out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the actual number of Service Requests sent against the forecasted volumes; and</li> <li>where there are exceptions, details of the Users whose actual volumes of Service Requests sent were less than or equal to 90%, or greater than or equal to 110% of their forecasted volumes</li> </ul>	SEC H3.24 – Monthly - 10 <sup>th</sup> working day of month Report late.	September 2019: The DCC have noted that they will move to the same format as the CSR report for the SR report from October. 78,649,750 SRs sent versus forecast of 204,010,873, 39% of forecast. 14 Users consumed service without submitting a forecast including a Large Supplier. <b>NB:</b> The June and July SR Variance reports were re-issued due to errors in the reporting suite. The reports have the same variances as those shown in this table for the respective months.
7	<b>Quarterly Problem Report</b> This report provides details of the Open Operational Problems experienced by DCC Users	SEC Appendix AG 3.2- Quarterly - timing not specified within Appendix AG.	No report to review this month.