

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_75_1312_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 (October 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 November 2019 DCC reporting teleconference and the observations raised. Below are the key observations.

#### 3.1 Performance Measurement Report

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

SMETS1 metrics were included again. The OPSG appreciated the inclusion of this data but asked the DCC to explain why they did not adhere to the process for addition to the PMR as set out in SEC Section H13.

Three Code Performance Measures (CPMs) were below Target Service Level: CPM 1 '*response times for on-demand Service Requests*' at 97.82%, CPM 3 '*Percentage of Alerts delivered within the applicable Target Response Time*' at 98.85% 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 83.33%.

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 North (CSP N) and CSP South (S) regions. However, it is now above target in CSP Central (C). This is the ninth time this CPM and underlying PMs have been below Target Service Level in tenth months. This issue has previously been escalated to the SEC Panel and the OPSG are monitoring the issue each month.

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 fifth 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.

### Major Incidents

There were 11 Category 2 Major Incidents (MIs) reported in the period. However, six of these were excluded. One Incident exceeded the Target Resolution Time, causing the failure of CPM4. The DCC agreed to confirm what led to this Incident and if new guidelines will need to be produced. An OPSG member noted that INC000000488824 impacted SSI, with the report stating it was unavailable. However, CPM6 (Percentage Availability – Self Service Interface) was at 100%. This demonstrates the disconnect between Incidents, the service and the PMR metrics and will be highlighted to the operational metrics team.

### CH Exceptions

The number of CH exceptions continues to grow in both the CSP C and CSP N regions. However, there has been a slight decrease in the number in CSP S. 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 continue to be incorrect CH variants being installed in the CSP C&S.

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 24x/05) 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 full agenda item was presented at the December OPSG meeting indicating that progress is being made.

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

OPSG members observed that there continues to be Users consuming DCC Services that are not submitting forecasts. In September there were 14 Users that are consuming Certificate Signing Services that have not submitted forecasts and 16 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

6 December 2019

### Attachments:

- **Appendix A** – Post Commissioning Information Report (October 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. September 2019	SEC H13.4 – Monthly - 25 working days following end of month. On Time	<p><u>CPM</u></p> <p>Three Code Performance Measures were below Target Service Level. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPM 1 (<i>Percentage of On Demand 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 the CSP N and CSP S Region. Additionally, PM1.1, a SMETS1 SIE measure, drove it down further;</li> <li>• 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>); and</li> <li>• 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 a Category 2 Incident in Service Level Agreed time.</li> </ul> <p>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>Once again there were over 50,000 Comms Hubs exceptions reported in September. The DCC have been actioned with explaining these, and work continues with SECAS and the CSPs to better understand the issue. A full agenda item on Comms Hubs exceptions was presented at OPSG_27.</p> <p>An OPSG member noted that INC000000488824 impacted SSI, with the report stating it was unavailable. However, CPM6 (Percentage Availability – Self Service Interface) was at 100%. This demonstrates the disconnect between Incidents, the service and the PMR metrics and this will be notified to the operational metrics team.</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>The DCC have closed a number of Incidents that were inhibiting the returns triage process and Comms Hubs are now moving through the full triage process. 3,157 units were registered as returned within the quarter. The DCC are engaging with Users to work on improving the process from both ends.</p> <p>OPSG members noted the returns process has begun to operate. However, the OPSG members are still validating if the process is working correctly from a User perspective.</p>
3	<p><b>DCC Network Enhancement Report (Network Enhancement Plans - NEP)</b></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>No report to review this month.</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</p>	<p>SEC Appendix AG 2.5.10 – Monthly - timing not specified.</p>	<p>October 2019</p> <p>Eight Incidents were raised within the month with a total of 14 Incidents reported as resolved within the month and five records reported as outstanding.</p>

	resolve incidents where the DCC is responsible for resolution, but activity is required by RDP's.		The DCC have been asked to consider whether the current level of RDP Incidents is reasonable and whether there are operational implications with this continuing level.
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.	October 2019: A new format of the report has been published this month due to confusion with the headline figures. This was because CSRs which were sent without accompanying forecasts, were excluded in the calculation of the Variance, but this was not made clear in previous papers.  3,555,822 requests were sent versus a forecast of 4,117,453, 86.4% of the forecast. 14 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 on time.	October 2019: As with the CSR the DCC have added a new row to the report clarifying the calculation of variance.  86,934,353 SRs sent versus forecast of 262,707,992, 33% of forecast. 16 Users consumed service without submitting a forecast including a Large Supplier.  An OPSG member noted that they still believe that the DCC's reporting of SRs sent differs from theirs. Further, the member is concerned that their explanation of why they had not been able to meet their SEC obligation of being within +/-10% of forecast had not been highlighted to the SEC Panel by the DCC as is their right. The same issue is believed to be occurring with regards to CSR forecasting.
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.	62 new Problem records were opened in the quarter, compared to 54 last quarter. There were 159 Open at the end of the quarter with the following status: Under Investigation - 53, Pending (fix identified but not applied) - 96, Completed (fix applied, awaiting confirmation) - 10.

			<p>OPSG members requested that the DCC engage with them to ascertain the business impact of Problems, particularly those that have surpassed their target for completing Root Cause Analysis. OPSG noted the need to understand the relationship between Problems and Defects, and the impact on the quality of the production service of known Defects and Problems.</p>
--	--	--	---