

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_77_1402_20</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. It remains a SEC Panel responsibility. However, although not officially delegated, it is currently being viewed on a monthly basis by the Security-Sub Committee (SSC) who are reviewing the report to improve accuracy and the quality of the data. At the SSC\_93\_2201 meeting, the SSC noted it had asked the DCC to separate CSP North, Central and South for future Post Commissioning reports and to investigate the discrepancy between the given total number of Devices and the rest of the figures detailing the number of Devices that have entered post commissioning.

- Post Commissioning Information Report (December 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 January 2020 Reporting meeting and the observations raised. Below are the key observations.

#### 3.1 Performance Measurement Report (PMR)

The DCC has been asked to explain why it did not adhere to the process for addition to the PMR as set out in SEC Section H13, and will present an update at the March OPSG meeting.

Three Code Performance Measures (CPMs) were below Target Service Level: CPM 1 '*response times for on-demand Service Requests*' at 95.40%, CPM 3 '*Percentage of Alerts delivered within the applicable Target Response Time*' at 98.33% and CPM4 '*Percentage of Incidents which the DCC is responsible for resolving and which fall within Incident Category 1 or 2 that are resolved in accordance with the Incident Management Policy within the Target Resolution Time*' at 87.50%.

The failure of CPM1 was again driven by the underlying Performance Measure (PM) 2 '*Percentage of Category 1 Firmware Payloads completed within TRT*' which was below Target Service Level in all

Communication Service Providers (CSP). This CPM has been below Target Service Level 11 times in the last 12 months, with consistent under performance from PM 2. 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 N region, and responsible for the failure of CPM 3. This is the seventh month in a row that this PM has been below target. CSP N are aware of the issue and are working with Service Users to resolve it.

OPSG members noted that DCC performance reporting is not reflective of actual operational performance and the DCC has been asked to confirm the report is accurate with the metrics as currently defined.

### Major Incidents

There were 10 Major Incidents (MIs) reported in the period of which two were excluded. Four of the Incidents impacted Install and Commission and six of the Incidents impacted the CSP N.

### CH Exceptions

The number of CH exceptions continues to grow across the CSP regions after an apparent drop off in October.

The OPSG noted that Comms Hubs Exceptions included two unexplained categories, 'Data Error' and 'Not Active'. The OPSG requested that the DCC provide a restatement of the report addressing the concerns raised at this and previous meetings regarding the reporting and management of CH Exceptions.

There continues to be incorrect CH variants 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.

Work between the DCC, the Technical Operations Centre (TOC), Communication Service Providers (CSPs), BEIS and SECAS on Exceptions continues. The DCC have been asked to recommence providing regular updates on Exceptions at OPSG meetings.

### 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 December, there were 16 Users consuming Certificate Signing Services that have not submitted forecasts including one Large Supplier. The OPSG requested DCC confirm whether it is engaging Service Users who are consuming Certificate Signing Requests (CSR) services without submitting forecasts.

The DCC noted it had raised the proposal to remove the Service Request Variance (SRV) forecasting obligation to the SEC Panel. The DCC requested that any Small Suppliers interested in being involved in the trial they are running should contact [graeme.ligget@smartdcc.co.uk](mailto:graeme.ligget@smartdcc.co.uk). The DCC reiterated that in the meantime, all Users need to continue to submit SRV forecasts as per their SEC obligation.

## 4. Recommendations

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

Huw Exley  
SECAS Team  
7 February 2020

**Attachments:**

- **Appendix A** – Post Commissioning Information Report (December 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.  November 2019	SEC H13.4 – Monthly - 25 working days following end of month.  On Time	<u>Code Performance Measures</u>  Three Code Performance Measures were below Target Service Level. These were: <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 all three CSP Regions. Additionally, PM1.1, (<i>Percentage S1SP Countersigned Service Request Times within relevant Target Response Time</i>) a SMETS1 measure drove it down further. This service level has been below target 11 times in the last 12 months;</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>CPM4 (<i>Percentage of Incidents which the DCC is responsible for resolving and which fall within Incident Category 1 or 2 that are resolved in accordance with the Incident Management Policy within the Target Resolution Time</i>) was below target due to the failure to resolve one Category 2 Incident (INC0000005102213) within service level agreed time.</li> </ul> <p>The DCC noted their planned remediation plan for CPM1 has not been achieved. Further the planned fix for CSP C&amp;S has been delayed from</p>

			<p>December 2019 to February 2020. This issue was raised at the Common Issues Forum on 8 January.</p> <p><u>Comms Hubs Exceptions</u></p> <p>After a dramatic fall in October in the number of Comms Hubs Exceptions in November again rose steeply in CSP N and CSP S. There was a slight decrease in CSP C. The DCC have been asked to reissue the November report due to the inclusion of unexplained additional Exceptions. Work continues with SECAS and the CSPs to better understand the issue.</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>Quarter 4 2019:</p> <p>478 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</p>	<p>SEC Appendix AG 2.5.10 – Monthly - timing not specified.</p>	<p>December 2019</p> <p>Eleven Incidents were raised within the month with a total of eight Incidents reported as resolved within the month and seven records reported as outstanding.</p>

	responsible for resolution, but activity is required by RDP's.		
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.	December 2019: 2,525,365 requests were sent versus a forecast of 3,198,904, 78.9% of the forecast. (Grand Total which assumes that those SEC Parties consuming services with no forecast submitted 'Zero Forecasts') 19 Authorised Subscribers who are consumed services without submitting a forecast, including four Large Suppliers.
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.	December 2019: 108,768,184 SRs were sent versus a forecast of 358,451,464, 30% of the forecast. (Grand Total which assumes that those SEC Parties consuming services with no forecast submitted 'Zero Forecasts') 16 SEC Parties consumed service without submitting a forecast including one Large Supplier. The SEC Modification has been raised to remove obligation on Users to submit SR forecasts.
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.