

This document is classified as **Green** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with other SEC Parties and SMIP stakeholders at large, but not made publicly available.

Paper Reference:	OPSG_29xx_2402_04
Action:	For Decision

DCC Reporting: DCC Performance Measurement Report December 2019

1. Purpose

This paper provides the Operations Group (OPSG) with a summary of the monthly DCC Performance Measurement Report (PMR). OPSG Members are asked to note the information provided and agree any issues they believe should be highlighted to the SEC Panel.

The SEC sets out the operational Service Levels which the DCC is required to meet. The PMR provides details of the Service Levels achieved in respect of the Code Performance Measures set out in Sections H13.1 and L8.6 of the SEC and such Service Provider Performance Measures are specified in the Reported List of Service Provider Performance Measures document.

Service Levels are reported monthly. This report is provided within 25 Working Days following the end of each calendar month. Therefore, the most recent PMR available is for December 2019. The report is provided to the Panel, SEC Parties, the Authority and (on request) the Secretary of State. A copy of the December 2019 report is attached to this paper as Appendix A for information. The Performance Measurement Report Tracker and Performance Measurement Report Issue Log have also been provided for information as Appendices B and C.

2. Performance Measurement Report General Observations

There are three Code Performance Measures (CPMs) below Target: CPM 1, CPM 3 and CPM 4.

The report lists seven Category 1 and 2 Incidents that were closed within the reported month. Three of these Incidents were excluded.

INC000000526144 is a Category 1 Incident which had a duration of over 3 days. However, in the 'Resolved within SLA' section it says yes. The SLA for Category 1 Incident resolution is 4 hours. The DCC have confirmed this should have been reported as a fail and was a reporting error.

INC000000520567 is a Category 2 Incident which had a duration of 8 hours and 44 minutes. However, in the 'Resolved within SLA' section it says yes. The SLA for Category 2 Incident resolution is 24 hours. As above, the DCC have confirmed this should have been reported as a fail and was a reporting error. The DCC have confirmed that all emails affected by the Incident were recovered.

INC000000518930 is a Category 2 Incident but affected SRVs and Install and Commission. The DCC have confirmed they were only partially affected the service which is why it was not given Category 1 status.

2.1 Code Performance Measures (CPM)

Three Code Performance Measures are below Target.

CPM1 - ‘response times for on-demand Service Requests’, is below Target Service Level at 98.05%. This is the 12th instance it has been below in 13 months. It was impacted by the failure of Service Provider Performance Measure (PM) 2 ‘response times for delivery of firmware payloads.’ This was below Minimum Target Service Level in Communication Service Provider North (CSP N) at 84.71%. The measure was also below target service level in both CSP Central & South (C&S). As in previous months, the failure in CSP N is attributed to Alerts generated from a small number of meters on the estate which will require device replacements to fix. The commentary notes ‘SU have been advised not to install this model of comms hub whilst investigations are on-going’. There is only one model of Comms Hub available in the CSP N.

The report notes that performance in CSP C&S for PM2 has improved, however it has actually fallen since last month. The DCC has been asked to clarify this statement. The report notes the failure of this target is due to, ‘continued user submission of single requests (instead of batch requests) and error timeouts caused by suspected aborted installs’.

CPM3 - ‘Percentage of Alerts delivered within the applicable Target Response Time’ is below Target Service Level for the sixth month in a row at 98.84%. This is due to Performance Measure 3.2 ‘Percentage of Category 3 Alerts delivered to the DCC WAN Gateway Interface within the relevant Target Response Time’ which was below Minimum Service Level at 94.74%. The issue is again due to a high volume of superfluous Alerts being generated, as with PM2 in the CSPN above.

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’. Was below Target Service Level at 75%. This was due to the failure to resolve INC000000518930 (referenced above) within Service Level Agreed time. As noted above, a further category 1 and 2 Incident failed their SLAs but were incorrectly reported. Therefore, this CPM should have been scored lower. Will this be amended and the reported reissued?

The majority of aged Incidents remain with Service Users and the total number has increased month on month. The top three Incidents are listed and the highest is ‘Incorrect Communications Hub Variant Installed’. SECAS is working with the DCC on a forward plan regarding Comms Hub Incidents.

The DCC presented an agenda item on the top Aged Incidents at OPSG_29_0402.

2.2 Service Provider Performance Measures Data Service Provider (DSP)

PM 7, ‘Notification of Planned Maintenance events’, is a quarterly measure and marked as Amber at 92.31%. The DCC has confirmed this is the latest quarterly service level and clarified this within the report.

2.3 Communication Service Provider (CSP) Performance Measures (PM)

CSP N

All Performance Measures for the CSP N are reported as above Target Service Level or no event.

CSP C&S

All Performance Measures for the CSP C&S are reported as above Target Service Level or no event.

Exceptions

CSP N

The same PMs accrued exception in CSP N as last month. Last month there were two exceptions, 'Data Error' and 'Not Active' that did not include explanations. The OPSG noted the reported should be rejected without them. The November report has subsequently been reissued with explanations now included. This month the same two Exceptions are present and there are explanations included. SECAS question the 'Data Error' exception. It appears to be a bug or defect within the reporting system, with a fix due by the end of March.

The number of exceptions in CSP N has decreased dramatically since the previous month, from 37,130 in November to 15,205 in December.

The decrease in '*Communications Hubs where no incident has been raised for outage*', from 27,502 in November to 7,065 in December, is responsible for the overall drop.

The DCC is working with CSP N to ensure that they raise Incidents against all incorrect Communication Hub installs.

CSP C

The same PMs accrued exceptions in CSP C as last month minus, '*Aborted Installation*' which hasn't accrued any exceptions this month. The overall number of Exceptions has fallen from 7,060 in November to 5,177 in December.

The number of instances of '*There were no, or incomplete address details provided by the Service User*' is the overwhelming majority of exceptions as with the previous months but has fallen markedly. The report notes, 'the exception remains as the issue is due to the service users not following the CHIMSM. Invalid data is being entered into the MPxN field.' However, the obligation in CHIMSM is to send the 8.14.1 in accordance with DUIS; and the MPxN field for this SRV within DUIS currently does not contain any strict restriction, simply a minimum character value of 1.

PM 1.3 gives the cumulative picture of exceptions for the whole estate. OPSG members have noted that the cumulative number appears to be inconsistent. The DCC has been asked to explain the figure once again.

CSP S

The same PMs accrued exceptions in CSP C as last month minus, 'Aborted installs' and 'CHIMSM Not Followed – Associated with NEP' which both accrued exceptions last month.

The overall number of exceptions has decreased this month from 7,501 in November to 6,467 in December. The number of instances of '*There were no, or incomplete address details provided by the Service User*' continues to be the majority of exceptions in CSP S. This exception continues to be discussed by the OPSG as above.

The cumulative picture for PM 1.3 also appears to be inconsistent in CSP S and the DCC has been asked to explain.

S1SPs

All Performance Measures for SIE are reported above Target Service Level, as was the case last month.

All Performance Measures for Capgemini are reported above Target Service Level or no event except PM 2.2 'Percentage Service availability – CP Service (Production Environment)' which is below target service level at 99.81%. This was as a result of INC000000528522, which has now been resolved.

All Performance Measures for Vodafone are reported above Target Service Level or 'TBC'. The DCC have been asked to confirm why this is. The DCC have confirmed that they will update corresponding number to measures in future and that it hasn't been done to date due to contractual differences.

3. Service Credits

Historically CSP S and CSP C have been exempted from service credits against PM 1.3, 1.2 and 1.1 due to numbers of installed Comms Hubs being below 550,000 and 700,000 respectively. CSP N was exempted against PM 1.2, 1.3 and 1.1 due to numbers of installed Comms Hubs below 700,000. In December only CSP S has been exempted on these grounds. The assumption is that Comms Hubs installations in the other two regions have surpassed the threshold and the DCC have been asked to confirm. The DCC have now confirmed that all three CSP regions are above the thresholds. The DCC are asked why they have left the note in for CSP S and note the other two, and whether service credit are being applied accordingly now the thresholds have been surpassed.

Service credits have been applied against four PMs in the CSP N: PM 2, PM 3.2, PM 7.3 and PM 9. Regarding PM2 'Percentage of Category 1 Firmware Payloads completed within the relevant Target Response Time' and PM3.2 'Category 3 Alerts delivered to the DCC WAN Gateway Interface', the report again notes that discussion is ongoing between CSP N and the DCC about installations of meters outside agreed derogation areas. The DCC therefore proposed that the recording of service failure is suspended, and no service credits were recorded against this measure. This month the report says, 'Until Phase 2 of ARQCR1028 is implemented, CSP N are unable to automate the exclusion of these non-compliant meters from Performance Measure results' but does not note when this will happen and the DCC has been asked to confirm. The DCC have now confirmed this will be, 'around July 2020'.

CSP S&C both had exceptions against them for PM2 'Percentage of Category 1 Firmware Payloads completed within the relevant Target Response Time' and PM9 'Delivery of change requests' the same as in November

The DSP accrued no Service credits; however, for PM10 which historically accrued credits, the report says, 'Whilst discussions on an appropriate measurement method for PM10 continue, it has been greyed out and will not count as either a pass or a fail. This will be revisited once the PM10 performance measure is agreed.'

4. Recommendation

The OPSG is requested to:

- **DISCUSS** the contents of this paper and Appendix A;
- **AGREE** whether the report reflects the service experienced for the period of the report; and
- **AGREE** any identified issues to be escalated to the Panel.

Huw Exley

SECAS Team

17 February 2020

Attachments:

- **Appendix A:** Performance Measurement Report December 2019 (**GREEN**)
- **Appendix B:** Performance Measurement Report Tracker December 2019 (**GREEN**)
- **Appendix C:** Performance Measurement Report Issue Log (**AMBER**)