

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.

SECMP0067 ‘Service Request Traffic Management’

Working Group meeting summary

Tuesday 14 April 2020

Progress to date

A recap of the issue and solution and progress so far was given by the Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS). The questions raised at the last Working Group meeting were the main topics to be discussed.

Last Working Group discussions

Queries raised at the last working group were recorded as

- Priority Service Request list
- Half Hourly Settlement
- Reporting
- Business case
- User Integration Testing (UIT)

The Priority Service Request list

SECAS explained that following the discussions at the last Working Group meeting the Priority Service Request list had been emptied and would be empty at implementation. As one Working Group member had pointed out at the last meeting, there is no point to implementing a mechanism if Priority Service Requests can still be sent in sufficient unrestricted volumes to cause the Data Service Provider (DSP) to fail. This was in line with previous advice from the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC). SECAS was recommending that the list would be under the control of the Panel and recommending that this be delegated to TABASC. Working Group members questioned why this was the case and the Working Group agreed that this should mirror SECMP0062 where the responsibility is delegated to the Operations Group (OPSG) with input from the TABASC and the Security Sub-Committee (SSC).

Half Hourly Settlement

SECAS explained that that the last Working Group meeting a point was raised that with the introduction of Half Hourly Settlement the number of Service Requests a DCC User would be sending would increase. The Data Communications Company (DCC) had agreed that the Capacity Allocation Formula would allow for this increase in Service Requests. The DCC would then scale the system to

cope with the increased amount of 'Business as Usual' traffic as part of their normal business processes.

The Working Group member asked for confirmation that they would not be affected (throttled) by other Users requesting information on their meter points. The DCC confirmed that Users would not be affected by others requesting information about their meter points.

Reporting

The DCC presented their wireframe reporting documents and asked for comments. One Working Group member questioned if the DSP scheduled activity would always be reduced in a traffic management event. The DCC suggested that the DSP would be aware of the scheduled activity and if a traffic management event were to take place they would be able to manage the activity to ensure it was processed. One Working Group member suggested that it would be useful to have reporting on the DSP scheduled activity included in the reports presented. They further requested that this should include if the DSP scheduled activity was then carried out and received within or outside the Service Level Agreement (SLA). Another Working Group member suggested that since most of the SLAs for scheduled activity were 24 hours it was unlikely they would be delivered outside the SLA, but the Working group agreed that it would be good to have this information anyway.

The DCC said they would discuss this with their Service Provider to confirm if it was possible to get these figures. If it was, they would include them in the reporting.

Business Case

The DCC presented their business case identifying the cost that might be incurred across the industry per hour if the DSP failed. This included looking at some suggestions made at the last Working Group meeting which were to add additional 'motorway lanes' or let Disaster Recovery take place. The Working Group pointed out a typographical error in the table in the Modification report. The correct figures were confirmed and SECAS took an action to correct the table. A Working Group member pointed out the Disaster Recovery was supposed to take a maximum of 4 hours and should indeed take less than 4 hours. The DCC acknowledged this and SECAS took an action to amend the Modification Report to reflect this. The DCC pointed out that this was not an ideal solution as if a Denial of Service attack took place the same situation would also affect the back up system. The Working Group agreed that the DR would not suffice as a back up in this situation, it was better to control the overload at the source.

A Working Group member suggested that the graph for the 1 March 2020 presented in the business case should clarify the current capacity available to give context to readers of the Modification Report who may not have been involved in the development of the Modification. They commented that the usage as a percentage had dropped recently as the result of the DCC adding an additional motorway lane.

User Integration Testing

The DCC explained that the User Integration Testing (UIT) for the November 2020 SEC Release was currently being planned. The UIT figures previously presented were only a part of that testing. The testing would be considered by TAG as part of the wider SEC November 2020 Release. The Working Group members agreed that this made more sense than what had previously been presented. The

Working Group were concerned that if FOC release slipped there would be a conflict with the November SEC Release Testing. They agreed that this was outside the scope of this modification but asked that the potential conflict should be highlighted in the Modification Report.

Changes to the Traffic Management Mechanism Document

There was some confusion over the redlined changes to the Traffic Management Document. SECAS explained that the Traffic Management Mechanism Document contained the approved SECMP0062 text as well as the proposed SECMP0067 changes. A Working Group member suggested that the SECMP0062 text should be removed from the redlining and only the additions presented for clarity. SECAS agreed to remove the SECMP0062 text from the suggested redlining. A Working Group member also expressed concern that there might be a number of changes to the SECMP0062 text before SECMP0067 was implemented and this could cause further confusion.

Next Steps

SECAS suggested that once the additions to the Modification Report were made it would be presented to Panel and providing Panel agree issued for Modification Report Consultation.

Actions

- SECAS to update the Modification Report to reflect changes to the management of the reporting by the OPSG.
- DCC to confirm if the information on DSP Scheduled activity and what happens once it is released after a traffic management event can be provided.
- SECAS to correct the figures in the table in the Modification Report.
- SECAS to update the time for DR to become effective to 'maximum of' 4 hours.
- DCC to add text to the Annex detailing the business case to clarify the current capacity of 1350 transactions per second.
- SECAS to highlight testing conflict concerns specifically in relation to FOC in the Modification Report.
- SECAS to remove the SECMP0062 text from the Traffic Management Mechanism Document and only present the changes for clarity.
- SECAS to ensure version control for the Traffic Management Mechanism Document is clear.