

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.

# DP094 ‘Supporting prepayment customers in no SM WAN scenarios’

## Annex A

## Request for Information responses

### About this document

---

This document contains the full non-confidential collated responses received to the DP094 Refinement Consultation.

## Question 1: When you attempt to install a SMETS2 Meter, how often do you find a lack of WAN?

Question 1		
Respondent	Category	Response and rationale
Smart DCC Limited	DCC	-
SMS PLC	Other SEC Party	We find lack of WAN in around 2 to 3% of occasions
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	Unfortunately, this is not something we record as an explicit reason as it's linked to other issues and outcomes. These are not really possible to measure directly. There are processes we follow depending on the situation and the nature of the Install itself. It is assumed this is where we are performing an install following the Reactive Install and Leave as per SLC 49.13 and as per SEC Appendix H:3.3? This also needs to consider the CSP in question and the matter of ICHIS compliance. We may find no WAN and the customer refuses an I&L so we abort and report a termination but we may also record no WAN but then perform a customer agreed I&L.
Ecotricity	Small Supplier	12% of elec meters. 36% of gas meters. The reasoning behind these figures are our current unsuccessful commission rates.
E.ON	Large Supplier	3% WAN aborts on install
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	Please see response to question 4

## Question 2: Do you keep statistics on how long it takes for WAN issues to be resolved from the point they are logged with the DCC?

Question 2			
Respondent	Category	Response	Rationale
Smart DCC Limited	DCC	Yes	86% of PPMID WAN issues are resolved within SLA (They are Category 3 incidents with 72 Hours SLA)
SMS PLC	Other SEC Party	No	As an installer or MAP we do not receive direct updates from the DCC on WAN resolution, these are sent direct to the supplier so we can't give accurate figures.
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	No	We have assumed this is following the sending of SRV8.14.2 and the DCC raising an Incident corresponding to that I&L situation. Due to the way the I&L process is defined, and that Industry agreed that there would be no SLA upon the Installing Supplier if the Incident was returned to them to provide additional input, this is not possible to measure. Work has been carried out to improve the I&L processes but that is not aligned to the question being asked here. It must be noted that some WAN issues lie with the Supplier and not the DCC.
Ecotricity	Small Supplier	No	We have not been raising our no WAN issues with the DCC as we are not able to send the required service request from our smart adaptor in order to notify the DCC of no WAN. This has been addressed and is due to be fixed in the near future.
E.ON	Large Supplier	Yes	E.ON only raise where there is an issue post a successful install, which is in only around 0.07% of cases. The response is normally within 48 hours.
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	No	We do not currently have this reporting, however we would expect the DCC themselves to have the most complete view of performance in regards to resolving these incidents.

### Question 3: What percentage of WAN issues that you have raised with the DCC are resolved to a positive conclusion?

Question 3		
Respondent	Category	Response and rationale
Smart DCC Limited	DCC	97.59% resolved
SMS PLC	Other SEC Party	As above, we don't get this information first-hand
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	This is not something we measure or are able to establish as we do not have any process or mechanism to record this.
Ecotricity	Small Supplier	As above, we have not been raising WAN issues to the DCC.
E.ON	Large Supplier	In 90% of recent cases a site visit is required. We have limited experience of the results of site visits from the low volumes of WAN incidents to date.
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	See response to question.

## Question 4: Please provide any further comments you may have

Question 4		
Respondent	Category	Comments
Smart DCC Limited	DCC	DCC notes that there is no information available about the commercially developed solution available from the Secure SMETS1 product. While we understand this RFI attempts to gather information about general problems with PPMID meters and WAN Issues, it would be helpful to understand what the requested level of functionality for devices in these WAN constrained situations might be.
SMS PLC	Other SEC Party	As an installer we would welcome information on WAN resolution directly to SMS either as MAP or Installing Partner to improve speed of response, provide a better service to end consumers and connect more devices to the DCC Smart infrastructure  As MAP we would also welcome the information, so we have a better understanding of our assets status, whilst assets remains not commissioned – asset is at high risk of removal at point of CHURN.
OVO Energy	Large Supplier	It is unclear what data is required here and how it will input into the DP to enable the issues of No WAN to be progressed. There are numerous Service Management elements that have been discussed at length with the DCC at the design and customer forums that all went through how to raise and deal with instances of expected WAN not being available and how to cope with a loss of WAN due to tower going down. DCC also report upon their performance measures and WAN connectivity. This DP seems to be trying to cover elements from there and the work previously being done at CRG. It would be worth considerable discussion at the Working Group to understand the problem this DP is attempting to resolve.
Ecotricity	Small Supplier	-
E.ON	Large Supplier	For successful installs, subsequent WAN issues are not a significant issue.
EDF Energy	Large Supplier	While we are not able to provide the information that has been requested as part of the RFI we do believe that the issue of WAN connectivity is one that should be addressed, and that this should be taken forward to

Question 4		
Respondent	Category	Comments
		<p>the refinement process. Issues with WAN connectivity, both as part of the installation visit and afterwards, have an impact on the provision of smart services for all consumers.</p> <p>We agree with the proposer that the issues have a disproportionate impact on prepayment customers, but any solution needs to be cost effective. Any solution should also, where possible, address the actual WAN connectivity issue and not create workarounds that only provide a temporary solution to the problem.</p> <p>While we have not been able to provide responses to the questions in this RFI we hope the following information is useful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not currently schedule a PAYG install where the DCC's coverage checker says there is no WAN. DCC effort should continue to be focused on getting WAN coverage to as many properties as possible.</li> <li>• Where there is WAN on the coverage checker but there is no WAN when we get to site we abort / replace with legacy for where the customer is prepayment. We do not yet follow the DCC Install and Leave (SR 8.14.2) process for prepayment, but we do for credit.</li> <li>• Where systems are down and cannot complete commissioning at installation we currently abort / replace with legacy but in future we will install and not commission (as we assume WAN coverage checker is correct and remote commissioning in the following 10 days will be successful)</li> <li>• We do see a loss of comms, and hence top up failures, to our prepayment meters at a rate of around 8% but the loss of comms is not always because there is no WAN. HAN failures also occur and impact successful communication with devices.</li> <li>• We proactively monitor connectivity to meters and define a prepayment meter with no comms as one where it has failed to respond to a ping (service request) for 3 consecutive days. This can be either due to no WAN and / or no HAN. Identifying all root causes is complex and we continuing to investigate these cases with Telefonica. Analysis so far points to 3 main causes             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1) a CH firmware defect causing meters to drop off the HAN</li> <li>○ 2) a elec meter defect causing drop offs and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Question 4		
Respondent	Category	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3) temporary WAN loss.</li> </ul> <p>We also know there are some meters that will temporarily lose communications during / after a firmware OTA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation of a top up for a PAYG meter can fail if that is attempted during a loss of comms. The only current remedy to a failed top up is to ask the customer to wait and retry (if the comms issue is very temporary eg same day) or manually enter a UTRN until the comms issue is resolved. The resolution time can be substantial depending on a number of factors. Some comms failures require a remote CH reboot (DCC incident raised) or a site visit to either hard reboot the CH, hard reboot the electricity meter and/or or exchange meters.</li> <li>• We do not proactively monitor comms drop off for credit meters apart for meters not reading within consent window, but we can assume a similar drop off percentage.</li> </ul>