

This document is classified as **White**. Information can be shared with other SEC Parties and SMIP stakeholders at large, but not published (including publication online).

Operations Group Meeting

26 October 2020, OPSG_37x_2610

12:30 – 16:30

Teleconference

Draft Minutes

Attendees:

Category	Operations Group Members
Operations Group Chair	Dave Warner
DCC	Mo Asif
Network Parties	Matthew Alexander
	Gemma Slaney
Large Suppliers	John Noad
	Ed Webber
	Fiona Robbie
	Mark Morrison
	Martin Christie
	Robin Mellish (<i>Alternate for Paul Clark</i>)
	Ralph Baxter
Small Suppliers	Kate Frazer
Other SEC Parties	Elias Hanna
	Michael Snowden

Representing	Other Participants
DCC	Michael Wallace
	Wendy Liddell
	Lisa Wong
	Philip Handley (Part)
	Ro Crawford (Part)
	Timothy Dunning (Part)
	Jason Hynes (Part)
	Parmjeet Dayal (Part)

Managed by

	Kayode Oluwatayo (Part)
	Andrew Rabey (Part)
	Tony Whitrod (Part)
	Gary Bailey (Part)
SECAS	Veronica Asantewaa (Meeting Secretary)
	Joey Manners
	Huw Exley
	Tim Newton (Part)
	Louise Evans (Part)
BEIS	Natasha Free

Apologies:

Representing	Name
Large Suppliers	Tony Shanahan
	Rochelle Harrison
	Rob Short
Small Supplier	Kate Barnes
Other SEC Parties	Geoff Huckerby

1. Previous Meeting Minutes

The OPSG Chair invited comments on the Draft Minutes from OPSG_36x_2809.

No comments were made and the OPSG **AGREED** that these minutes would be published as final.

2. Actions Outstanding

SECAS presented the updates to the actions outstanding from OPSG_35x. Actions were noted as completed where appropriate. It was noted that a number of actions had not been completed by the target date, and new deadlines for these actions were set.

Action ID	Action	Date Raised	Last Target Date	Revised Target Date	Owner
OPSG 34xxx/06	The DCC to provide an update on how CSP N intend to achieve the SEC SLA at the September meeting (OPSG_36x)	27/07/2020	26/10/2020	23/11/2020	DCC
The DCC reported that it will have a formal plan by 30 October and will be able to discuss the scope with the OPSG at the November meeting (OPSG_38x).					

Action ID	Action	Date Raised	Last Target Date	Revised Target Date	Owner
<p>The OPSG Chair asked the DCC to engage with SECAS once the plan has been received, and consult with the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC) for any architectural implications.</p> <p>Status: Open</p>					
OPSG 34xxx/07	SECAS and the DCC to confirm the appropriate governing body or forum to discuss the BMax target.	27/07/2020	26/10/2020	23/11/2020	DCC
<p>SECAS confirmed that Ofgem are happy with the current approach of being notified by the Panel. The DCC noted that Communication Service Provider North (CSP N) are on track to achieve the BMax target by the end of October.</p> <p>The OPSG Chair noted that the BMax target is not included in the SEC and we will need to clarify the legal authority for monitoring the achievement of the target.</p> <p>Status: Open</p>					
OPSG 35x/01	The DCC to review if it is feasible to produce a monthly reconciliation report to analyse the discrepancies in SR reporting.	24/08/2020	26/10/2020	N/A	DCC
<p>The DCC explained it has produced one reconciliation report to date., The DCC explained it is only possible to produce the reports on a per Party basis due to the volumes of data involved. The DCC requested that any Parties that require a report should contact them individually.</p> <p>Status: Closed</p>					
OPSG 35x/04	The DCC to include a summary of the operational impact of Problems in the SEC Panel Quarterly Problem Report	24/08/2020	26/10/2020	23/11/2020	DCC
<p>The DCC reported that it is reviewing the additional requirements within the team and will look to incorporate for the November report as requested. SECAS noted that this action should be open until this has been implemented in the report.</p> <p>Status: Open</p>					
OPSG 35x/10	The DCC to provide a summary of the robustness of the plan to changes in schedules of the various DCC programmes that will be affected by the SMETS1 FOC Go-Live plan.	24/08/2020	26/10/2020	23/11/2020	DCC

Action ID	Action	Date Raised	Last Target Date	Revised Target Date	Owner
<p>The DCC reported that there may be some contentions with Central Switching Service (CSS), noting that it will have to wait until the testing has been completed in November to assess whether the Final Operating Capability (FOC) plan is likely to cause any more contentions. The OPSG noted that this is the first time that it has seen conflicts with CSS.</p> <p>Status: Open</p>					

The OPSG **NOTED** the update.

3. SEC Panel Reports

SECAS presented a summary of the SEC Panel reports to the OPSG.

SECAS requested that the OPSG provide any comments on the summary of DCC reporting (Annex 1) by 5 November.

3.1. Registration Data Provider Incident Report

The OPSG considered the Registration Data Provider (RDP) Incidents Report for September 2020.

SECAS highlighted that there were 11 RDP Incidents opened in September. Nine Incidents were reported as resolved within the month. Nine remain open with investigation to be completed. The DCC noted that eight of these Incidents had since been closed, including some long-standing Incidents.

The OPSG Chair noted that the number of RDPs Incidents was again at a higher level. The DCC noted that it continues to engage with RDPs and will provide an update on its investigation at the next meeting (OPSG_38x).

3.2. DCC Certificate Signing Request Variance Report

The OPSG considered the Certificate Signing Request (CSR) Variance Report for September 2020.

The report outlined that there were 27 Users who have consumed services without submitting a forecast, which includes two Large Suppliers (LSs). The OPSG noted that due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the reported "actuals" had been much lower than the usual numbers.

3.3. DCC Service Request Variance Report

The OPSG considered the Service Request Variance (SRV) report for September 2020.

The report outlined that 31 Users consumed services without submitting forecasts, including two LSs. The OPSG noted that due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the reported "actuals" were much lower than the usual numbers.

ACTION OPSG 37x/01: The DCC to provide an update on its investigation into the rise in RDP Incidents at the next meeting (OPSG_38x)

ACTION OPSG 37x/02: The OPSG to provide any comments on the summary of DCC reporting (Annex 1 of the SEC Panel Report) by 5 November.

The OPSG **NOTED** the SEC Panel Reports

4. CH Returns Quarterly Report - Revised Format

SECAS presented a review of the revised format Communications Hub (CH) Returns Quarterly Report.

The OPSG noted the difference between the format of Q1 and the Q2 Communications Hub (CH) Returns Quarterly Report.

SECAS reported that in section F9.15 of the SEC, the DCC is required to produce a report that outlines the numbers of CH for which the reason for return, loss or destruction, was the DCC's responsibility, either pre or post installation. From discussions with the DCC, SECAS noted that it was agreed that the 90 day return window is not required by the SEC to be reported to the SEC Panel. Likewise, fault diagnosis is not required to be reported to the SEC Panel as the SEC obligates that this is between the DCC and an individual SEC party. The OPSG Chair questioned this view of SEC compliance, noting that the SEC required an explanation of "the circumstances" relevant to DCC-responsible returns. It was agreed that SECAS will work with the DCC and OPSG Chair to confirm.

The DCC acknowledged that it should have engaged with the OPSG before making such extensive changes to the formatting of the report.

The OPSG Chair noted that the SEC requirement is that CHs for which the returns responsibility is being disputed by the SEC Party does not need to be listed in the report. The OPSG Chair noted that the SEC says that the SEC Panel is responsible for such dispute resolution. The Chair questioned whether this responsibility had been delegated to the OPSG. SECAS noted it will investigate.

The DCC advised that it will produce two versions of the Q3 report for review at the next meeting (OPSG_38x). One review will be in the same format as the Q1 2020 and one report will be in the format of the Q2 2020. The OPSG and DCC can then review the two reports side by side with the target of producing the Q4 report in a new agreed format. The DCC noted that in the meantime, they will publish the Q3 report in the Q2 format. If they need to retrospectively republish the Q3 report following OPSG discussion, they will do.

ACTION OPSG 37x/03: SECAS and the DCC to confirm if the newly formatted Q2 CH Returns Quarterly Report is compliant with the SEC.

ACTION OPSG 37x/04: SECAS to investigate whether the responsibility for determining disputed CHs return responsibility has been delegated to the OPSG by the Panel.

ACTION OPSG 37x/05: The DCC to produce two versions of the Q3 CH Returns Quarterly Report for OPSG review at the next meeting (OPSG_38x).

The OPSG **NOTED** the update.

5. PMR Report – August

SECAS presented its review of the Performance Measurement Report (PMR) for August 2020 to the OPSG.

SECAS noted that two Code Performance Measures (CPM) were below Target: CPM 1 and CPM 3.

CPM1 has been below Target Service Level for the last 14 months; with this being the 20th instance it has been below in 21 months. This was largely driven by the continued failure to achieve the minimum service level for PM2 *'response times for delivery of firmware payloads'* in CSP N and the failure to achieve Target Service Level in Communications Service Provider Central and South (CSP C&S). CPM1 was further impacted by the failure to achieve Target Service Level of PM1.1 *"Percentage S1SP Countersigned Service Request Times within relevant Target Response Time"*.

SECAS reported the failure of PM2 in CSP C&S was attributed to firmware download requests for single installations being submitted in large volumes by one service user, rather than being submitted as batch requests. The OPSG noted that the SEC does not obligate Users to send Firmware upgrades in batched requests. The DCC noted that the issue was caused by one Service User who had acted to modify this approach. The DCC noted that CSP C&S are reviewing the best approach and do not believe this issue will have an impact in the future.

SECAS noted that CSP C&S did not report its performance for PM3.2, *'Percentage of Category 3 Alerts delivered to the DCC WAN Gateway Interface within the relevant Target Response Time'*, underlying CPM3, for June, July and August. (However, it has met the Target Service Level in previous months). The DCC noted that it would not be possible to rectify this omission because the relevant data had not been retained by the Service Provider. The OPSG Chair asked that the report to the Panel should note the failure of CSP C&S to report the performance measure. The OPSG Chair noted that it would be expected that the data would be retained, noting that the DCC should investigate their data retention policy and report back to OPSG.

The Chair asked DCC to summarise how missing performance data is treated in the calculation of metrics.

ACTION OPSG 37x/06: SECAS to report to the Panel CSP C&S failure to report PM3.2 performance for August.

ACTION OPSG 37x/07: The DCC to review its data retention policy regarding the failure to report PM3.2 performance in the August PMR.

ACTION OPSG 37x/08: The DCC to summarise how missing performance data is treated in the calculation of metrics.

The OPSG **NOTED** the PMR Report.

6. CH and Network Evolution - Solution & Business Requirements

Project Scope Q&A

The OPSG reviewed the DCC's CH & Network project scope at OPSG_36x and raised a number of queries. It was agreed that the DCC would provide answers to the queries raised. SECAS presented slides covering the queries and DCC's responses.

The OPSG Chair noted that the assumption appeared to be that the 4G Service coverage will not be a constraint on the deployment of the new devices. The DCC confirmed that if the 4G service is not available then it will fall back to the 2G service.

A LS member queried when the DCC will communicate the SMETS1 scope to wider SEC Parties, and that the scope will need to be specific for each cohort.

The OPSG Chair requested that the DCC consider the requirement for quality in delivery, to reduce the number of defects.

A LS member mentioned that it was expecting a schedule for the implementation of Dual Band CHs (DBCHs) soon after the Single Band CHs (SBCHs) had been released. The OPSG Chair noted TABASC may need to consider any design dependencies between the two workstreams. (SECAS were asked to communicate this to TABASC)

The OPSG Chair noted that a defined schedule is needed for when Single Band and Dual Band capabilities will be implemented, identifying any dependencies between the workstreams

Requirements Review

The OPSG made a number of comments regarding the requirements. It was noted that the assumed scenarios for transition and deployment had not been explained specifically, and would need to be considered for the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA).

The OPSG agreed there was a clear and recognised user business need for this project. The OPSG noted the assurances from DCC that the Minimum Viable Product (MVP) + 4G service would meet the existing SEC requirements and that there would be no changes to SRVs or User orchestrations. It was also noted that the new CH would appear as a new variant in logistics processes, but otherwise Users would see no difference from current processes.

There are a number of questions on candidate service improvements (beyond the scope of the MVP) that are dependent on the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA). Further, an Other SEC Party Member noted the need to take this opportunity to consider candidate functionality beyond the scope of the MVP. The OPSG will consider these candidate additional requirements further in subsequent meetings.

The Chair asked that SECAS draft a summary of the OPSG views regarding the project scope and requirements: SECAS should circulate this to OPSG members. This would be an interim position pending consideration of the CBA (to be published).

ACTION OPSG 37x/09: The DCC to communicate the strategy and requirements for SMETS1 to wider SEC Parties regarding the scope for the CH and Network Evolution Plan.

ACTION OPSG 37x/10: The DCC to provide a defined schedule for implementing DBCHs after the SBCHs had been released.

ACTION OPSG 37x/11: The DCC to consider the dependencies between DBCHs and SBCHs work streams in the CH and Network Evolution Plan.

ACTION OPSG 37x/12: SECAS to communicate any design dependencies between DBCHs and SBCHs to TABASC.

ACTION OPSG 37x/13: SECAS to draft a summary of the OPSG views regarding the project scope and requirements and circulate this to members.

The OPSG **NOTED** the presentation.

7. Major Incident Review

SECAS provided a review of Major Incidents INC000000627085 and INC000000629108.

INC000000627085

The DCC noted that following the post Incident review CSP N did not follow the agreed notification process, as the monitoring in place was not adequate.

SECAS reported that the root cause for this Incident was an unexpected system crash due to a memory leak. The DCC confirmed that the loss of connectivity to Remedy and Self-Service Management Interface (SSMI) did have the same root cause as the failed SMETS2 Service Requests, therefore there was no need to raise two separate Incidents. However, it was noted that the failure of the system to recover correctly constituted a further problem with a separate root cause.

The DCC noted that they were not happy with their communications of the Incident and improvement is needed.

INC000000629108

SECAS questioned whether the maintenance window was sufficient to allow for system recovery. The DCC noted that this was still under investigation.

[Post Meeting Note: The DCC confirmed that the post Incident review showed that an overload of planned maintenance work led the execution of this work to overrun. The Data Service Provider (DSP) have added Service Delivery to the change attendees to ensure that the recovery/backout is completed within the planned maintenance window.]

SECAS also questioned whether the failed scheduled reads could be reattempted (as per the 24-hour window to execute). The DCC noted that this was still under investigation.

[Post Meeting Note: The DCC reported that this was not identified until after the 24-hour period and as such could not be reattempted. The DCC noted that the DSP have advised that should this occur in future it would look to re-run the missed scheduled reads within the 'same day window'.]

The DCC confirmed that there is no recovery plan for lost Alerts, and that this is common during planned maintenance windows and Service Users are aware of this.

The DCC acknowledged that the communications of this Incident were not clear and timely. A Distribution Network Operator (DNO) member echoed this, noting that it had received communications of the Incident at 3:39 am, an hour after it had been declared as a Category 1.

A LS Supplier member noted that when a Category 1 or 2 Incident is declared it is not updated on the Self Service Interface (SSI), and queried if this was included in the post Incident review. The DCC noted that this will be included in the Incident timeline going forward.

The OPSG Chair mentioned that that the Review Report should acknowledge that the timeliness of Incident communications was not achieved.

ACTION OPSG 37x/14: The DCC to amend the Major Incident Review Report for INC000000629108 to include the delay in Incident communications.

The OPSG:

- **NOTED** the Major Incident Reviews; and
- **AGREED** that the Review Reports for INC000000627085 and INC000000629108 should be published to all SEC Parties following necessary amendments to INC000629108.

8. Work Package - Q2 2020 (July - Sept) actuals

SECAS presented the Work Package for Q2 2020 (July - Sept) actuals. No further comments were made by OPSG members.

The OPSG **NOTED** the lookback report against the Work Package for Q2 2020–21.

9. OPSG ToR Project

SECAS presented the final version of the OPSG Terms of Reference (ToR), highlighting the amendments made since the last meeting. No further comments were made by OPSG members.

The OPSG **ENDORSED** the recommended changes to the OPSG ToR.

10. Meeting Effectiveness – Survey Actions

SECAS outlined the actions from the recent Sub-Committee Survey. The OPSG had a positive response to the survey actions.

Members noted that they would like to avoid committing to two full day meetings per month due to the commitments on their resources. The Chair noted that the intent would be to avoid having two full meetings per month and remain as is for the time being.

The OPSG noted the need for authors to adhere to the submission of papers 5 working days in advance of the meeting, except where the latest operational information was being provided (for example, the Operational Update).

The OPSG noted that they were not keen for late/updated papers to be circulated as late as 08:30 on the day of the meeting and that the cut off should be at least the day before.

The OPSG experimented with the use of Slido, a tool which may be useful for supporting participation during Teams meetings. It was agreed to trial this tool further for part of the next meeting.

The OPSG:

- **NOTED** areas of improvement to OPSG meeting; and
- **AGREED** to the proposals made which will be implemented at future meetings.

11. Any Other Business

There were no Any Other Business items proposed and the Chair closed the meeting.

Next main meeting: 3 November 2020; Next reporting meeting: 23 November 2020.

DRAFT