

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.

## MP122B ‘Operational Metrics – Part 2’

### Working Group Meeting summary – 8 October 2021

#### Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
David Kemp ( <i>Chair</i> )	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Easton Brown	DCC
Oliver Bridges	DCC
Charlotte Semp	DCC
David Rollason	DCC
Robbie MacIntosh	DCC
Rochelle Harrison	British Gas
Emslie Law	OVO
Mahfuzar Rahman	Scottish Power
Tom Wooley	SMS
Matthew Alexander	SSEN
Robert Johnston	Utilita
Gemma Slaney (Proposer)	Western Power Distribution
Kelly Kinsman	Western Power Distribution

#### Summary

[MP122B ‘Operational Metrics – Part 2’](#) impacts the Data Communications Company (DCC) and all its Service Providers. Several solution options are available for each reporting area and a Refinement Consultation was recently held to agree which ones should be progressed to a DCC Impact Assessment.

SECAS presented a summary of the responses and its recommendations, before asking the Proposer and the Working Group to come to a decision on each reporting area.

#### DCC consideration of TOC and proxy solutions

SECAS highlighted the DCC’s statement on the use of Technical Operations Centre (TOC) and proxy solutions for reporting against DCC’s performance:

*Progressing the Change Request (CR) is considered to report on the DCC's performance most effectively in the areas of User interest. However, the DCC is also considerate of the cost saving when utilising TOC data for reporting and believes this should be a User choice.*

*Where TOC or proxy data is used, Users should be mindful of this when either setting targets or where the DCC might be held to account for under performance since the DCC is not under full control of achieving the target.*

*Where TOC data is to be utilised, those measures should not be Code Performance Measures, since this would indicate the performance is specific to the DCC, but should be included in Performance Indicators. This would provide Users with the same information but under a different, clearer, definition.*

SECAS highlighted that Working Group members should take this statement into consideration when assessing whether to take forward TOC or proxy solution options. It considered it would impact the following Code Performance Measures (CPMs) as each have a TOC or proxy solution available:

- CPM 3 (used to report on Alerts)
- CPM 6B & 6C (used to report on Communications Hub firmware)
- SEC Section H13.1A (Update Device Firmware business process), accountable under CPM 6A

The Working Group had no comments.

## **Alert reporting: Solution options**

SECAS summarised the Refinement Consultation responses to the Alert reporting solutions and recommended that both CR1418 and CR1438 (both titled 'Throughput of Alerts') be progressed to Impact Assessment.

Before the Working Group made its decision, members further questioned what the DCC currently reports in the PMR related to Alerts. The DCC clarified that its existing reporting for Alerts includes the time spent in the following phases and does not use a proxy:

- Time from receipt on the Communications Hub to onward transmission to the Communications Service Provider (CSP)
- Time from receipt from the Data Service Provider (DSP) to onward transmission to the Service User Gateway

This date is provided as an average against the combination of all Alert types. However, the data for these two phases cannot be summed together for an overall total average. Also, time from the Alert being generated by the Device to reaching the Communications Hub is not currently measured.

The DCC clarified that the current data is not presented against each individual defined Alert but is recorded as an average across all the Alert types combined.

Members agreed the TOC option would not suffice but could not justify the costs for taking forward CR1418 and CR1438. The Proposer and the DCC questioned the other members how important reporting on Alerts is to Parties, or whether the existing reporting noted above was sufficient, considering there to be a lack of strong support for this reporting.

Further discussions were held on what is defined as 'success' for Alerts. The DCC clarified that 'success' is interpreted as the success of the Alert being delivered, rather than it being delivered within

the Target Response Time. CR1418 and CR1438 would provide capability to assess the speed of each individual Alert, as well as the time from it being generated on the Device through to reaching the Communications Hub. Members questioned whether the time taken from the Device to the Communications Hub was needed given this would constitute an indicator of performance rather than a measure. Members also questioned whether it would be cheaper for the DCC to disaggregate a subset of Alerts rather than for all Alerts. The DCC advised it would be unlikely for it to be cheaper disaggregating a subset of Alerts.

Considering members' views, the DCC agreed to investigate any other options to reporting on Alerts before the Proposer made their decision. The Working Group agreed it could not decide on the inclusion of SMETS1 Alerts until any new options had been assessed.

**ACTION:** The DCC to investigate what other options there are for improving the reporting on Alerts.

### POAs, PRAs and Polyphase meter Alerts

Measuring and reporting of Power Outage Alerts (POAs) and Power Restoration Alerts (PRAs) were further discussed.

SECAS confirmed that the DCC has already built a capability to report on AD1, 8F35 and 8F36 Alerts. However, the equivalent Alerts for Polyphase Meters are not reported and not in scope of [MP096 'DNO Power Outage Alerts'](#). These Alerts are:

- 8F58 'Supply interrupted on Phase 1'
- 8F59 'Supply interrupted on Phase 2'
- 8F5A 'Supply interrupted on Phase 3'

Three open modifications were referenced as options for including the measuring and reporting of these Alerts:

- [MP096 'DNO Power Outage Alerts'](#)
- [MP122B 'Operational Metrics – Part 2'](#)
- [MP152 'Consumption on Smart Polyphase Electricity Meters'](#)

Members agreed the Polyphase Meter Alerts should not be added to MP096 as it has become a non-DCC System impacting modification and including these Alerts could delay its progression. Subsequently, they agreed the Alerts should be added to MP122B since it already has DCC System impacting solutions for Alerts reporting under consideration.

### Reporting on Incident Categories 3, 4 and 5

SECAS summarised that all Refinement Consultation responses agreed that DCC's Remedy Systems should be used to report on Incident Categories 3, 4 and 5.

The Proposer and the Working Group subsequently agreed this solution should be taken forward to DCC Impact Assessment.

The Proposer questioned whether it could be Impact Assessed on its own to prevent delay. However, considering the Working Group did not agree to progress any other solution options, it was deemed inefficient to progress it individually.

## The PMR SLA

SECAS summarised the consultation responses, highlighting concern over the DCC implementation costs for both a 14 and 18 working day SLA. It therefore recommended that the SLA be reverted back to 25 working days within SEC Section H 'DCC Services' as was previously before the implementation of MP122A.

Members expressed disappointment that a more cost-effective solution had not been found. They noted the CSP South and Central implementation costs were unjustifiable and requested that the DCC provide more rationale behind the costs. The DCC agreed with the concerns raised and advised other options may be possible if the DCC was allowed to make exceptions and caveats on the data, noting it would have less time to validate data under any shortened timescales.

SECAS highlighted that the proposed 18 working day SLA, at a preliminary cost of £1,160,000, is unlikely to have enough material benefit to the OPSG to justify the costs. This is due to the SLA not enabling the DCC to publish the PMR in time to allow the OPSG to consider this before the end of the calendar month following the end of the measurement reporting period for every calendar month. The DCC questioned what the longest the SLA could be for the PMR to be presented to the OPSG within one month following the end of the reporting period.

**ACTION:** The DCC is to provide rationale behind the CSP South and Central implementation costs.

**ACTION:** The DCC is to investigate other cost-effective solutions to shortening the SLA considering it may be able to make exceptions to the data as a result.

**ACTION:** SECAS will investigate the minimum amount of time needed from receipt of the PMR to be presented at the OPSG meeting within one month following the end of the measurement reporting period.

## Communications Hub firmware

SECAS advised that there was no clear consensus from consultation respondents for any of the solution options for the measuring and reporting of Communications Hub firmware updates.

The Working Group raised a question over the synergies with other modifications. SECAS confirmed that [SECMP0024 'Enduring Approach to Communication Hub Firmware Management'](#) contains a requirement for a new DCC Alert upon firmware activation. This is also covered under the MP122B requirement for this reporting area. Now that SECMP0024 has been approved, the impact will be reflected in the MP122B Impact Assessment with an expected cost reduction. Members asked the DCC to advise roughly how much these costs would decrease by. SECAS also confirmed that the solution under CR1423 'Comms Hub Firmware Image Data' would make use of the firmware tracking mechanism being implemented under [SECMP0007 'Firmware updates to IHDs and PPMIDs'](#).

A member noted that they already received reporting for Communications Hub firmware in the CSP North Region and questioned if the DCC could make use of this. The DCC noted this is for the CSP North only but would investigate it.

**ACTION:** The DCC is to advise roughly how much the cost of CR1423 would reduce by now that SECMP0024 has been approved.

## **SMETS1 Device firmware**

Considering the drawbacks of the alternative solution for the measuring and reporting of SMETS1 firmware, SECAS recommended that CR1440 'Update Firmware SMETS1 Process' be progressed to Impact Assessment. Members questioned whether there was any overlap with SECMP0007. SECAS clarified that only SMETS2+ Devices are in scope of SECMP0007 and therefore there is no crossover with CR1440.

Members sought more clarity on the solution options being considered for SMETS1 Device firmware before deciding on which solution options to progress.

## **Progression of MP122B**

SECAS highlighted that all of the Refinement Consultation respondents agreed that MP122B should continue to be progressed.

## **Next steps**

SECAS and the DCC will carry out the actions listed in this document before a further Working Group meeting is convened to discuss any updates and agree the way forward.