

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’

11 February 2022 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
David Kemp	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Ali Beard	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Charlotte Semp	DCC
Easton Brown	DCC
David Rollason	DCC
Rochelle Harrison	British Gas
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Audrey Smith-Keary	OVO
Emslie Law	OVO
Gemma Slaney	WPD
Robert Johnston	Utilita

Working Group Discussion

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the Proposed Solution identified under [MP122B ‘Operational Metrics - Part 2’](#). It was noted that the costs for each solution option do not include Systems Integration testing (SIT), User Integration Testing (UIT), additional Application Support or contractual changes.

Reporting on Alerts

SECAS provided an overview of the current DCC reporting on Alerts and how the solution options proposed to enhance this. This would be achieved by reporting on two additional Alert timings:

- When the Alert initially gets generated by the Device
- When the Data Service Provider (DSP) receives a handshake from the Service User confirming receipt of the Alert

CR1418 ‘Throughput of Alerts’ would provide this data for the Communications Service Provider (CSP) Central and South (C&S) only. CR1418 combined with CR1438 ‘Throughput of Alerts’ would

provide this for the CSP North and the Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) 1 Service Providers as well.

SECAS recommended that CR1418 and CR1438 be taken forward, the latter with the SMETS1 elements removed. This was to ensure that enhanced reporting on Alerts is investigated further whilst making efforts to preserve the business case.

Members agreed with the recommendation and that the high costs for the SMETS1 Alerts were not able to be justified. However, one member noted the SMETS2 costs are likely to rise further given that one of the CSPs tests twice and that this hasn't been factored into the existing preliminary costs. Following the meeting, the DCC advised that the repeated testing cycles only apply to Communications Hub firmware updates which are not required for CR1418 or CR1438.

Decision

Progress CR1418 and CR1438 without SMETS1 Alerts.

Action: The DCC will provide updated estimated implementation costs for CR1438 as well as an updated cost to complete the CR1438 Impact Assessment now the SMETS1 elements have been removed.

Reducing the PMR SLA

SECAS reminded members of the original business requirement which was to reduce the Performance Measurement Report (PMR) service level agreement (SLA) to within 10 Working Days from the end of the measurement reporting period. This had been implemented into the SEC under MP122A 'Operational Metrics' and a derogation subsequently granted to the DCC who has been unable to achieve this.

SECAS highlighted the DCC's Preliminary Assessment had found that the fastest time it would be able to produce the PMR is 18 Working Days from the end of the measurement reporting period. This would cost £1.14m – £1.16m and would not be of material benefit to the Operations Group (OPSG). As a result, SECAS considered the solution did not present a viable business case and recommended that the SLA should be reverted back to its previous SLA of 25 Working Days.

The DCC noted that the CSP C&S was the only Service Provider to prevent the SLA from being reduced to 14 Working Days. The organisation fulfilling the CSP C&S has changed since the Preliminary Assessment which may result in being able to meet a 14 Working Day SLA and with lower costs. The DCC suggested that the CSP C&S solution for the PMR SLA be Impact Assessed on its own with a view to it reducing its costs and delivery timescales to align with the other Service Providers. The DCC advised the estimated costs for the CSP C&S to do the CR1430 'PMR Reduced Timescales' are around £24k but would confirm before seeking Change Board approval. These costs were relatively low compared to the full cost under CR1430 to Impact Assess all the Service Providers.

Decision

The CSP C&S solution for CR1430 will progress to Impact Assessment.

The Working Group will review the response from the CSP C&S and will determine if there is merit with proceeding to Impact Assessment with the remaining Service Providers or whether the SLA should revert to 25 Working Days.

Action: The DCC will advise what the standalone CSP C&S Impact Assessment costs are for CR1430 before the February Change Board meeting.

Reporting on firmware

SECAS provided an overview the DCC's current reporting on firmware, including the PMR and Technical Operations Centre (TOC) reporting. Two solutions were available to enhance firmware reporting:

- CR1423 'Comms Hub Firmware Image Data' – To improve reporting on Communications Hub firmware
- CR1440 'Update Firmware SMETS1 Process' – To improve reporting on SMETS1 Device firmware

SECAS presented four options of progressing without a recommendation of its own:

1. Impact Assess CR1423
2. Impact Assess CR1440
3. Impact Assess CR1423 and CR1440
4. Do nothing

Members noted that the existing PMR reporting on firmware provides a good view on performance. Another member advised that other industry groups also receive reporting on firmware and this provides a comprehensive view on performance.

Ofgem's Operational Performance Regime (OPR) includes measures against meter firmware, including a breakdown by SMETS2 and SMETS1. The DCC advised that it is not seeking to use the MP122B reporting solutions to report against the OPR. SECAS also advised that Ofgem would align the OPR measures with those that industry wanted to measure.

Members agreed that the 'do nothing option' would be best considering the high costs for both CR1423 and CR1440 as well as current reporting the DCC produces for firmware. If this approach was approved under MP122B, SECAS would amend SEC Section H 'DCC Services' accordingly.

Decision

CR1423 and CR1440 will not be Impact Assessed and will be removed from the Proposed Solution. The MP122B legal text will amend the SEC wording introduced under MP122A accordingly.

Implementation approach

SECAS summarised the consultation views on the implementation approach. The Proposer preferred a single implementation approach as this would be cleaner and less confusing to industry. The DCC noted that each of the reporting solutions under MP122B impact differing elements and systems within the DCC and its Service Providers. As a result, it agreed to also investigate a phased implementation approach under the Impact Assessment. The Proposer stated that the phased implementation approach within the Impact Assessment must have clearly defined dates of what solutions get implemented and when.

Action: The DCC will investigate both a single and a phased implementation approach under the Impact Assessment.

Case for change

SECAS summarised the case for change including the views against the General SEC Objectives and consumer impacts. Members agreed with the impacts and one member noted that SEC Objective (a)¹ would also be benefited, particularly in regard to the operation of DCC Alerts and firmware updates.

SECAS noted the implementation costs of circa £3m for these three Change Requests and the DCC Remedy solution for Incident Categories 3, 4 and 5 is expensive considering these will only enhance reporting. It advised that MP122B will be Authority Determined and that the Authority will assess the business case when making its decision.

The Proposer noted the high costs but stated that to hold the DCC accountable the industry must know how well it is performing.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- The DCC will provide updated estimated implementation costs for CR1438 as well as an updated cost to do the CR1438 Impact Assessment now the SMETS1 elements have been removed
- The DCC will advise what the standalone CSP C&S Impact Assessment costs are for CR1430 before the February Change Board meeting.
- SECAS will request the Change Board approve the Impact Assessment costs on 23 February
- If approved on 23 February, for CR1430 SECAS will only request an Impact Assessment from the CSP C&S, as well as a full Impact Assessment for CR1418, CR1438 and the DCC Remedy solution for Incident Categories 3, 4 and 5 agreed at a previous meeting.

¹ To facilitate the efficient provision, installation, and operation, as well as interoperability, of Smart Metering Systems at Energy Consumers' premises within Great Britain.