

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.

MP187 ‘Incorporation of Target Round Trip Times and Target Success Rates into the SEC’

February 2022 Working Group – meeting summary

Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Elizabeth Woods	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Bradley Baker	SECAS
Joe Hehir	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
Tim Newton	SECAS
Louise Evans	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
Katie Taaffe	DCC
Oliver Bridges	DCC
Easton Brown	DCC
Emma Johnson	British Gas
Lynne Hargrave	Calvin Capital
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davis	ESG Global
Terry Jefferson	EUA
Carrie Coles	Good Energy
Peter Hoare	Kaifa Metering
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Grace Royall	Ofgem
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Elias Hanna	Smart ADSL
Christie Thomson	SSE
Audrey Smith-Keary	SSE - OVO
Emslie Law	SSE - OVO
Matthew Alexander	SEEN
Robert Johnstone	Utilita
Kelly Kinsman	WPD

Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified and the difference between Round Trip Times (RTTs) and Target Response Times (TRTs). The Data Communications Company (DCC) presented the proposed definitions of 'Round Trip Time' and 'Success Rate' and proposed target RTT-setting methodology.

Issue

- [MP122A 'Operational Metrics'](#) introduced new Service Reference Variant (SRV) metrics reporting.
- These reports measure Round Trip Times and compare them to Target Response times.
- DCC cannot currently measure Target Response Times – to do so would cost £3.5-5m.

Proposed definitions

- **Round Trip time** - Round Trip Time for Service Responses refers to the period starting as described in H3.14 and ending on the provision of the Service Response to the User, counting the entire time spent in the Smart Metering System (SMS), and includes the HAN and Device processing time.
- **Success Rate** - A Service Reference Variant shall be considered to have been successfully processed, when it has been sent to the DCC, and an associated Response Code (as defined in the DCC's supporting response code spreadsheet), indicating success or failure to execute the requested action, has been sent to the User Interface.

The categorisation of response codes in the DCC's supporting response code spreadsheet is for guidance, and it is recognised that some codes may be interchangeably categorised as a 'Success', 'Error (fail)' or 'Invalid (unknown/ignore)', depending on circumstances. In these instances, a judgement is made and the categorisation of the response code will be noted so that SEC Parties can dispute the categorisation if required.

In addition, SEC Parties have the ability at any stage to challenge the categorisation of a code, either as a general challenge or on a case-by-case basis.

Working Group Discussion

SECAS (BB) provided an overview of the issue and the difference between RTTs and TRTs.

Round Trip Time definition

The DCC (KT) presented the proposed definition for Round Trip Time. A Working Group member (EL) commented that the introduction of RTTs into the SEC would be beneficial and should be pursued.

The DCC (OB) added that it has been through an exercise of categorising Alert Codes. This has resulted in a DCC-produced document which would be distributed following the Working Group meeting. A Working Group member (EL) advised that during the original drafting of the GB Companion Specification (GBCS), volunteer Parties analysed all Events and Alerts, with the exception of those that are Smart Metering Technical Specifications (SMETS)1-related. This resulted in the Event and Alert mapping table found in GBCS. They advised that SMETS1 Event and Alert Codes are different to those of SMETS2. They added that the DCC was involved with this project, and the Proposer should investigate if there are DCC colleagues who may be able to provide guidance.

Success Rate definition

SECAS (BB) asked the Working Group whether 'time' and/or 'speed' need to be considered as part of the Success Rate definition. A Working Group member (EL) advised that to 'close the loop' within the Data Service Provider (DSP) and within User systems, Parties need to know when the response is due to be received. They added that time must be included within the definition to allow Parties to be able to close off actions.

SECAS (JM) added that the way TRTs are currently set, relates to messages delivered within their correlating TRT. They added further that the MP122A reporting focused on whether messages were delivered or not. The Working Group agreed that time should be incorporated into the definition, with parameters set to determine how time impacts success.

SECAS took an action to distribute the proposed definitions and supporting Alert Code spreadsheet to Working Group attendees for further comments. This has now been done.

Reporting

SECAS (JM) set out the proposed reporting that will be introduced to analyse the success of SRV RTTs. SECAS informed the Working Group that the DCC will not be financially incentivised by the reports. The best means to utilise the targets and reporting will be to identify dips in performance that can be investigated and where improvements may be identified. This will be through categorising messages into each business process and by using a Red/Amber/Green (RAG) rating system. The DCC are to return to a following Working Group meeting with proposed thresholds for each rating.

The DCC (KT) presented the proposed methodology for setting target RTTs. This was displayed through box whisker diagrams. The DCC has utilised this methodology for the prepayment business process and showed the findings to the Working Group. Several Working Group members commented positively on the data shown, stating that it was a very good visualisation of the data. This methodology will be further developed ahead of the next Working Group meeting. SECAS (AB) also asked if additional information could be provided on the whisker box diagrams such as the total number of SRVs in each category and the dates that the data was collected to ensure any incidents or unusual events could be identified and their effects on the data understood.

Next Steps

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to distribute proposed definitions and supporting spreadsheet to Working Group attendees; and

- DCC to further develop target RTTs and whisker box diagrams for each SRV before returning to the Working Group with a fully developed Proposed Solution.