

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'

# August 2022 Working Group – meeting summary

### Attendees

Attendee	Organisation
Ali Beard	SECAS
Kev Duddy	SECAS
Joey Manners	SECAS
Mike Fenn	SECAS
Elizabeth Woods	SECAS
David Walsh	DCC
David Rollason	DCC
Robbie Macintosh	DCC
Julie Brown	British Gas
Rochelle Harrison	Centrica
Alex Hurcombe	EDF Energy
Daniel Davies	ESG Global
Martin Bell	EUA
Alastair Cobb	Landis+Gyr
Ralph Baxter	Octopus Energy
Mafs Rahman	Scottish Power
Lorna Clarke	SMDA
Aiden Way	So Energy
Matt Alexander	SSE Networks
Shuba Khatun	SSE Networks
Audrey Smith-Keary	OVO
George Macgregor	Utilita
Kelly Kinsman	WPD

### Overview

The Smart Energy Code Administrator and Secretariat (SECAS) provided an overview of the issue identified, the Proposed Solution and the Data Communications Company (DCC) Impact Assessment response.





#### Issue

The Smart Energy Code (SEC) Operations Group (OPSG) identified issued with the Performance Measurement Report (PMR), which is provided to it monthly by the DCC. The Operational Metrics review (OMR) was conducted to provide insights on how the reporting could be improved and MP122 was raised to implement the recommendations of the OMR.

<u>MP122A 'Operational Metrics'</u> delivered the amendments to the SEC which didn't require DCC System or Service Provider contract changes. MP122B was initially intended to deliver these remaining changes but has significantly reduced in scope during the Refinement Process. MP122B now consists of enhancements to the reporting on Alerts and Incident Categories 3, 4 and 5.

#### **Proposed Solution**

#### Incident Categories 3, 4 and 5

Reporting on these Incident Categories relates to two Code Performance Measures (CPMs) included in the PMR:

- CPM 5 measures the number of incidents resolved within their Target Resolution Time. The DCC has already included this in its reporting to the OPSG.
- CPM 5A measures the percentage of incidents recorded on the Incident Management Log and assigned to a resolver within the Target Initial Response Time. The DCC is intending to add this to the OPSG reporting at no extra cost, however DCC stakeholder agreement is required, and this is currently being sought. This requirement will remain in scope of MP122B to ensure its delivery.

#### Alerts reporting

Reporting relating to CPM 3 is to be expanded for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS)2 Alerts only. Instead of measuring the Target Response Time for a combination of all Alerts, the average success rate and Round Trip Time for each individual Alert type will be measured.

The DCC carried out separate Change Requests for the different aspects of the reporting. A Data Service Provider (DSP) change is required to provide a log of Alert data and the lifespan of the Alerts, including Alert generation time (where available), time of arrival at DSP, time of leaving, and time of acknowledgement by the Service User. Two other timing points in the log will indicate the time received at the Communications Hub and time received at Communications Service Provider (CSP) North.

As the required timing point data is already recorded by CSP South & Central and sent to the DSP there will be no changes required in CSP South & Central systems.

As the required data is not currently recorded by CSP North, changes to the DCC SMWAN Gateway are required to include an additional field for the Great Britain Companion Specification (GBCS) Alert timestamp as recorded on the Application Programming Interface (API) within the Communications Hub.

The new *HubTimestamp* field will not be mandatory, because it is not applicable to all types of traffic carried by this interface.

The *HubTimestamp* field is for the Wide Area Network (WAN) side of the Communications Hub, not the Home Area Network (HAN) side. CSP North have stated that in 99.9% of cases it will be



Page 2 of 3



practically identical to the HAN-side time; the only difference is it would not identify any delay in Alert processing by the Communications Hub itself. CSP North has indicated that capturing the HAN side data would require a change to the Communications Hub, which would be complex and time consuming. The approach of using the WAN-side timestamp was previously agreed with SECAS and the Working Group.

#### **DCC Impact Assessment**

The DCC has provided a timescale from approval to implementation of seven months.

The DCC has quoted a total cost to implement MP122B of £1,171,967 which comprises:

- £811,776 in Design, Build and Pre-Integration Testing (PIT) costs;
- £360,191 in post-PIT Release costs (Systems Integration Testing (SIT), User Integration Testing (UIT) and Transition to Operations (TTO)).

There will be no change in SMETS1 Service Provider (S1SP) systems as reporting on SMETS1 Alerts is no longer in scope of the modification.

## Working Group Discussion

A Working Group member (JB) queried if this method would also give an indication of Alert 'losses' between the DSP and the CSP. The DCC (DW) confirmed that it would. The DCC (DW) also noted that the flow diagram included in the SECAS presentation is no longer accurate. SECAS (MF) agreed to correct the diagram and include the updated version in the next draft of the Modification Report.

Another Working Group member (MR) asked to clarify the technical detail of the solution. The DCC (DW) and SECAS (MF) referred to the relevant section of the DCC's Impact Assessment regarding timestamp recording (set out in the 'Alerts reporting' section above), noting that the timestamp for CSP N is measured at the Communications Hub and then picked up by the Application Programming Interface (API) on the base station, so regardless of transmission delays between the Communications Hub and the CSP the timestamp will still measure the point at which the Alert reaches the Communications Hub.

The DCC (DW) also noted that the solution approach was agreed at previous Working Group meetings.

The member also queried the cost quoted by CSP North to implement the changes. The DCC (DW) noted that these costs are the same as what was quoted at the Preliminary Assessment stage and advised that the costs are being challenged with the CSP.

## **Next Steps**

The following actions were recorded from the meeting:

- SECAS to present the DCC Impact Assessment to the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC).
- SECAS to work with the DCC and the SECAS lawyer to draft the amended legal text.
- SECAS to issue a second Refinement Consultation.

