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.

Paper Reference:	**TABASC_27_1502_12**
Action:	**For Decision**

Operations Group Feedback on the TABASC Effectiveness Review Survey

1. Purpose

At the January TABASC 2018 meeting it was agreed to share and seek feedback from the Operations Group on the questions included in the Effectiveness Review Survey. This paper provides details of the feedback received and the proposed actions to be taken in light of the feedback.

2. Sharing the survey with the Operations Group

The details of the Effectiveness Review Survey were discussed at the Operations Group on 23rd January 2018. The Operations Group Members were then given time to provide any feedback on the scope of the survey, to enable any necessary revisions to be brought to the TABASC in February 2018 for consideration.

The only feedback received was a question on whether the survey should include a question to obtain feedback on any data quality issues encountered by Users when utilising DCC Services and Systems.

3. Proposed addition to the Effectiveness Review Survey

In light of the feedback received, it is proposed the following question is added to section 1[1] of the survey:

> Have you experienced any data quality issues when utilising the DCC services or processes? (For example, have you experienced any discrepancies between the data held within your organisation's systems compared to that held within/by the DCC).
>
> If Yes, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

This additional question has been captured within an amended set of Effectiveness Review Survey questions provided in Appendix A.

[1] Section 1: DCC Systems, services and processes (including those associated with the Communications Hub

4. Recommendations

The TABASC is requested to:

- **NOTE** the contents of this paper; and
- **AGREE** the proposed revisions to the Effectiveness Review Survey questions.

David Barber

SECAS Team

8th February 2018

Appendix A – Amended Effectiveness Review Survey

Effectiveness Review Survey

Smart Metering Implementation Programme

Survey to obtain feedback about specific aspects of live operations
Context and Purpose

The Smart Energy Code (SEC) Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC), with agreement from the SEC Panel, has sponsored a series of surveys of DCC Users. This questionnaire is to obtain views on the experience of live operations to date. Subsequent questionnaires will aim to obtain views and allow an assessment of how they change over time, as installation rates increase.

The purpose is to identify any emerging problems that may be attributed to the effectiveness of the design and specifications relating to the Technical and / or Business Architecture and / or to the HAN requirements and to report to the SEC Panel with recommendations as required by the SEC.

The SEC places obligations on the TABASC to undertake reviews relating to the Technical and Business Architecture. SEC Section F1.4 requires that:

"The Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee shall undertake the following duties on behalf of the Panel: ……

(e) to review (where directed to do so by the Panel) the effectiveness of the End-to-End Technical Architecture (including so as to evaluate whether the Technical Code Specifications continue to meet the SEC Objectives), and report to the Panel on the outcome of such review (such report to include any recommendations for action that the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee considers appropriate)."

(f) to review (where directed to do so by the Panel) the effectiveness of the Business Architecture (including their assessment against the SEC Objectives), in consultation with Parties and Competent Authorities (but without engaging directly with Energy Consumers), and report to the Panel on the outcome of such review (such report to include any recommendations for action that the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee considers appropriate);

(g) to review (where directed to do so by the Panel) the effectiveness of the HAN Requirements (including their assessment against the SEC Objectives), in consultation with Parties and Competent Authorities (but without engaging directly with Energy Consumers), and report to the Authority and the Panel on the outcome of such review;"

Confidentiality

It is recognised that any information you provide may have commercial sensitivity and will be treated in confidence for analysis and any resulting recommendations reported to the SEC Panel.

The survey is being undertaken by SECAS on behalf of the TABASC. All information will be treated in confidence.

However, if a DCC User identifies an emerging problem, it might be necessary for the TABASC to obtain further details for clarification. For this reason, the Questionnaire asks for the name of your Organisation and Contact details (for any necessary follow-up).

Survey of DCC Users:

The aim is to identify any problems in live running that may be linked to the underpinning technical design and the associated business processes and infrastructure in the Home. In this respect, the aim is to identify if the systems and processes meet your business needs rather than simply meeting the SEC Obligations. Technical questions would best be answered in conjunction with a relevant solution architect (or similar role) with an understanding of the technology.

Just one response per Organisation is required where Commissioned Devices are being operated.

Name of Organisation:

Contact Point (for follow-up):

Responses authorised by:

Number of Commissioned Devices[2]. Please place a tick in a box (✓ - you can copy this tick)				
0 - 500	500-1000	1000-5000	5000-10000	>10000

[2] The SEC defines 'Commissioned' as meaning, in respect of a Device [includes Communication Hubs], that:
(a) the Device has been commissioned in accordance with the Smart Metering Inventory Enrolment and Withdrawal Procedures; and
(b) the Device has not subsequently been Decommissioned, Withdrawn or Suspended,

Section 1: DCC Systems, services and processes (including those associated with the Communications Hub)

1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied. Please place a tick in a box (✓ - you can copy this tick)

Q1. How satisfied are you with the systems, services and processes (including those associated with the Communications Hub) provided by the DCC for your business operations?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q2. Have business operations been adversely affected by the performance of the DCC Systems, services or processes?

Yes
No (Go to Question 3)

If Yes, did the problems arise from part of the DCC technical solution listed below (if so, please use Box 1 to expand) or from any other cause (if so, please use Box 2 to explain) and please indicate the degree of impact.

a) Poor network connectivity to the DCC using the Gamma link. Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) Technical connectivity using the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS). Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) Overall system response times. Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) Stability of Wide Area Network (WAN) connectivity with Communications Hubs. Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

e) Incidents and problems relating to the technical architecture. Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

f) Any DCC business services or processes. Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

g) A lack of technical functionality available now (recognising some may be scheduled for future releases). Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

h) A lack of functionality in the overall system. Please expand in Box 1 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

i) Other. Please explain in Box 2 below

Box 1 (please expand providing the nature and extent of the problem)

Box 2 (please explain any 'Other' problem not listed above)

Q3. Have you experienced any data quality issues when utilising the DCC services or processes? (For example, have you experienced any discrepancies between the data held within your organisation systems compare to that held within/by the DCC). If Yes, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

Q~~3~~4. Have you identified any areas of DCC systems, services and processes for improvement? If Yes, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

Section 2: Home Area Network (HAN) and Device performance

(including the ESME, GSME, IHD, PPMID, HHT, HAN and Communications Hub)

1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.

Q~~4~~5. How satisfied are you with the performance of the HAN and associated Devices?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q~~5~~6. Have business operations been adversely affected by HAN or Device performance?

Yes
No (Go to Question 7)

If Yes, did the problems arise from any of the causes listed below (if so, please use Box 4 to expand) or from any other cause (if so, please use Box 5 to explain) and please indicate the degree of impact.

a) The response times of the HAN. Please expand in Box 4 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) The range of 2.4GHz connectivity (e.g. does the actual coverage meet your expectations). Please expand in Box 4 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) The responsiveness of Devices. Please expand in Box 4 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) Problems with integrating In Home Displays (IHDs) or Pre-Payment Interface Devices (PPMIDs). Please expand in Box 4 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

e) Problems with interoperability between Devices on the HAN e.g. different versions of specifications or where more than one Supplier is involved. Please expand in Box 4 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

f) Problems with interchangeability e.g. when inheriting equipment on churn. Please expand in Box 4 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

g) Other. Please explain in Box 5 below

Box 4 (please specify the nature and extent of the problem)

Box 5 (please explain any 'Other' problem not listed above)

Q~~6~~7. Have the problems had an apparent link to:

a) Installations in the North CSP region. Please expand in Box 6 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) Installations in the Central CSP region. Please expand in Box 6 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) Installations in the South CSP region. Please expand in Box 6 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) Installations involving MESH. Please expand in Box 6 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

Box 6 (please expand the nature and extent of the problem)

Q~~7~~8. Have you identified any areas for improvement in HAN and Device performance? If Yes, please explain below and confirm how it is being progressed.

Section 3: Firmware Upgrades

Q~~8~~9. Have you had experience of Firmware Upgrades via the DCC?

Yes
No (Go to Question 10)

If Yes, did any problems arise from Firmware Upgrades to any of the Devices listed below (if so, please use Box 8 to expand) and please indicate the degree of impact

a) Firmware Upgrade to the ESME. Please expand in Box 8 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) Firmware Upgrade to the GSME. Please expand in Box 8 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) Firmware Upgrade to the Communications Hub. Please expand in Box 8 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

Q10~~9~~. Did the problem arise from any of the causes listed below (if so, please use Box 9 to expand) or from any other cause (if so, please use Box 10 to explain) and please indicate the degree of impact.

a) The process used by the Device Vendor to provide ESME or GSME Firmware to the Supplier.

Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) The process used by the Supplier to provide ESME or GSME Firmware to the DCC.

Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) The listing of the Firmware version in the Certified Product List (CPL).

Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) The distribution of the Firmware upgrade by the DCC e.g. within expected timescales. Please specify in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

e) The activation of the Firmware upgrade e.g. did it happen as expected? Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

f) The quality and effectiveness of the Firmware in live operations e.g. errors encountered. Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

g) Other. Please explain in Box 8 below

Box 7 (please expand providing the nature and extent of the problem)

Box 8 (please explain any 'Other' problem not listed above)

Q1~~0~~1. Have you identified any areas relating to firmware management for improvement? If Yes, please explain below and indicate how it is being progressed.

Section 4: System performance

Q1~~1~~2. How satisfied are you with the system performance to date?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q1~~2~~3. Have installation rates been adversely affected by overall system performance?

Yes
No (Go to Question 14)

If Yes, did the problems arise from any of the causes listed below (if so, please use Box 9 to expand) or from any other cause (if so, please use Box 10 to explain) and please indicate the degree of impact.

a) DCC Installation systems and processes not working effectively (e.g. allowing the meter to be installed at the site at first attempt). Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) DCC Commissioning systems and processes not working effectively (e.g. preventing the meter being commissioned by the Supplier). Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) User Installation systems and processes challenges (e.g. use of HHT to install). Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) User Commissioning systems and processes challenges (e.g. allowing Devices to be Commissioned and SMKI Certificates changed). Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

e) Service requests not processed quickly enough (end to end). Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

f) Not receiving the information you need from the system quickly enough. Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

g) Incorrect or missing alerts. Please expand in Box 9 below

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

h) Other. Please specify in Box 10 below

Box 9 (please specify the nature and extent of the problem)

Box 10 (please explain any 'Other' problem not listed above)

Q1~~3~~4. What proportion of installations that have been aborted are due to the above issues? Please specify below indicating whether it is being progressed.

Q1~~4~~5. Have you identified any areas relating to System Performance for improvement? If Yes, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

Section 5: Business processes

Q15~~5~~6. How satisfied are you with the current business processes?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q16~~7~~7. Have business operations been adversely affected by the smart metering business processes?

Yes
No (Go to Question 17)

If Yes, did the problems arise from any of the causes listed below (if so, please use Box 16 to expand) or from any other cause (if so, please use Box 17 to explain) and please indicate the degree of impact.

a) Installations being delayed due to technical issues in **DCC Systems** affecting business processes. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) Installations being delayed due to technical issues in **User Systems** affecting business processes. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) Business As Usual (BAU) operational processes taking longer or needing more resources due to technical issues.

Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) Specific business processes not performing as planned e.g. Change of Supplier. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

e) Submission of Threshold Anomaly Detection values. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

f) Release of quarantined messages. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

g) Processes affecting the consumer experience e.g. requiring consumer contact or manual processing to complete readings, billings and changes of circumstances. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

h) Service requests not supporting the User obligations. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

i) The technical architecture not capable of supporting smart home services. Please expand in Box 11

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

j) Other. Please explain in Box 12

Box 11 (please expand providing the nature and extent of the problem)

Box 12 (please explain any 'Other' problem not listed above)

Q1~~7~~8. Have you identified any areas related to business processes for improvement? If Yes, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

Section 6: Issues related to SMKI, DCCKI, and / or IKI

Q1~~8~~9. How satisfied are you with the operation of SMKI, DCCKI and IKI to date?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q~~18~~20. Have business operations been adversely affected by any key infrastructure issues?

Yes
No (Go to Question 19)

If Yes, did the problems arise from any of the causes listed below (if so, please use Box 13 to expand) or from any other cause (if so, please use Box 20 to explain) and please indicate the degree of impact.

a) SMKI Keys, Certificates or processes involving Senior Responsible Officers (**SRO**) and Authorised Responsible Officers (ARO). Please expand in Box 13

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

b) DCCKI processes for DCC connectivity. Please expand in Box 13

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

c) IKI processes for file-signing e.g. Threshold Anomaly Detection. Please expand in Box 13

0 (N/A / No Impact)	1 (Low)	2 (Medium)	3 (High)

d) Other. Please specify in Box 14

Box 13 (please expand providing the nature and extent of the problem)

Box 14 (please explain any 'Other' problem not listed above)

Q21~~9~~. Have you identified any areas related to SMKI, DCCKI, and / or IKI for improvement?

If Yes, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

Section 7: Any other issues

Q22~~0~~. Do you have any other issues that you would like to bring to the attention of the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC)? If so, please expand below: