Data Communications Company

DCC Price Control RY25/26 – OPR report

Version: 1.0
Date: 31.07.2026

Table of Contents

1. OPR report 3
1.1. Purpose and context 4
2. System performance 5
2.1. Background 5
2.2. Service availability (SUM1) 6
2.3. RY25/26 reported performance 6
2.4. Install and commission (SDM1) 7
2.5. Prepayment (interim response times) (SDM2) 8
3. Customer engagement (VMM1) 9
4. Contract management (VMM2) 10
4.1. Background and context 10
4.2. Commentary on auditor scores 10
5. OPR performance summary 12
Appendix A: Zero-weighted system measures 14
Firmware management (SUM2) 14
Change of supplier (SDM3) 14
Appendix B: DCC responses to qualitative questions 16
Question 1 16
Question 2 16
Question 3 17
Question 4 17
Appendix C: Supporting evidence 18

1. OPR report

Summary

What is this and why is it important?

The Operational Performance Regime (OPR) is designed to incentivise DCC to run a high-quality service for its customers by placing all of its Baseline Margin at risk against the achievement of certain targets. The regime does this by financially incentivising DCC's performance in three main areas:

- System performance (60% weighting)
- Customer engagement (15% weighting)
- Contract management (25% weighting)

RY25/26 performance

In RY25/26, £14.005m was placed at risk against the OPR, and we expect to retain £12.996m of this.

We have provided an excellent service overall to our customers and have achieved 93% performance overall under OPR.

- On **system performance**, we are reporting performance of 100% for RY25/26. This reflects our commitment to ensure the smart metering network is always fully available, is reliable and operates as designed. We are continuing to evolve the way we report the operational performance based on supplier feedback.
- On **customer engagement**, we are reporting performance of 92% (2.75 out of 3). SECAS has suggested a score of 2.18 out of 3. Overall, we have seen significant improvement in our customer engagement, working with them more collaboratively in areas such as developing our ex-ante business plan and have developed a better understanding of their priorities, in line with the objectives of our Customer First programme. Against the OPR survey questions, we have delivered a strong performance and improved our customer focus since last year's OPR score.
- On **contract management**, DCC has determined its performance to be 76% (2.29 out of 3) based on the scores from the independent auditor. This is higher than last year's final outcome of 73% (2.19 out of 3).

Future performance

We expect DCC's future system performance to remain the same as RY25/26, with year-on-year improvements expected in customer engagement and contract management. We do however acknowledge that OPR, due to the business handover from DCC1 to DCC2 in November 2026, will be reporting in its current form on results for a partial year.

1.1. Purpose and context

1.1.1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to report on the DCC's assessment of its OPR performance for RY25/26 and provides the narrative to support the data in RIGs Annex 1. This submission reports against the five OPR measures:

1. Service availability (SUM1)
2. Install and commission (SDM1)
3. Prepayment (interim response times) (SDM2)
4. Customer engagement (VMM1)
5. Contract management (VMM2)

For each of the systems measures (SUM1, SDM1 and SDM2), we outline our assessment of our performance against each of the incentivised OPR System Performance measures, alongside the associated margin impact, if any. We provide an explanation of our assessment, as well as any key points Ofgem may want to consider in making its assessment.

For VMM1 and VMM2, we summarise our views but refer to separate submissions which provide more detail on each.

Whilst this document focuses on systems performance measures, it should be read in conjunction with the Customer Engagement submission Perf_OPR_CE_RY2526, the Contract Management audit report (see Appendix C of this document) and RIGs Annex 1 RIGS_annex_1_RY2526.

We cover the responses to the qualitative questions[1] in Appendix B and all supporting evidence is contained in Appendix C.

1.1.2. Context

DCC is subject to several economic incentive regimes. The table below sets out a summary for each and includes references to where they are reported within this year's Price Control submission.

Regime	Regime type	Status	Narrative reference	RIGs reference
Operational Performance Regime (OPR)	Operational	Live	Systems and contract management - reported in this document. Customer engagement in: • 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part1_RY2526 • .Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part2_RY2526 • 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part2_Ofgem_only_RY2526	RIGs Annex 1
Enduring Change of Supplier (ECoS)	Programme	Live	Please see: 5.Perf_BMPPA_RY2526	RIGs Annex 2
4G Communications Hubs and Networks (4G CH&N)	Programme	Live	No reporting for RY25/26	RIGs Annex 2

[1] Ofgem, Annex 1 RIGs Guidance - Quality of Service Information, 30 June 2023, Section 5: https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-06/RIGs_Guidance_-_Annex_1_-_2023.pdf

Regime	Regime type	Status	Narrative reference	RIGs reference
Data Services Provider (DSP)	Programme	Not yet live	No reporting for RY25/26	RIGs Annex 2
Future Service Management (FSM)	Programme	Not yet live	No reporting for RY25/26	RIGs Annex 2
Public Key Infrastructure – Enduring (PKI-E)	Programme	Not yet live	No reporting for RY25/26	RIGs Annex 2
Switching Incentive Regime (SIR)	Operational	Live	Please see: • 5.Perf_Switching_SIRSDM1_RY2526 • 5.Perf_Switching_SIRVMM1_RY2526	RIGs Annex 4

Table 1 - Economic incentive regimes and their status

As set out above, this document explains the performance related to OPR only and, as such, provides the supporting commentary for RIGs Annex 1.

For RY24/25 we were awarded 100% of the £8.135m of margin placed at risk against the system performance element of OPR. For RY25/26, £8.403m has been placed at risk against system performance and we anticipate that 100% of this is awarded.

For RY24/25 we were awarded 69% of the £2.68m of margin place at risk against the customer engagement and contract management elements of the OPR. For RY25/26, £5.602m has been placed at risk against the customer engagement and contract management elements of the OPR and we anticipate that 80% of this is awarded.

2. System performance

2.1. Background

The overarching aim of the OPR is to improve DCC's customers' experience by financially incentivising DCC to drive better performance. We accept that as a monopoly company, it is important that we face sufficient incentives to deliver our role in a manner in which we provide our customers with a value for money and high-quality service that supports smart metering.

The OPR incentivises DCC based on the reliability of DCC systems, customer engagement, and contract management. There are currently five active performance measures under which DCC is financially incentivised:

- Service availability
- Install and Commission
- Prepayment (interim response times)
- Customer engagement
- Contract management.

The three system measures (service availability, install and commission, and prepayment (interim response times)) carry an equal weighting of 23.33%, therefore reflecting the importance of the operational performance of the DCC. The customer engagement measure weighting is 15% and contract management measure carries a weighting of 25%.

A portion of DCC's baseline margin is put at risk against each of the above measures.

The first OPR came into effect on 1 April 2018[1]. The regime changed on 1 April 2021 and again on 1 April 2022 when an interim regime was put in place due to some of the proposed changes not being technically possible to report against. DCC has been working with its customers to develop a revised set of reporting that will provide industry with the service and performance it considers is missing from the current set of performance measures.

Each year, DCC's performance is assessed against a set of assessment criteria, which for RY25/26 is set out in the OPR guidance that came into effect on 29 March 2022[2].

2.2. Service availability (SUM1)

The service availability measure is designed to incentivise DCC to ensure its services are accessible as needed, whenever and wherever they are required by DCC users. The Target Performance Level (TPL) for this measure is 99.50% and the Minimum Performance Level (MPL) is 98.00%.

In RY25/26, DCC performed very strongly, with overall services availability of 99.95%.

2.3. RY25/26 reported performance

The value of the Reported Performance Levels (RPLs) in RY25/26 were determined as a mean of five metrics, which measure the availability of DCC's interfaces, and their supporting sub-systems averaged across the 12 months from April 2025 to March 2026.

The individual RPLs for each of the metrics were:

- DCC User Interface: 99.97% (99.95% last year)
- Registration Data Interface: 99.98% (99.97% last year)
- SMKI Repository Interface: 99.98% (99.97% last year)
- SMKI Service Interfaces: 99.84% (100% last year)
- Self-Service Interface: 99.98% (99.97% last year)

As the five metrics are equally weighted, the overall RPL for SUM1 was 99.95% (see cell T35 in worksheet vi. SUM1 in RIGs Annex 1). This means that TPL was achieved, and so no margin should be deducted.

The overall SUM1 performance is summarised in the table below:

[1] Decision on DCC's Operational Performance Regime | Ofgem
[2] Ofgem, Revised OPR Guidance, 29 March 2022: https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2022-03/Revised%20OPR%20Guidance%20%28March%202022%29.pdf

SUM1 – service availability Designed to incentivise DCC to ensure its services are accessible as needed, whenever and wherever they are required by DCC users.	
Minimum (%)	98.00%
Target (%)	99.50%
Penalty mechanism	A
DCC self-assessment (%)	99.95% TPL ACHIEVED
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet vi. SUM1, T35.
Related performance measures	SECMOD122A availability measures for the DCC Interfaces (a-e only).[1]
Margin impact	All margin retained. £2.801m

Table 2 – SUM1 performance summary

2.4. Install and commission (SDM1)

The install and commission measure is designed to incentivise DCC to provide high quality services to support the installation and commissioning of a smart meter. This measure also includes the logistics involved, the success of first time, and overall, WAN connectivity. The TPL for this measure is 99.00% and the MPL is 96.00%.

The value of the RPLs in RY25/26 were determined as a mean average of four of the five metrics, which relate to the install and commissions business processes averaged across the 12 months from April 2025 to March 2026. The fifth metric relating to SRV8.11 has been zero weighted for RY25/26 within the OPR however we continue to focus on this aspect of our performance. Overall DCC's performance has been very strong, outperforming the Target Performance Levels.

The individual RPLs for each of the metrics were:

- PM1.2 Comms Hubs Accepted by Customers (IC1)
    - North: 100.00%
    - Central: 100.00%
    - South: 100.00%
- PM1.3 Comms Hubs not Faulty (IC2)
    - North: 99.99%
    - Central: 99.96%
    - South: 99.99%
- PM1.1 First time SMWAN connectivity at Install (IC3),
    - North: 97.51%
    - Central: 99.77%
    - South: 99.75%
- PM1.3 (South and Central) / PM1.4 (North) SMWAN Connectivity Level (IC4)
    - North: 100.00%
    - Central: 100.00%
    - South: 100.00%

[1] See SEC A Definitions and Interpretation: DCC Interfaces

- SRV8.11 Update Home Area Network (HAN) Device Log (IC5)
    - Zero-weighted for RY25/26.

As four of the five metrics were equally weighted, the overall RPL for SDM1 was 99.38% in the North Region (see cell T85 in worksheet viii. SDM1 in RIGs Annex 1), 99.93% in the Central Region (see cell T86 in worksheet viii. SDM1 in RIGs Annex 1) and 99.93% in the South Region (see cell T87 in worksheet viii. SDM1 in RIGs Annex 1). This means that TPL was achieved in each region, and so no margin should be deducted.

The overall SDM1 performance is summarised in the table below.

SDM1 – install and commission Designed to incentivise DCC to ensure that all DCC services required in the install and commission of a smart meter are provided at a sufficient quality	
Minimum (%)	96.00%
Target (%)	99.00%
Penalty mechanism	B
DCC self-assessment (%)	**North: 99.38%** **Central: 99.93%** **South: 99.93%** **TPL ACHIEVED**
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet viii. SDM1, T85:T87
Related performance measures	PM1.1, PM1.2, PM1.3 and PM1.4
Margin impact	All margin retained. £2.801m

Table 3 – SDM1 performance summary

RY25/26 introduced the rollout of 4G CHs across all regions, resulting in a reduction in the install and commissioning of 2G/3G CHs. In January, February and March 2026 there was no data to report for PM1.2 in the central region and no data to report in the south region for February and March 2026. We can expect further SDM1 measures to return no data in the future as the 4G CH rollout continues at scale. To accurately measure and report for Price Control purposes, for the months where there is an absence of data, a zero weighting has been applied.

2.5. Prepayment (interim response times) (SDM2)

The prepayment (interim response times) measure is designed to incentivise DCC to ensure that Service Request Variants (SRVs) and CSP HAN Test Commands are successfully delivered to devices within a given a Target Response Time (TRT) (these interim metrics are not prepayment metrics). The TPL for this measure is 99% and the MPL is 96%.

The value of the RPLs in RY25/26 was determined as a weighted mean of four performance measures relating to the delivery of SRVs within TRT under SEC Code Performance Measure 1, averaged across the 12 months from April 2025 to March 2026.

The individual RPLs for each of the metrics were:

- PM4.3 Communications Services Provider (CSP) Test HAN Interface Command
    - North: 100.00%
    - Central: 99.43%
    - South: 99.44%
- PM1.1 DSP Real Time TRTs: 99.87%

- PM1.4 DSP Real Time TRTs: 99.82%
- PM1.1 S1-SP Real-time TRTs: 99.99%.

As all four metrics were equally weighted, the overall RPL for SDM2 was 100.00% in the North Region (see cell T83 in worksheet ix. SDM2 in RIGs Annex 1), 99.43% in the Central Region (see cell T84 in worksheet ix. SDM2 in RIGs Annex 1) and 99.44% in the South Region (see cell T85 in worksheet ix. SDM2 in RIGs Annex 1) for the CSP Test HAN Interface Command metric and 99.89% for the remaining metrics (see cell T116 in worksheet ix. SDM2 in RIGs Annex 1). This means that TPL was achieved and so no margin should be deducted.

The overall SDM2 performance is summarised in the table below:

SDM2 – prepayment (interim response times) Designed to incentivise DCC to ensure that SRVs are successfully delivered to devices within a TRT	
Minimum (%)	96.00%
Target (%)	99.00%
Penalty mechanism	A and B
DCC self-assessment (%)	**Penalty mechanism A: 99.89%** **Penalty mechanism B:** **North: 100.00%** **Central: 99.43%** **South: 99.44%** **TPL ACHIEVED**
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet ix. SDM2, T83:T85 and T116
Related performance measures	CPM 1 (in part)
DCC self-assessment	All margin retained. £2.801m

Table 4 – SDM2 performance summary

3. Customer engagement (VMM1)

Please find our full submission relating to customer engagement in the following documents:

- 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part1_RY2526
- 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part2_Ofgem_only_RY2526
- 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part2_RY2526

Last year, we were awarded a score of 2.55 out of 3 in relation to customer engagement. Our self-assessment of our performance under this measure in RY25/26 is 2.75 out of 3. We believe this score reflects the continued efforts to provide the appropriate level of engagement our customers expect.

Please note that in Annex 1 worksheet xi. VMM1, we have overwritten the green Ofgem cells and set the scores to be consistent with DCC's self-assessment across all questions so as to ensure a more meaningful BMOPA value is reported in the RIGs. We recognise that these will be updated following Ofgem's Final Determination.

VMM1 – customer engagement Designed to incentivise DCC to undertake high-quality customer engagement	
Minimum score	0
Maximum score	3

DCC self-assessment	2.75 (92%)
SEC Panel assessment	2.18 (73%)
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet xi. VMM1, T65:T93.
Margin impact	Margin deduction of £0.175m

Table 5 – VMM1 performance summary

4. Contract management (VMM2)

4.1. Background and context

Since April 2021, DCC's contract management and procurement activity has been subject to a financial incentive, ensuring that contracts with smart metering service providers are entered into, manages, and closed out effectively and efficiently. DCC remains committed to undertaking proactive, best in class contract management and procurement to deliver benefits to DCC customers and the consumer.

Each year, Ofgem commissions an independent audit to DCC's contract management using a modified version of the NAO Contractual Relationships Audit Framework[1]. For RY25/26 that audit took place in May and June 2026.

For RY24/25 we were awarded a score of 2.29 out of 3 by the independent auditor, which was reduced to 2.19 in the Ofgem draft and Final Determination. This translated to 73% (£0.915m) of margin assigned to the contract management element of OPR being retained. For RY25/26, £3.501m has been placed at risk against this incentive.

The auditor score for our performance under this measure in RY25/26 is 2.29 out of 3 (76%).

Please note that in Annex 1 worksheet xi. VMM2, we have overwritten the green Ofgem cells and set the scores equivalent to the auditor scores across all questions so as to avoid a misleading BMOPA value in the main RIGs. We recognise that these will be updated following Ofgem's Final Determination.

VMM2 – contract management Designed to incentivise DCC to undertake high-quality contract management	
Minimum score	0
Maximum score	3
Auditor assessment	2.29 (76%)
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet xii. VMM2, T117:T189.
Margin impact	Margin deduction of £0.834m

Table 6 – VMM2 performance summary

The section below sets our commentary against the findings contained within the interim audit report, received from the independent auditor on 12 June 2026 and the draft report (with scores) received on 26 June 2026. The final report was received on 31 July 2026.

4.2. Commentary on auditor scores

4.2.1. Commercial strategy

[1] Ofgem, Modified NAO Framework for use in the OPR, March 2024 Revised OPR Guidance decision March 2024 | Ofgem

Q1.1 DCC welcome the recognition of our clear understanding of contract outcomes, delivery models and commercial arrangements. We agree that approval arrangements for the IT PSL have taken longer than anticipated to resolve and remain dependent on Ofgem approval.

Q1.2 DCC are pleased that the auditors found our assessment of strategic and policy drivers to be complete and reasonable. We will ensure options analysis, internal challenge and lessons learned are consistently applied before sourcing activity begins.

Q1.3 DCC agrees that our commercial strategies are appropriately informed by strategic assessments. We have enhanced our documentation and stakeholder engagement to ensure these strategies remain robust and adaptable to evolving market conditions.

4.2.2. Capability and governance

Q2.1 We appreciate the recognition of our efforts to build commercial capability and standardise processes. DCC accept that staff churn and role changes continue to create contract knowledge continuity risks.

Q2.2 We welcome the recognition that the Commercial Pipeline is increasingly used to identify future sourcing activity, support resource planning and inform procurement strategies. We also recognise the recommendation of a single end-to-end process of system so that Commercial lifecycle activity is consistently connected.

Q2.3 DCC agrees that we have strengthened integration of commercial capability across the lifecycle, but enhancements continue to be embedded, with resource continuity challenges and lifecycle activities not always operating through a fully integrated end-to-end process.

Q3.1 DCC appreciates the recognition of our market engagement efforts. We acknowledge the need to perform structured lessons learned activity at both programme and organisation level to understand the key challenges and blockers affecting bidder participation and final-stage competition.

Q3.2 We are pleased that our demonstration of structed and defensible processes have been noted in the audit. However, we also agree that evidential support, internal challenge and alignment of procurement approaches varies across programmes.

Q3.3 DCC welcomes the recognition that we have demonstrated effective use of competition, collaborative solutioning and benchmarking to improve proposal quality, pricing and commercial outcomes, including significant expected cost efficiencies through the ANSO re-procurement.

4.2.3. Contract approach

Q4.1 We welcome the recognition of our appropriate allocation of risk. We will continue to actively manage complex supplier dependencies and mobilisation challenges throughout the contract lifecycle. DCC will review how interim commercial arrangements are managed with suppliers where delivery needs to commence before final approvals are complete.

Q4.2 DCC is pleased our range of contractual incentives, remedies and performance measures to align supplier behaviour with objectives has been recognised. We will continue to enhance performance measurement and reporting to improve consistency, transparency and alignment to contractual obligations.

Q4.3 DCC agrees that we are strengthening supplier relationship mechanisms by enhancing governance, performance management and stakeholder engagement across the contract lifecycle.

4.2.4. Contract management

Q5.1 We are pleased that it was recognised that DCC manages supplier performance through contractual KPIs, SLAs, governance forums, service credits and remediation activity. We will review the effectiveness of the revised MSR process after a suitable period of operation.

Q5.2 DCC is pleased that our contract management processes are seen as effective. We continue to monitor supplier performance closely and apply contractual remedies where necessary. We accept that opportunities remain to improve consistency of performance assessment and conversion of VfM initiatives into realised outcomes.

Q5.3 We are committed to meeting our obligations and have implemented Brooklyn AI to support obligation tracking. We acknowledge that continued embedding of Brooklyn and related process improvements will be important to sustaining performance.

4.2.5. Contract lifecycle

Q6.1 We appreciate the recognition that contracts continue to support DCC's strategic objectives and evolving business requirements. We are aware of future strategic challenges and are actively managing transition, extension, novation and re-procurement activities across key contracts.

Q6.2 DCC welcomes the recognition that we challenge suppliers through contract management, governance and commercial negotiations to maintain value for money throughout the contract lifecycle. We accept that commercial approvals and funding decisions can lag delivery needs on time-critical changes.

Q6.3 We welcome the recognition of the reduction in EEIs and change cycle times. There are opportunities to improve requirements definition, approval timelines and overall process efficiency. We welcome the recommendation to introduce clearer entry criteria before a change progresses into formal change control.

4.2.6. Transition and termination

Q7.1 DCC agrees with the recommendation to define minimum mobilisation requirements for future complex procurements and re-procurements, including named dependency owners, supplier interlock arrangements, knowledge transfer requirements, readiness criteria and contingency planning.

Q7.2 We are pleased that our transition planning has been recognised as effective. We agree that effective operation of licence transition governance will be critical to handover readiness.

Q7.3 DCC acknowledges the need to strengthen lessons learned activities and how they are captured and applied across major programmes, transitions and material contract events.

5. OPR performance summary

In RY25/26, £14.005m was placed at risk against the OPR.

In summary, our assessment of our performance for RY25/26 is as follows:

OPR measure	Weight	DCC performance assessment	Margin retained (%)	Margin retained (£m)	Margin lost (£m)
Service availability (SUM1)	20%	Non-regional = 99.95%	100%	2.801	-
Install and commission (SDM1)	20%	North = 99.38% Central = 99.93% South = 99.93%	100%	2.801	-
Prepayment (interim response times) (SDM2)	20%	Non-regional = 99.89% North = 100.00%	100%	2.801	-

		Central = 99.43% South = 99.44%			
Customer engagement (VMM1)	15%	2.75 out of 3	92%	1.926	0.175
Contract management (VMM2)	25%	2.29 out of 3	76%	2.667	0.834
Total	**100%**	-	-	**12.996**	**1.009**

Table 7 – Summary of DCC's self-assessment of OPR performance in RY25/26

Our self-assessment above reflects our view that we have had a strong year. We propose that we retain £12.996m of the Baseline Margin associated to the OPR for RY25/26.

Appendix A: Zero-weighted system measures

Firmware management (SUM2)

The firmware management measure remains zero weighted and cannot be reported on (see Appendix B). DCC are unable to provide data for the SMETS1 aspect of the measure and there is no ability for firmware performance to be measured per service provider, therefore performance can only be reported on at an aggregate level.

An explanation for DCC's performance for the north region is in Appendix B.

The overall SMETS2 SUM2 performance is summarised in the table below.

SUM2 – firmware management Designed to incentivise DCC to ensure that firmware payload images are successfully delivered to communication hubs	
Minimum (%)	96.00%
Target (%)	99.00%
DCC self-assessment (%)	**North: 97.83%** **Central: 99.49%** **South: 99.91%** **SMETS1: no data available**
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet vii., T83:T85 and T116.
Margin impact	Measure zero weighted so no margin impact

Table 8 – **SUM2 performance summary**

Change of supplier (SDM3)

The change of supplier measure is zero weighted. The value of the RPLs in RY25/26 was obtained from a mean of the three SEC performance measures relating to SRVs comprising the Change of Supplier Business Process, under SEC Code Performance Measure 6A, averaged across the 12 months from April 2025 – March 2026. It is still not possible to measure the individual TRT RPLs for each region, as was the case in previous years. This is because DCC's overall performance is reported at an aggregate level. DCC therefore proxy measure using Round Trip Times (RTTs). The RTTs include not only include the TRT for which DCC has control, but also the HAN and DCO time, for which we do not control. For these reasons the values we report on are not an accurate view of the DCC's element of the overall process with the full end to end process not being within DCC's full control to achieve.

The overall SDM3 performance is summarised in the table below.

SDM3 – change of supplier Designed to incentivise DCC to ensure that all DCC services required in the change of supplier process are provided at a sufficient quality	
Minimum (%)	96.00%
Target (%)	99.00%
DCC self-assessment (%)	North: 13.79% Central: 61.94% South: 59.79% SMETS1: 68.73%
RIGs reference	Annex 1, worksheet x, T83:T85 and T116
Margin impact	Measure zero weighted so no margin impact

Table 9 – SDM3 performance summary

Appendix B: DCC responses to qualitative questions

Question 1

Where the Licensee has not reached the TPL for any Performance Measure please provide a narrative which explains:

i. **Any reasons why the Licensee was prevented from reaching TPL**
ii. **Any actions or plans to remedy or achieve the TPL in the future.**

Of the non-live metrics, the north measure for SUM2 was below the TPL of 99%, recording a measurement of 97.83% and SDM3 did not meet TPL for all regions.

SUM2 (Firmware Management)

Similar to previous years, DCC has engaged with our service providers to increase performance in the north. The service improvement plan has resulted in performance increases, however, as was the case in RY24/25, the maximum the north region can achieve is 98% and so the TPL of 99% is unlikely to be achieved due to technological restraints.

DCC has applied service credits to its service provider for not reaching its contracted performance targets and the TPL of 99% and in RY25/26 a total of £0.297m has been paid.

SDM3 (Change of Supplier)

SDM3 (Change of Supplier) remains a measure in which a large portion of the metric is not fully within DCC's control to achieve as we are unable to measure the TRT. We therefore measure RTT and part of the RTT includes the time on the HAN – this is the part of the process that is outside of DCC's control.

Question 2

Provide a description and supporting evidence of the processes in place to quality assure reporting submitted to the Authority. This may include:

iii. **Assurance the Licensee has undertaken on reporting received from their Service Providers**
iv. **Internal policy processes and procedures**
v. **Independent auditor reports**
vi. **Consistency with other related reporting (e.g. Smart Energy Code performance measures)**
vii. **Appropriate senior level management and oversight of quality assurance processes.**

The process in which DCC quality assures the reporting submitted to the Authority has not deviated since last year. DCC continues to maintain a dedicated model for monitoring progress against the OPR and this model was designed to meet the reporting requirements outlined in Ofgem's OPR guidance. The model also ensures that DCC is actively monitoring its performance throughout the year and provides the opportunity to respond to any decline in performance immediately.

We can confirm that regular assurance continues to be undertaken on the reporting received from our service providers which is managed by the In-Life Supplier Service Delivery Management Team. This reporting is also reviewed each month by the Regulatory & Operational Reporting Team.

Each OPR measure has a dedicated senior owner within DCC who is responsible for ensuring the information provided within the RIGs is correct. The Regulatory & Operational Reporting Team, together with the Head of Economic Incentives reviews and quality assures all information before its submission. The Regulatory & Operational Reporting Team also ensure that the data is consistent with the information

provided to, and approved by, DCC's Executive Committee (ExCo). DCC's ExCo also review the model outputs on a monthly basis.

Question 3

Please provide an assessment of the number and percentage of incidences that have been exempt from reporting due to being exceptional events. Please include:

viii. **Reasons events were excluded from performance reporting, and the number/percentage of exemptions that were for this reason**
ix. **Any quality assurance undertaken to ensure that categorisation of incidences as exceptional events was correctly applied.**

There have been no incidences that have been exempted from reporting due to exceptional events in RY25/26.

Question 4

Please specify if, and explain why, additional reporting is not complete, for example because reporting was only developed part way through the year.

DCC is still unable to report against the SMETS1 metric in the zero-weighted SUM2 measure. The data for this measure is not available.

Under SMETS1, the S1SPs are responsible, whereas, under SMETS2, it is the responsibility of the service users. This makes it very difficult to incorporate any service provider contract changes to include this metric.

All other reporting is complete.

Appendix C: Supporting evidence

Ref #	Evidence	File name / location
1	RIGs Annex 1	7.RIGS_Annex_1_RY2526
2	Customer engagement	Please see: • 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part1_RY2526 • 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part2_Ofgem_only_RY2526 • 5.Perf_OPR_Customer_Engagement_Part2_PUBLIC_RY2526
3	Contract management – interim audit report	5.Perf_Contract_Management_Interim_Report.pdf
4	Contract management – draft audit report	5.Perf_Contract_Management_Draft_Report.pdf
5	Contract management – final audit report	5.Perf_Contract_Management_Final_Report.pdf

Table 10 – Supporting evidence