B2B Procedures

- Service Orders
- Customer and Site Details
- Meter Data
- One Way Notification
- RoLR Part B

Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework.

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: *Endeavour Energy*

Completion Date: *30 November 2016*

Table of Contents

1. Service Orders 3
2. CSDN 13
3. Meter Data 18
4. OWN 23
5. RoLR Part B 27
6. Glossary and Framework 28

1. Service Orders

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	Contents	There are a number of tables within the document. For ease of referencing we suggest that the contents page include a listing of tables.
1.2.d		Currently the procedure states in clause 1.2.d that "In the event of any inconsistency between this Procedure and the Metrology Procedure, the Metrology Procedure shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency." For avoidance of any doubt the existing clause 1.2.d should be reinstated or into section 1.2 or in the Glossary and Framework in section 1.2.4
	1.3.2	For consistency and ease of referencing this section should be in the Glossary and Framework
	Table 1 Service Order Types and Subtypes	Insert the sentence "This service order is not required in NSW whilst the Accredited Service Provider Scheme is in operation for service works." into the Description column for the following Service Order and Service Order Sub Type combinations:

		Supply Service Works, Supply Alteration Supply Service Works, Establish Temporary Supply Supply Service Works, Establish Temporary in Permanent Supply Service Works, Establish Permanent Supply Supply Service Works, Temporary Isolation
	Table 1 Service Order Types and Subtypes	Special Read - Description Remove the words 'If the DNSP is the MC, the Service Order must be sent to the DNSP.' This is captured in 2.1.2(d).
	Table 1 Service Order Types and Subtypes	1. Reinstate the SO subtypes for Re-energisation as it is necessary to know why the Re-En is being requested. Eg Re-En after DNP must be completed within obligated timeframes else it is considered a NECF Type 1 breach • After disconnection for non-payment • New Reading Required • Retrospective Move In • Sticker Removal 2. Add new sub types of 'Remote' and 'Move In'

	Table 1 Service Order Types and Subtypes	For De-energisation SO's need to add a sub type of Group Metering so it is clear to the recipient that they need to co-ordinate multiple parties for a de-energisation.
	2.1.2.b	Prospective Retailer is not defined in the glossary. We suggest that this term be defined in the glossary or use a defined term.
	2.1.2.e	Clause 2.1.2.e is a duplicate of clause 2.2.a. We suggest that clause 2.1.2.e be deleted because 2.2.a is in a more appropriate section.
	2.1.2.f	Clause 2.1.2.f is a duplicate of clause 2.2.b. We suggest that clause 2.1.2.f be deleted because 2.2.b is in a more appropriate section.
	2.1.2.g	Clause 2.1.2.g is a duplicate of clause 2.2.d. We suggest that clause 2.1.2.g be deleted because 2.2.d is in a more appropriate section.
	2.1.2.n	It should be made clear that service orders that require co-ordination can only be used if the Initiator and the Recipient have a bilateral agreement. We suggest rewording clause 2.1.2.n to: "Service Orders requiring co-ordination are only supported where the Initiator and the Recipient have a bilateral agreement. Where multiple parties need to be co-ordinated to complete related ServiceOrderRequests, the Initiator must arrange and provide details of the co-ordination contact in the Service Order Request."
	2.1.2.o	This clause refers the reader to the B2B Guide. However the B2B Guide is a non-enforceable document. We suggest that any details regarding service order and notified party combinations should be

		captured in this procedure or the B2B technical specification procedure.
	2.2	Depending on the solution proposed by the SWG for Notified Party(ies), the Procedure will need to be updated to reflect that solution.
	2.3	Add a new clause – Service Orders requiring customer consultation are only supported where the relevant parties have a bilateral agreement.
	2.4	The procedure should make it clear that service orders that require a customer preferred date and time can only be used if the Initiator and the Recipient have a bilateral agreement.
	2.5.b	'Required Timeframe' should be added to the Glossary
	2.8.b	Service levels should clearly define when the metric starts from. We suggest rewording clause 2.8.b to: "….The Recipient must communicate this reply within 2 business days of receiving the negative BusinessAcceptance/Rejection."
	2.9.b	Notified parties must be included in a ServiceOrderRequest cancellation so that they are made aware of the cancellation. We suggest rewording clause 2.9.b to: "To cancel a ServiceOrderRequest, the Initiator must send a ServiceOrderRequest with the ActionType set to "Cancel" and quote

		the ServiceOrderID of the ServiceOrderRequest to be cancelled and included all the Notified Parties in that were in the ServiceOrderRequest to be cancelled ."
	2.10	Initiators must not be able to update Service Orders. If there is something incorrect or requires changing, the original service order must be cancelled and a new one created. Updating Service Orders creates complexity to the Notified Party(ies) notification process.
	2.11	Remove this new *Action Type* 'Resend'. It is an unnecessary change, and adds no value. Participant systems manage resent transactions today. If the transaction hasn't been previously received it will be treated by Recipient systems as a new transaction. If it has been previously received, it will be treated as a duplicate.
	2.12	Remove this new *Action Type* 'Resend'. It is an unnecessary change, adds no value. Participant systems manage resent transactions today. If the transaction hasn't been previously received it will be treated by participant systems as a new transaction. If it has been previously received, it will be treated as a duplicate.
	2.13.1	Add a new Value "Minor on Site".

	Table 3	Definition – There is a minor (person under the age of 18) on site and the Site was not de-energised.
	2.13.1 Table 3 Customer On-Site value	ServiceOrderSubTypes of Remove Fuse (Non-payment) and Pillar Box, Pit or Pole Top (Non-payment) no longer exists. We suggest that these terms be replaced with the new methods.
	2.13.1 Table 3 De-energisation Not Completed Due To A Reenergisation value	This Exception Code should apply to both physical and remote de-energisation. We suggest removing the word 'physical' from the column called Used with ServiceOrderStatus
	2.13.1 Table 3	There should be an Exception Code to indicate that a request for a network tariff change is not approved. We suggest adding a new Exception Code of 'Tariff Change Not Approved', the definition would be 'Request for a tariff change is not approved', and the Used with ServiceOrderStatus would be 'Not Completed'
	2.13.1 Table 3	There should be an Exception Code to indicate that work could not be completed because the disconnection point is common with other customers (group metering). This Exception Code will provide better information and allow the Initiator to decide what to do next. We suggest adding a new Exception Code of 'Group Metering', the definition would be 'Unable to perform the requested work because

		the disconnection point is common with other customers', and the Used with ServiceOrderStatus would be 'Not Completed'
	2.13.2.c	Suggested rewording of this clause to reflect current processes: Suggest that this clause should read - "On receipt of a valid Allocate NMI ServiceOrderRequest, the DNSP must allocate a NMI and issue it to the retailer using a ServiceOrderResponse with a service order status of "Complete". The DNSP must populate the Retailer who has issued the Allocate NMI ServiceOrderRequest as the FRMP in MSATS. The Retailer must not object to being allocated as the FRMP where they have lodged the ServiceOrderRequest.
	2.13.2	add a new clause (f) : Where the DNSP receives an Allocate NMI request and believes the address is not valid, the DNSP must advise the Retailer by sending a ServiceOrderResponse requesting the Retailer provide additional addressing details. The DNSP may withhold the creation of the NMI until a valid address is provided.
	2.13.3.c	For the benefit of the customer and for avoidance of any doubt it should be made clear that the obligation in clause 2.13.3 applies to both regulated and non-regulated businesses. We suggest that clause 2.13.3 be restructured such that clause 2.13.3.a does not apply to clause 2.13.3.c and to replace references to the DNSP with Recipient.
	2.13.4.	Add a new clause –

		The Initiator must always nominate the DNSP as a Notified Party when raising a De-Energisation service order.
	2.13.4 (d)(i)	This clause needs to be updated to reflect the use of Reason codes and not sub types.
	New Clause	It should be made clear how the Tariff Change Service Order should be used. We suggest inserting a new clause after 2.13.6 as follows: “a) Only a Retailer is allowed to raise a Tariff Change Service Order. b) The Initiator must provide the proposed start date of the new Network Tariff in the ScheduleDate field. ”
	2.13.7.a	This clause should apply to both regulated and non-regulated businesses. We suggest deleting clause 2.13.7.a
	2.13.7.1.a	There are two paragraphs labelled as clause 2.13.7.1.a
	Figure 4 Service Order Summary	Scenario 8 is not relevant to the NMI Allocate SO. If a second SO is received for the same address, the Recipient should reject the SO with Event Code of 1918 – NMI already allocated for this address.
	Figure 10 Timing Period for completion of work Metering Investigation	Suggest rewording this text as follows: “The following timeframes apply for Meter Investigation: • VIC and ACT – 20 business days • All other jurisdictions – 15 business days

		The following timeframe applies for Meter Investigation with a sub-type of 'Test': • Use reasonable endeavours to carry out a test within 15 business days for all jurisdictions."
	3.3.4	Allocate NMI applies to all jurisdictions. We suggest deleting the words "in NSW' in clause 3.3.4
	Figure 11	This table is ambiguous especially with regards to the Supply Service Works. For example the NotifiedPartyID field is listed as "M/N" however it is not clear when this field is Mandatory and when it is Not Required. Other examples include: ProposedTariff field is listed as "O/N" however this should be a mandatory field for the Tariff Change sub type. Co-ordinatingContactName is listed as "M/N" and a note that it is not required for a Cancel service order, however this field is also not required when the ServiceOrderCo-ordinationRequired field is set to "No". We suggest that the table be redefined at the Service Order Sub Type level to provide better granularity and remove any doubt about the requirement of each field for every service order sub type.
	Figure 11	Action Type – remove 'Resend'

	Transaction table	
	Figure 11 Page 40	In the definition for EmbeddedNetworkParentName, Parent is spelt incorrectly. Should be spelt 'Parent' not 'pParent'.
	Figure 12 Service Order Transaction	Response Type - remove 'Resend'
	Figure 13	This transaction only contains one field, (RecipientReference) that is not in the SerrviceOrderRequest transaction. Having a different transaction for only one extra field is inefficient. We suggest that this transaction be removed and that the field called RecipientReference be added to the ServiceOrderRequest transaction.
	4.4.1.a	The procedure suggests that multiple event code can be provided, however it does not explain how this can be done. The procedure should clarify if multiple event codes must be sent in separate business acceptance rejection transactions or if multiple event codes can be sent in the one business acceptance rejection transaction.
	Figure 15 Business Event Codes	Add a Business Event – "Address is outside of distribution area"

2. CSDN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Consultation Question 1A	Who has the obligations(s) in an Embedded Network to notify relevant participant(s) of Life Support?	The AEMC considered this mater and decided that the party who perform the notification is the Embedded Network Operator. Clause 4.1.10.b of the AER Network Service Provider Registration Exemption Guideline states: Where notified by a customer ('life support customer') of the existence of a requirement to maintain supply for life support equipment, the exempt embedded network service provider must, without undue delay, promptly notify: from 1 December 2017: the parent connection point retailer of the existence of a life support requirement in accordance with the reasonable requirements of the parent connection point retailer. In addition the exempt embedded network service provider must, without undue delay, promptly notify the child connection point retailer when they are informed of life support requirements at a child connection point.
Consultation Question 1B	How do participant(s) communicate Life Support information in an Embedded	It should be that any person who is made aware of a life support customer must notify the Embedded Network Operator, then they

	Network?	must notify as per the Exemption Guideline.
Consultation Question 1C	Are B2B communications required? Note: the Embedded Network Operator (ENO) is not required to be a B2B Participant.	It is considered reasonable to be consistent with how the DNSP notifies the retailer of life support customers – outside of B2B.
Consultation Question 2A	Should the SiteAccessNotification be available for parties related to a NMI to send new or updated site hazards and access details?	Yes, but it should all be sent to the FRMP and the FRMP then sends it to all other parties who are entitled to it as per the B2B procedure.
Consultation Question 2B	Which participant(s) should be considered the 'master of record' holder for this information?	The FRMP who has a relationship with the customer, the MC/MP/MDP and the LNSP, and the information should be stored in MSATS. If it is stored within MSATS against the NMI, new participants will have access to it.
	2 Customer and Site Details Process	The CSDN process doesn't have a summary table or listing of all the transactions with this procedure. We suggest a summary is added to aid in reading and for consistency with the other procedures.
	Figure 3	The text within the diagram is illegible.
	3.2.b.ii.B 3.2.b.ii.C	The CDN should be sent once the site is energised and not wait until the MSATS transactions are complete.

	3.2.b.ii.D	
	3.2(c)	Suggest this is not only restricted to the DNSP. It should be all participants.
	4.1	Add a new clause – “Data contained within CSDN’s can be used by the DNSP whilst fulfilling their regulatory obligations eg outage notifications, responding to customer requests for data, communicating with life support customers.
	4.3.2 – section C	Currently the Customer Detail Notification process does not provide scope for an initiator to provide supporting evidence when the life support flag is no longer required. Where the requirements for Life Support are no longer required, Endeavour suggests an additional field be included in the Customer Detail Notification allowing the initiator to advise the recipient the reason for the removal. Suggested reason codes include: • Deceased estate • Failed to provide medical certificate • Churn did not occur

		• Medical equipment no longer required
	4.5 (b)	Replace SiteDetailsNotification with SiteAccessNotification and SiteDetailsRequest with SiteAccessRequest
	4.6 (a)	Replace SiteDetailsNotification with SiteAccessNotification
	4.7	Endeavour Energy's preference is that the C7 report from MSATS be utilised to provide this information to the new MP. With the excpetion of Network Tarfiff Code, all of the mandatory fields are available in this report. Utilising the C7 report for this process is a cost effective solution which would also reduce risk to the PoC program.
	4.7(c)	Remove the referenece to section 3.5 as it does not exist in the document.
	4.7.1	Add a new clause – " The Recipient may reject the PreInstallationDataRequest if there isn't an MSATS Change Request nominating the Initiator as the new MPB."
	5.2 - CustomerDetailsNotification	Re – Sensitive load field This flag should be R – Required now that we have separated Life Support from this flag.
	5.2 –	*AccountContactName* must always be manadatory to allow DNSP's

	CustomerDetailsNotification Table	to validate customers requesting access to data
	5.5 PreInstallationDataRequest Data Table 1	Add a new field – Change Request ID The change request ID of the change request in MSATS nominating the Initiator as the MPB.
	Table 8 Business Events	Add an event to allow a Recipient to reject a PreInstallationRequest if the initiator is not authorised to receive the data.

3. Meter Data

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
1.2.d		Currently the procedure states in clause 1.2.d that "In the event of any inconsistency between this Procedure and the Metrology Procedure, the Metrology Procedure shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency." For avoidance of any doubt the existing clause 1.2.d should be included in the new service order procedure in section 1.2 or the in Glossary and Framework in section 1.2.4
	New clause	There should be a new clause that states: "In the event of any inconsistency between this Procedure and the Service Level Procedure (MDP), the Service Level Procedure (MDP) shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency."
	2.2.1.a	There is no business document called PreInstallationRequest or RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest. We suggest that these be deleted from clause 2.2.1.a or the name defined in table 1 be used.
	2.2.1.b	For consistency the terms Initiator and Recipient should be used in clause 2.2.1.b

	2.2.2.c.v	This should be in the Glossary
	2.2.4 (c)	Change MDP to “Recipient”
	2.2.4.a.ii	The term Request is not defined in the glossary
	2.2.5	Move the Meter Installation Inquiry Process to the SO Procedure. This transaction does not belong in the B2B Meter Data procedure. The B2B Meter Data processes are carried out by the MDP today and this service will be carried out by the MPB or MC. The Meter Installation Inquiry can be requested using the B2B Service Order transaction without any change to the structure. The proposed transaction looks like: SO TYPE (Special Read) SO SUB TYPE (Meter Inquiry) REASON (Product1) Adding the Service Order Sub Type of “Meter Inquiry” with Reasons of Product 1 - 5 would afford participants the flexability to develop their own solutions for this new request.
	2.2.5	Reformatting: (a) An Initiator may commence a MeterInstallationInquiryRequest process if they:

		(i) are authorised to receive the information; and (ii) require information from the Current MP regarding a metering installation. (b) Upon receipt of a MeterInstallationInquiryRequest, a Recipient must respond to the Initiator who sent the MeterInstallationInquiryRequest, as follows: (i) If the Recipient is able to fully satisfy the Request, the Recipient must send a BusinessAcceptance/Rejection with a Status of “Accept” and send a MeterInstallationInquiryResponse, in response to the Request; or (ii) If the Recipient is unable to satisfy the Request, the Recipient must send a BusinessAcceptance/Rejection with a Status of “Reject” and must not send a MeterInstallationInquiryResponse, in response to the Request. The Recipient must provide appropriate EventCodes and associated details in the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection to explain why the Request cannot be satisfied. The EventCodes in the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection must have a Severity of “Error”.
	2.2.6	Move the Remote On Demand Meter Read Process to the SO Procedure.

		This transaction does not belong in the B2B Meter Data procedure. The B2B Meter Data processes are carried out by the MDP today and this service will be carried out by the MPB or MC. The Remote On Demand Meter Read can be requested using the B2B Service Order transaction without any change to the structure. The proposed transaction looks like: SO TYPE (Special Read) SO SUB TYPE (On Demand) REASON (Product1) Adding the Service Order Sub Type of “On Demand” with Reasons of Product 1 - 5 would afford participants the flexability to develop their own solutions for this new request.
	2.2.6.a	There is no business document called RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest. We suggest that the name defined in table 1 be used.
	Figure 3	Figure 3 is blank
	2.4	There is an incorrect reference to 2.2, it should be referencing 2.3.
	2.4.3.c	In addition to what is stated, it should also be worded so that the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection for a PMD must be sent within 1 business day.
	2.4.3.d	In addition to what is stated, it should also be worded so that the

		BusinessAcceptance/Rejection for a VMD must be sent within 5 business days.
	Table 4	Details of footnote 3 is missing
	Table 6 InvestigationCode field	Delete the list of allowable values and refer the reader to Table 4 for ease of maintaining the Procedure
	Table 8	Needs to be at the register level and be repeatable at that level
	Table 9	Needs to be at the register level and be repeatable at that level
	Table 9 Events field	Needs to be repeatable
	Table 10	Needs to be at the register level and be repeatable at that level

4. OWN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	1.2	There is no content under this section.
1.2.d		Currently the procedure states in clause 1.2.d that "In the event of any inconsistency between this Procedure and the Metrology Procedure, the Metrology Procedure shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency." For avoidance of any doubt the existing clause 1.2.d should be included in the new service order procedure in section 1.2 or the in Glossary and Framework in section 1.2.4
	1.3	There is no heading for the section.
	1.5	For consistency and ease of referencing this section should be in the Glossary and Framework
	1.5.a.i	The term Participant is already defined in the Glossary and Framework. Using the same term with different definition is confusing. We suggest that a different term be used or use a defined term.

	2.1.b.iv	The MFN is not to meant to notifiy meter changes but meters that require a change. We suggest rewording clause 2.1.b.iv to: "…this message with allow an Initiator to send information relating to a Meter Fault or Issue to a Recipient. This includes meter faults and meters that requires changing due to the meter not meeting Metrology requirements."
	2.1.b.v	The term Meter Works and Customer are not defined in the Glossary and Framework. We suggest that this term be defined in the Glossary and Framework or use a defined term.
	2.3.a.ii	It should be made clear that any resend of data must be in a new One Way Notification. We suggest rewording clause 2.3.a.ii to: "…If the rejection is valid, the Initiator must resolve the problem and resend the data in a new One Way Notification …"
	3. Process Diagrams and Timing Requirements	The timing requirements are missing from this section.
	Figure 5	One of the reasons, 'Incorrect NTC in MSATS', which suggests that correction of network tariff in MSATS would require a Network tariff Notification. Having to correct the network tariff in MSATS and also provide a notification thatthis will be done is inefficient. Any correction of network tariff should not require a Network Tariff Notification. We suggest removing 'Incorrect NTC in MSATS from

		the list.
	Figure 5 METERID field	This field must be mandatory.
	Figure 5 NMISUFFIX field	This field must be mandatory.
	Figure 6 STARTTIME field	Should always be mandatory
	Figure 6 DURATION field	Rename this field to ENDTIME Format HHMM
	Figure 7 REASONFORNOTICE	Include: Meter bypassed and Metrology threshold breached
	Figure 7 PRODUCTCODE (new field)	Add a new field - PRODUCTCODE This can be used to communicate the product code that will charged to the recipient ie meter fault and bypassed by the DNSP.
	4.1.6	The Notice of Metering Works transaction cannot be in csv format due to there being multiple elements/levels of data to a meter record. Either we don't provide a sample in the MD Procedure or we refer the reader to a sample XML in the Tech Spec.

	4.1.6	Should make it clear that the NMW must describe what metering equipment is at the site when work is completed, even in the event that not all of the equipment at the site was changed.
	Figure 11	Add the following to the event codes to be used when the Recipient validates the NMW: Meter and NMI combination invalid Final meter reading failed validation Meter register invalid

5. RoLR Part B

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	54.3	First line should say Each MC/MP/LNSP must:

6. Glossary and Framework

Clause	Heading	Comments
	1.3	Include the B2B Guide
	Glossary	Add - Cancel A status for a B2B Service Order transaction