

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (version change)
- Service Order (procedure changes)
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification (procedure changes)
- Technical Delivery Specification (procedure changes)
- B2B Guide (document changes)

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Ausgrid

Completion Date: 11/4/22

Table of Contents

- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 3
- 2. Service Order Process – Option 1a 6
- 3. Service Order Process – Option 1b..... 6
- 4. One Way Notification 7
- 5. Technical Delivery Specification 7
- 6. B2B Guide – Option 1a 8
- 7. B2B Guide – Option 1b 8

1. Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders	Question 1: What is your preferred solution, Option 1a or Option 1b, and why?	Ausgrid has already built option 1a and is currently using it to manage coincident SO for the customer switching changes implemented in October 2021. As notified party is not a mandatory requirement in the current procedures and to ensure this process works as efficiently as possible, Ausgrid has informed retailers that when raising de-en and re-en SO to MPs, Ausgrid should be a notified party in this transaction. Where retailers have used the notified party on their transactions we have not had any significant reportable issues.
2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders	Question 2: Have you already implemented one of the proposed options? What would be your expected incremental costs to deliver each of the proposed solutions? This should not include costs already spent.	Yes, Ausgrid has already built option 1a and is currently using it to manage coincident SO for the customer switching changes implemented in October 2021. Very minor costs, if any would be expected. If option 1b is selected Ausgrid will need to build for this solution. We would also have to unbundle the NPN logic we have already built.
2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders	Question 3: These proposed solutions will not provide 100% coverage for every service order requested. Do you believe that Option 1a or Option 1b provides better protection for customers? To what extent do you believe that your chosen option better protects customers?	Timing issues are a problem for both solutions, but Ausgrid's experience with the 1a notified party option has been good since its October 2021 implementation to deal with customer switching issues.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders	Question 4: What is the extent of the customer impact for each of the proposed solution? How long will a customer be without supply when each proposed solution does not provide coverage (that is, how long does it take to rectify the negative impact to the customer)?	If a site has been remotely de-energised and the incoming retailer does not have the ability to remotely re-energise the customer, this will cause a negative impact for the customers and limit the choice of retailer they may elect to engage a retail contract with. If a site has been correctly remotely de-energised, Ausgrid does not send a technician to site to bypass the meter, Ausgrid will refer the customer back to their retailer.
2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders	Question 5: Assuming that Option 1a or Option 1b is to be implemented by May 2023, do you see any substantial or significant issues which would delay this implementation? If so, what are they?	If 1a is selected Ausgrid will have no implementation issues. If option 1b is selected Ausgrid will need to build for this solution and unwind our current NPN logic. Ausgrid would ensure that either option would be ready for May 2023.
2.3 Shared Fuse Notification using One Way Notification (OWN)	Question 6: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to Shared Fuse Notification using the aseXML OWN? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes, Ausgrid supports these changes.
2.3 Shared Fuse Notification using One Way Notification (OWN)	Question 7: If the changes proposed were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues in implementing the changes by May 2023?	Ausgrid does not see any current issues in meeting this date.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.9 Questions on proposed changes	Question 8: Do you have any other suggestions, comments or questions regarding this consultation? If you have any comments outside of the scope of this consultation, please reach out to your relevant B2B-WG representatives.	No further comments.

2. Service Order Process – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

3. Service Order Process – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	2.16.2 (d) (iii)	<p>Ausgrid does not agree that a mandatory site visit is required by the DNSP where a site has been remotely de-energised. This clause should be reworded to MAY to suit each LNSP businesses current practices.</p> <p>[Guidance Note 1] Excluding Victoria, where the metering installation is not a Type 5 or Type 6 and the DNSP reasonably believes the site will remain energised on the scheduled date provided within the re-energisation service order, the DNSP must not undertake a field visit and must send a 'Not Completed' ServiceOrderResponse with the ExceptionCode indicating "Site already Energised" except where the re-energisation service order subtype is 'Physical Visit' then the DNSP may undertake a physical visit and return the appropriate ServiceOrderResponse.</p>

4. One Way Notification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

5. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

6. B2B Guide – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

7. B2B Guide – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments