

## 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:*** Evoenergy

***Completion Date:*** 31/03/2022

# Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 3
- 2. Service Order Process – Option 1a ..... 6
- 3. Service Order Process – Option 1b..... 7
- 4. One Way Notification ..... 8
- 5. Technical Delivery Specification ..... 8
- 6. B2B Guide – Option 1a ..... 8
- 7. B2B Guide – Option 1b ..... 10

## 0. 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?	<p>Either option really, but...</p> <p>Prefer option 1a as the costs to implement are marginally less than the other, and ongoing costs to manage the process is less i.e. does not require manual intervention.</p> <p>Option 1b would offer a better long term solution however there is not enough information on how it is expected to work operationally i.e. as an LNSP, I do not want to send a truck as it will cost the customer, and we cannot do anything at the site.</p>
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.	No
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?	1a and it would appear parts 1b, but neither fully protects the customer whilst there are so many variables.

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)?	Mostly same day
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?	May be significant change to processing logic so insufficient time for build and testing.
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
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?	Yes, insufficient time for build and testing.

Topic	Question	Comments
<p>2.9 Questions on proposed changes</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Is there any proposal for Retailers to limit Type 1-4 De-energisations for Non-pays as Remote only, initially at least? This would alleviate the personal safety risks and rising costs of attendance.</p> <p>What would also improve this process and stop needless site visits that get charged to the customer are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If the current Retailer has a move in, and they have not issued a Deenergisation, and NMI Status is A:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) if Type 1-4 or 5 meter, No SORD required;</li> <li>(ii) if Type 6 meter, send a Special Read SORD, where the move-out read or last read is greater than 10 business days (B2B procedures allow 6 weeks).</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. If the current Retailer receives a COM CR1xxx, and they have issued a Deenergisation for today or greater date; send a Cancel SORD. (responsibility to cancel should not rest solely on LNSP or MP)</li> </ol> <p>Point one could fit into 2.2. as new dot point (d) and/or as Guidance note 1. Point two could fit under B2B SORD 2.12.(c)(iv)</p>

### 3. Service Order Process – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.1 Table 3 header	Use of Notified Party (either via SO transaction or via stand-alone notified party transaction)	What exactly does this mean please? Is it allowing for bi-lateral communications? If for option 1a, should be reworded to avoid misinterpretation as this appears to include option 1b process.  New heading: Use of Notified Party
2.3.1.	2.3.1 (b)	Throughout this document, it is De-energisation or Re-energisation when referring to SORDs, so why have you introduced new styles (e.g. De-Energisation, de-energisation)? Please standardise here where you refer to the SORD. Suggest;  ...Initiator of Re-energisation and De-energisation Service Orders... ...are triggered by the receipt of a Re-energisation or De-energisation.
2.3.1.	2.3.1 (c)	Throughout this document, it is De-energisation or Re-energisation when referring to SORDs, so why have you introduced new styles (e.g. De-Energisation, de-energisation)? Please standardise here where you refer to the SORD. Suggest;  The Initiator of a Re-energisation or De-energisation Service Order must raise a Notified Party transaction.
2.6.	2.6. (c).ii	References appear to be missing.
2.16.4.(f)	2.16.4.(f)	Is this statement required as it appears to achieve nothing. Should it be a Guidance Note? Suggest deleting or moving to B2B Guide.

#### 4. Service Order Process – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.3. Heading	Reword	<b>Notified Party – General</b> Looks better to have this as the header
2.3.(a)	Reword this clause to:	The Service Order Procedures contains the capability of a Notified Party as part of the Service Order process. The aim is to notify related parties <b>at</b> the connection point ( <b>i.e.</b> the Notified Party) who are not involved directly in the provision of the requested service, and provide <b>them</b> visibility of activities undertaken by a Service Order Recipient (the Service Provider) prior to commencement and at completion of any request. <del>The use of Notified Party is not mandatory, the following clauses apply to the use of Notified Parties using B2B</del> <b>The following clauses apply to the use of Notified Parties using B2B:</b>
2.6.	2.6. (c).ii	References appear to be missing.
2.16.2.(b)	2.16.2.(b)	Not sure what this clause is trying to say, as ...which party performed... indicates past tense so what Re-energisation would have happened and why would the Incoming Retailer send another? Should this read ...in the process of performing <b>a de-energisation</b> ...
2.16.2.(d).(iii)	2.16.2.(d).(iii)	Should be ...provided within the <b>Re-energisation Service Order</b> , ... ...except where the <b>Re-energisation Service Order</b> subtype...

## 5. One Way Notification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		No comments

## 6. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		No comments

## 7. B2B Guide – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.(f)	2.(f)	Should be capital ...undertake a De-energisation or...



Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
4.3.2.(d)	4.3.2.(d)	Grammatical. This has two dot points following the statements so should reword end sentence with; ...their site de-energised if;  (i) <del>if</del> the Notified...
4.3.3.	4.3.3. Table x	Why have this table duplicated from the B2B Procedure Service Order Procedure? Two places to maintain. Not required here.
4.4.(g)	4.4.(g)	Grammatical. This paragraph has too many commas and not enough full stops to break it down for understanding. Suggested to rewrite as below.  Notified Party transactions for re-energisations and de-energisations play a significant role in identifying coincident service order checks, and preventing any unnecessary de-energisations from occurring. For other Service Orders, the Notified Party transactions <del>copies</del> are provided for information only, but a Notified Party may choose to use the information provided as a way of determining what impact work assigned to other parties will have.
6.1.2.	6.1.2. Figure 5	Evoenergy submitted a change to this flow more than a year ago. It would have been expected to be included in this consultation. Was that change reviewed by the B2B working group?

## 8. B2B Guide – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.(f)	2.(f)	<p>This statement is incorrect for Option 1b, as the Notified Party is not mandatory as per 2.3 of B2B 1b. Suggest rewording this from the second sentence to;</p> <p>The obligation to send multiple Reenergisation and De-energisation Service Orders to the two service providers has therefore been made mandatory. Where both parties receive the requests...</p>
4.3. 4.3.2	4.3. 4.3.2	<p>This has been written as if the Notified Party transaction is mandatory for Re-energisations and De-energisations, and that recipients must action accordingly for coincident Service Orders.</p> <p>This has only muddied the waters of what the differences are between 1a and 1b. Can we please have confirmation of how 1b is supposed to work as the procedures and guides do not align?</p>
4.4.(g)	4.4.(g)	<p>Grammatical. This paragraph has too many commas and not enough full stops to break it down for understanding. Suggested to rewrite as below. Only reword once 4.3 sorted as Notified Party is not mandatory for 1b, and does not align to 6.1.4.(d).</p> <p>Notified Party transactions for re-energisations and de-energisations play a significant role in identifying coincident service order checks, and preventing any unnecessary de-energisations from occurring. For other Service Orders, the Notified Party transactions copies are provided for information only, but a Notified Party may choose to use the information provided as a way of determining what impact work assigned to other parties will have.</p>
6.1.2.	6.1.2. Figure 5	Evoenergy submitted a change to this flow more than a year ago. Why has that change not been updated into this document?

6.1.4.(d).	6.1.4.(d).	<p>This clause needs rewording to provide clarity. Suggested wording:</p> <p><b>This clause does not apply in Victoria.</b></p> <p>(d) Where small customer meters may be <del>either be</del> de-energised by the DNSP or remotely de-energised by the MPB, and the incoming retailer is unaware of whether the FRMP has requested a de-energisation to one of the two Service Providers, an incoming Retailer is required to raise two <b>Re-energisation ServiceOrderRequests</b>; one to the DNSP and one to the MC.</p> <p>Under these conditions:</p> <p>The DNSPs must;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) cancel any received or future De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests within the requirements of co-incident service order logic.</li> <li>(ii) undertake field work if they need to re-store supply to the site, as records indicate a physical de-energisation i.e. the previous De-energisation ServiceOrderRequest ServiceOrderSubType was not “Remote” and/or NMI Status is D.</li> <li>(iii) if the DNSP reasonably believes that the site will be on supply on the scheduled date, close the Re-energisation ServiceOrderRequest and send a ServiceOrderResponse of ‘Not Completed’ with the ExceptionCode indicating “Site already Energised”.</li> <li>(iv) send the ServiceOrderResponse with appropriate charge codes for any field visit.</li> </ul> <p>The MCs must;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(v) cancel any received or future De-energisation ServiceOrderRequest within the requirements of co-incident service order logic.</li> <li>(vi) undertake works if they need to re-store supply to the site, as records indicate a remote de-energisation.</li> <li>(vii) if the MC reasonably believes that the site will be on supply on the scheduled date, close the Re-energisation ServiceOrderRequest and send a ServiceOrderResponse of ‘Not Completed’ with the ExceptionCode indicating “Site already Energised”.</li> <li>(viii) send the ServiceOrderResponse with appropriate charge codes for any works or field visit.</li> </ul> <p>The outgoing FRMP must;</p>
------------	------------	---

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		(ix) On receipt of a COM CR1xxx, and they have issued a Deenergisation for today or greater date; send a Cancel SORD.
6.1.4.(d).	6.1.4.(e).	Where are the actions you want the MC/MPB to perform when they receive the Re-energisation ServiceOrderRequests?