

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: TasNetworks

Completion Date: 11/04/2022

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?	<p>Option 1b.</p> <p>TasNetworks considers that option 1b provides for a more traditional way for management of service order requests without having to incorporate the management of Notified Party transactions. Option 1b will still meet the objective of minimising customers being left off supply as a result of coincident service order requests.</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.	<p>No, TasNetworks has not implemented either of the proposed options, noting that Remote Re-en and De-en services are not currently undertaken in Tasmania.</p> <p>TasNetworks does not have an indicative cost to deliver each of the proposed options, however, it expects that any costs required for option 1b would be far less than that required for 1a.</p>
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?	<p>TasNetworks believes option 1b provides better protections for the customer as there is no confusion about what action needs to be taken. For a remote service capable meter, if both parties receive a re-en service request, then the party which performed the de-en has an immediate request to re-en supply and cancel any de-en request if not yet performed.</p>

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)?	TasNetworks anticipates that a customer could be left without supply for a longer period under option 1a. If a re-en service order request is received by both parties, as per 1b, then immediate steps can be taken to arrange for re-energisation by the disconnecting party rather than the initiator having to process a Notified Party Response before initiating a re-en request.
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?	Option 1a could take significantly more design, implementation and testing effort to undertake. Option 1b should be easier to implement with potentially minimal change to existing processing and business logic. Until it is more defined as to when remote services may begin in Tasmania, it is anticipated that TasNetworks will not undertake changes to cater for option 1a, should that be adopted.
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”)	Other. Whilst TasNetworks acknowledges the benefits of using an aseXML B2B protocol over the interim email solution, it would question whether the expense across the industry to implement a new OWN transaction is warranted. The interim email solution may suffice, particularly as participants need to develop processes to manage this for at least 12 months. Although the transaction may be of use in the short to medium term, as the value of Shared Isolation Point Flag becomes more widely known in MSATS, and reflective of the isolation state for the NMI, the use of the transaction will decline.
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?	Other than questioning the need and cost for the development of the transaction over the interim solution, TasNetworks would not have capacity to implement this change any earlier than May 2023 given the MSDR changes coming in November 2022 and then allowing for downtime during the start of Q1 2023.

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.

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(b)	Replace the word 're-energisation' with 'de-energisation'.

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
	6.7.2	The definition of 'The date that the Shared Fuse state was identified by the Initiator.' should be added to the Date Field, the same as defined in the OWN Process
	6.7.2	Value for Shared Fuse should be 'Y' to align with the enumerated value in MSATS.
	7.3.6.1	Suggest removing the 'Note' Field as this is not required and does not serve any purpose.

7. B2B Guide – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	2(f)	Remove this clause as not valid for Option 1b.
	4.3	Changes relating to Notified Party transactions is not valid for Option 1b.
	4.4	Changes relating to Notified Party transactions is not valid for Option 1b.
	6.1.4(d)	Subclause (ii) and (iii) need to be modified to ensure they integrate correctly with statement 'Under these conditions, DNSP's....)
	6.7.2	The definition of 'The date that the Shared Fuse state was identified by the Initiator.' should be added to the Date Field, the same as defined in the OWN Process
	6.7.2	Value for Shared Fuse should be 'Y' to align with the enumerated value in MSATS.

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	7.3.6.1	Suggest removing the 'Note' Field as this is not required and does not serve any purpose.