

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: *Telstra Energy (Retail) Pty. Limited*

Completion Date: *11/04/2022*

Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
<p>2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders</p>	<p>Question 1: What is your preferred solution, Option 1a or Option 1b, and why?</p>	<p>Telstra Energy is of the view that the best solution for dealing with the issues addressed in this consultation is to ensure that all participants have access to timely and accurate information relating to the status of customer supply.</p> <p>The consultation options do not truly address this issue as both the B2B notifications and MSATS status information cannot be relied upon to ensure appropriate customer outcomes are achieved.</p> <p>Our preference is not for the establishment of an enhanced B2B process but that the MSDR Programme of work leads to a solution whereby accurate MSATS data is made available on time basis. Providing an additional means of receiving NMI and Meter Status data, which like MSATS, is neither ensured to be accurate nor timely is not a real solution.</p> <p>Within the above noted constraints, if the industry determines there is a need to implement an interim B2B Process, our preference is Option 1a. This preference is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continued coincident service order management performed by service providers (either formally as per B2B Service Order Procedure or via interim processes currently implemented by MC's/MPB's) • minimal impact to Energy Retail systems and business processes

Topic	Question	Comments
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.	Telstra Energy are in the process of implementing a solution to utilise Option 1a.
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?	Telstra Energy regard both options as providing equal coverage and protection for customers supply, with both carrying the same risks for that supply. Telstra Energy note as there are less steps involved in Option 1a, there is a potentially less time involved in reinstating a customers supply in the scenario whereby a customer is off supply due to process timing of Re-Energisation SO's and NP transactions.
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)?	Telstra Energy remains concerned that the proposed solutions retain the risk that customers will be unnecessarily off supply. But otherwise, refer to Telstra Energy response to Question 3.
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?	Provided Option 1a is implemented, Telstra Energy do not anticipate any reason not to meet a May 2023 implementation.

Topic	Question	Comments
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”)	<p>Other – The B2B OWN Procedure (2.1.2 (e)) allows, but does not mandate, the new B2B OWN to communicate Shared Fusing. Further, the B2B Guide (Section 7.3.6) provides for both Interim (email) and aseXML communication of shared fusing.</p> <p>Telstra Energy support communication of Shared Fusing via aseXML OWN for high volumes however, in the event a Retailer is required to communicate shared fusing to a DNSP (low volumes), Telstra Energy support continuation of interim (email) process.</p>
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?	<p>The B2B OWN Procedure (2.1.2 (e)) allows, but does not mandate, the new B2B OWN to communicate Shared Fusing. Further, the B2B Guide (Section 7.3.6) provides for both Interim (email) and aseXML communication of shared fusing.</p> <p>On this basis, Telstra Energy do not anticipate any reason not to meet a May 2023 implementation.</p>
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