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: *Vector Metering*

Completion Date: *11/04/2022*

Table of Contents

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?	1a is our preferred option. • It maintains the current paradigm where coincident SO's are managed by service providers, not the retailers. Option 1B changes this by placing the onus on retailers. • It is the lowest cost approach. Only a few MP's and a few DNSP's need to make changes to include NPX into coincident SO logic. Option 1B requires all retailers (x 35) to changes their systems to manage multiple SOR and SO responses. • From a retailer perspective they will have a similar process across all jurisdictions where remote services are permitted i.e. only one SOR, where as Option 1B will require different processes in diff jurisdictions i.e. NSW v Vic.
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 we have already implemented 1a – costs were immaterial to add NPX into coinicndet SO logic.

Topic	Question	Comments
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?	From a coincident SO perspective – where two inflight SOR are active and need to be managed, option 1A and option 1B provide the same protection. Option 1b has the added advantage over option 1a of better managing the scenario where the Physical DEEN SO has *just been completed* before the REEN has arrived (this is not a coincident SO scenario). Option 1b gives the DNSP's the SOR request to reverse the DEEN. Option 1a does not provide this protection and would require the retailer to be made aware that the customer remains disconnected and take appropriate action (issue a SOR to the DNSP).However, once remote services are taken up by all retailers it is expected that the opportunity for this scenario to occur is very limited. Discussions with retailers related to this scenario have concluded that while 1b offers better protection in this specific scenario the risk is acceptable.
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)?	Where a physical DEEN has just been completed and the customer is off supply • under option 1a the customer would be need to alert the retailer that power has not been energised as requested and the retailer would need to raise a SOR to the DNSP, and the DNSP would need to roll a truck to re-energise. If the DNSP provides a 'SAME day' service then the customer will be reconnected that day, otherwise it will be within the SLA required under the Rules and procedures. • Under option 1b the DNSP would be immediately aware it had just deened the site and needed to reattend. If the DNSP provides a 'Same day' service then the customer will be reconnected that day, otherwise it will be within the SLA required under the Rules and procedures. Under either options the duration of interruption will be approximately the same depending on the actions of the DNSP.

Topic	Question	Comments
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?	From Vector Meterings perspective option 1a has already been delivered and under option 1b there is nothing for the MPB to do. Therefore meeting May 2023 is not an issue.
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")	We support using a AseXML as the primary method of communicating shared fuse status between a MP and the DNSP, however we believe there are less costly solutions by using existing transactions. The MFIN could be adapted, or including the shared fuse information in the NOMW transaction. Both these options will be cheaper for industry to implement than building a new transaction.
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?	No.
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.

1. Service Order Process – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
4.3		Vector Metering notes that the SO procedure table 16 in section 4.3 BusinessAcceptance/Rejection Transaction Data indicates a 'Rejection' event code for 'Site Already Energised' business event.

Business Document	Business Signal	Business Event	Explanation Required	Severity	EventCode	Relevant Procedure clause or Reference Notes
		No Comms.	No	Error	2009	
		Unknown Connection Status.	Yes	Error	2010	
		Meter Not Retrieved.	No	Warning	2011	
		Site Already Energised.	No	Warning	2012	
		Shared Supply Point.	Yes	Error	2013	
		Tariff Change Not Approved.	Yes	Error	2014	
ServiceOrderResponse	BusinessAcceptance/Rejection	ActualDateAndTime is after the date and time the ServiceOrderResponse was sent.	No	Error	1921	

This appears in contradiction to Section 2.16.2. Re-energisation which states

(b) The Recipient must not reject a Re-energisation ServiceOrderRequest if the Site is already energised. The Recipient must return the appropriate ServiceOrderResponse and where possible provide a Meter Reading.

This is confusing and could lead to disputes as to how respond to a Re-energisation SOR where the site is already energised. Suggest a note to be added to table 16 to clarify e.g. 'Used for Service Order sub types other than 'Re-energisation' Cl 2.16.2.

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

2. Service Order Process – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

3. One Way Notification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

4. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

5. B2B Guide – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
6.7. Shared Fuse Obligations		This appears to be misplaced. Looks like an additional entry should be added under OWN decription in section 6.5.1 (if required – not sure it is)
6.7.2. Shared Fuse Notification – CSV File		This section is defined later in the document. Does not fit here.
7.3.6.1 Shared Fuse Obligations		This section **incorrectly describes a format for the interim .CSV file (page 75 section 7.3.6.1.)**. MP's are already using the interim process to advise DNSP's of shared fuses and there is no benefit in changing the agreed format.

6.   B2B Guide – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.(f)		This is not necessary for a two Servcie Order solution (1b). Clause can be removed.
4.3(b)		Ditto – not required for two Service Order solution. Should be reverted to current wording.
6.7. Shared Fuse Obligations		This appears to be misplaced. Looks like an additional entry should be added under OWN decription in section 6.5.1 (if required – not sure it is)
6.7.2. Shared Fuse Notification – CSV File		This section is defined later in the document. Does not fit here.
7.3.6.1 Shared Fuse Obligations		This section **incorrectly describes a format for the interim .CSV file (page 70 section 7.3.6.1.)**. MP's are already using the interim process to advise DNSP's of shared fuses and there is no benefit in changing the agreed format.