B2B Guide

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: United Energy*

***Completion Date**: 1 December 2016*

Table of Contents

1. Guide 3

1. Guide

Clause	Heading	Comments
3.4 (b)	Business Communication Model Changes	Modify this clause to explain that the message to Notified Parties will be a One Way Notification (assuming advice from SWG is adopted)
3.4 (b)	Business Communication Model Changes	Add an additional clause (based on SWG advice) that the Initiator can choose to advise the Notified party directly rather than requiring the Hub to do this.
3.4 (b)	Business Communication Model Changes	Add an additional explanatory clause describing the exception situations – eg 1. When the Notified party does not receive the SO Copy 2. When the Notified party rejects the SO Copy
3.4 (c)	Business Communication Model Changes	Add a new clause explaining that other that populating the CC list in the response (If this method still applies following advice from SWG), the Recipient has No Responsibility to manage or supply response transactions to the Notified party, or to manage exceptions in regard to transactions to the Notified Party. This responsibility lies with the Hub or with the Initiator.

3.4 (c)	Business Communication Model Changes	Add an additional explanatory clause explaining the process when • the Notified party does not receive the Tack or the SO Response • the Notified party rejects the Tack or the SO Response
3.4	Business Communication Model Changes	An entire new section could be usefully added into the document describing the operations of the Hub. It could cover: • Different participants using different protocols • How the communications flow with a notified party works: (a) When the Hub handles it (b) When the initiator handles it
5.1.1.(c)	**New Connections**	It would be useful to provide greater explanation about the use/requirement for service paperwork in each Jurisdiction. It should address the following points: • Will Competitive MPs expect to see the paperwork too? • Which paperwork is mandatory for an Allocate NMI Service Order (UE recommend that the EWR / Form A is Mandatory at this point) • Which paperwork is necessary for the Supply Install Service Order (UE recommend that all three items of paperwork are mandatory at this point unless there is an agreement that the Metering CES will be available on site) • If paperwork is left on site (eg Metering Safety Certificate) –

		explain that the paperwork ID cannot be supplied in the Supply Works Service Order if the metering was not installed at the time of the service order being sent. In such a case it should be marked as "On-Site", but with the Certificate number being blank. – DB's could enter that later.
5.1.1.1 g	Example process flows – New Connections	One of the other potential triggers for the Supply Installation could be the MSATS CR Notification for Metering Install. This could also be shown in the diagrams.
5.1.2	**Adds Alts**	A section should be added regarding the Role of paperwork in the Adds Alts section. I.e. – Required if there is a material change to the Site's electrical supply requirements. (eg 1 phase to 3 phase), but not required for Temporary Isolation
5.1.3	**Re-energisation & De-energisation**	There needs to be an explanation around the use of the "Life-support" flag in Service orders and its relationship with the CDN life support data. What is the explanation / difference between the two?
5.1.3.2	**De-Energisation Method**	The de-energisation methods listed in the diagram are not consistent with the methods listed in the B2B Service Order procedure.
5.1.4 (a)	**Service Order Coordination**	The description needs to make it clear that the Initiator can only nominate a person as the Coordinator, with agreement of that person/organisation. If the Initiator has no agreement then they cannot nominate someone as the coordinator for that activity.

5.1.4 (c)	**Service Order Coordination**	The clause suggest that if the co-ordinating party is not contacted then they should follow up with the Retailer – However this assumes that the Coordinating party knows about, and expects a call from the service provider. This may not be the case. Suggest that some qualifications ne inserted into the text to recognise that the co-ordinating party may not be able to follow-up.
5.1.4 (d)	**Service Order Coordination**	Service Order Appointment: In the Service Order process – there is no explanation on the use of this. Ensure that any changes to that process are reflected in the Guide.
5.2	**Customer and Site Details Notification**	There has been changes to the data in the CSN Procedures. This section should provide greater clarity around the purpose and use of that new data. Eg: • Outage contact v's Account (if account stays) • When life support is recorded • Who is obliged to record life support (MPs?) • Life support equipment
5.3.1.3	**Planned Interruption Notification (PIN)**	This should provide further information about its intended use, the timeframes and Reference should be made to NER clause 99A
5.3.1.4	**Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFN)**	The text should provide more explanation about the intent and use behind each of the Reason Codes especially regarding "Area Event", "Meter verification" and "Threshold breach" as these do not necessarily require a meter exchange to take place. – It needs to be

		clear about when a meter exchange must occur vs's when it may need to occur.
5.3.1.4	**Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFN)**	The narrative need to better explain the use of the MFN content. It should show how the content is used under different scenarios eg. - Meters installed - Meters removed and readings supplied - Transformers installed - Network devices removed/installed
5.3.1.4	**Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFN)**	The narrative should explain the expectation on the sending party when they receive a rejection for some of the lines/records listed within an MFN's CSV payload
5.3.1.5	**Notice of Metering Works (NMW)**	• Reference should be made to MP SLP 4.3b, and the 2 business day obligation for this message to be sent
5.3.1.5	**Notice of Metering Works (NMW)**	The NMW CSV format is a complex and difficult to understand structure. Especially given that it must deal with the addition and removal of different pieces of equipment. There should be a description about reach of the main scenarios and their effect on the content of the message to explain how the message is structured. Eg: • Meters installed

		• Meters removed • CT transformers installed • Testing performed • Network device removed
5.4.3 (b)	**Metering Installation Inquiry response**	The response to a meter Installation Inquiry should be defined as being a format agreed bi-laterally between participants (eg delivered as name value pairs or any other format in an envelope in response to the request)
5.4.4 (b)	**Remote On-Demand Meter Read**	Requiring the response of an On-demand read to be an MDN is too restrictive. It presumes a particular use-case which may not be valid- It should be defined as being a format agreed bi-laterally between participants which could be the NEM12 format – but may also be delivered as name value pairs or any other format in an envelope in response to the request