

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (version change)
- Service Order
- Meter Data
- One Way Notification
- Technical Delivery Specification

CONSULTATION – Draft Stage B2B v34

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE

Participant: PLUS ES

Completion Date: 11/03/2020

Table of Contents

- 1. Service Order Process 3
- 2. Meter Data Process 11
- 3. One Way Notification Process 11
- 4. Technical Delivery Specification 12
- 5. Question 1 'Draft Report Change Pack' 13

1. Service Order Process.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES			

Metering Service Works – Section 4.1 ServiceOrderRequest Transaction Data

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES	General	Aligning with B2B Principles	<p>PLUS ES' understanding of the B2B procedures is that of a mechanism which should effect an efficient, consistent and harmonised method of communication between B2B participants, as per B2B Principles.</p> <p>This is also applicable in the current POC (contestable) environment.</p> <p>Hence, PLUS ES recommends that any proposed changes which offer two different alternatives for an Initiator to communicate the same information in a B2B SO should be reviewed and the resulting outcome align with NER B2B Principles Clause (b).</p> <p>Anything additional should be a P2P agreed process.</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES	General	SpecialInstructions field	<p>PLUS ES supports the enumeration of 'Other' in the proposed new fields, as appropriate. However, 'Other' does not add any value if selected without additional information provided.</p> <p>Hence, it is strongly recommended that the B2B Procedures support mandatory application of Special Instructions when an enumeration of 'Other' is selected.</p> <p>Current wording in the Special instructions field definition: Any special instructions the Initiator wishes to convey to the Recipient.</p> <p>Mandatory where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A value of "Other" is used in MeteringRequired <p>PLUS ES proposes that the wording 'in MeteringRequired' is removed to achieve the requirement.</p>
PLUS ES		ReqClassification	<p>Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected.</p> <p>Refer to General SpecialInstruction field comment.</p>
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	<p>This field should be renamed as the enumerations do not always reflect a site visit.</p> <p>PLUS ES suggests an alternative; perhaps: 'Purpose of Request'</p>
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	<p>The following enumerations can be communicated with existing B2B SO fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidirectional Flows at premise – this can be communicated via the MeteringRequired field • Communications Remove – the remove and add can be communicated via MeterInstallCode. PLUS ES suggests this field is renamed 'Alter meter communications'

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected. Refer to General SpecialInstruction field comment.
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	PLUS ES proposes for the following fields to be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revenue Protection• Site Abolishment• Family Failure• Fault
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	'Replace existing metering' : PLUS ES recommends removing as it is superfluous. The meter exchange MSW – Exchange meter caters for this. It would require additional cost to implement – for no perceivable value.
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedStartDate	PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as it would add value (O/N instead of N in the matrix): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MSW Remove Meter• MSW Install Controlled Load

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedEndDate	<p>PLUS ES supports the customer agreed start and end date combination to be used for a deployment timeframe; other than an appointment. There is a current gap for participants to indicate a Timeframe in a B2B SO, specially with the introduction of the Metering Installation Timeframes.</p> <p>Existing fields in the B2B SO and processes cater for the appointment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ScheduledDate ○ AppointmentReference ○ CustomerPreferredDateAndTime <p>Introducing an additional method of communicating an appointment will add additional costs and make the process less efficient.</p> <p>Hence PLUS ES recommends the currently proposed wording to be amended in the definition to reflect a timeframe other than a fixed date/appointment. i.e. Remove the sentence: <i>'Where the Initiator.....will be the same date.'</i></p> <p>Refer to General B2B Principle comments</p>
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedEndDate	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as it would add value (O/N instead of N in the matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MSW Remove Meter
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedEndDate	<p>PLUS ES proposes all date or schedule date reference fields relating to the delivery date of the service works should be located together in the B2 SO table. i.e. This field should be located near or adjacent the ScheduledDate field etc.</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as they also may occur an outage (O/N instead of N in the matrix): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter • MSW Install Control Load • MSW Install Meter
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	PLUS ES proposes the addition of “as per bilateral agreements” so the paragraph should read: This is the method by which the notice of interruption to the customer is to be delivered. This is used when the Recipient is to issue the notice on behalf of the Initiator, as per bilateral agreements.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	Formatting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undo bullet point from the paragraph in the definition column • Add bullet point to ‘Post’
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	PLUS ES recommends including comments to state that if ‘waiver’ is selected then either of the two must be populated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CustomerAgreed Start & End date or • CustomerPreferredDate
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	PLUS ES recommends including comments to state that if ‘sms’ or ‘phone’ is selected then the CustomerContactNumber must be populated.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationAddress	Spelling error in the Definition field – puposes amend to purposes.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationAddress	PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as they also may occur an outage (O/N instead of N in the matrix): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter • MSW Install Control Load • MSW Install Meter
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationAddress	PLUS ES recommends that the wording is amended to make the population of this field mandatory when Post is selected: <p><i>Customer postal address must be provided for the purpose of a retailer planned interruption notice when the CustomerNotificationMethod is 'Post'</i></p>
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationEmail	Spelling error in the Definition field – puposes amend to purposes.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationEmail	PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as they also may occur an outage (O/N instead of N in the matrix): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter • MSW Install Control Load • MSW Install Meter
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationEmail	PLUS ES recommends that the wording is amended to make the population of this field mandatory when Email is selected: <p><i>Customer email address must be provided for the purpose of a retailer planned interruption notice when the CustomerNotificationMethod is 'Email'.</i></p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		Escalation	Formatting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undo bullet point from the paragraph in the definition column • Add bullet point to 'Normal'
PLUS ES		Escalation	PLUS ES proposes: Remove 'Normal' enumeration. The escalation field should only be populated when required and the absence of any enumeration implies normal status. i.e. Only include a tag in this field when escalation truly exists. The recipient should not be imposed to build system logic for a 'normal' status when it adds no value or an initiator to incur additional costs to populate the field when not required. PLUS ES has interpreted 'normal' as no escalation.
PLUS ES		Escalation	PLUS ES proposes: 'VIP' enumeration –remove this enumeration. There is no way of verifying if a VIP SO is an escalation. Agents could potentially escalate non-VIP SOs incorrectly, impacting the metering providers scheduling and timeframes unnecessarily. PLUS ES questions the value-add of this enumeration, since they have not received any B2B SOs from any retailers with such a requirement. This could be handled via a P2P process rather than including an enumeration that every participant would have to build if they intend to use the Escalation field.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		Escalation	Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected. Refer to General SpecialInstruction field comment.
PLUS ES		Escalation	PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs (O/N instead of N in the matrix): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter • MSW Install Control Load • MSW Install Meter
PLUS ES		Exemption	PLUS ES recommends that this field is removed. Communication of this code is best achieved and more efficient via making this field available in MSATS. The MSDR is currently consulting and this field has been raised to be included in the review. MSATS is the more appropriate repository for this field as it would communicate the exemption to all the participants associated with the NMI.

Supply Abolishment

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
			n/a

Allocate NMI

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
			n/a

2. Meter Data Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
			n/a

3. One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		MFIN	PLUS ES notes that the MFIN has not been renamed given that in the draft consultations it has also been repurposed to include a 'Meter exchange Notice'. Also refer to PLUS ES response below, (Section 5), with respect to the question asked in the Draft Report Change Pack.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
PLUS ES		MFIN	<p>Meter Exchange Notice</p> <p>PLUS ES do not support the addition of this enumeration in the MFIN if the PIN also remains as a OWN for meter exchange notice.</p> <p>Also refer to PLUS ES response below, (Section 5), with respect to the question asked in the Draft Report Change Pack.</p>
PLUS ES		Version Release History 3.4	<p>There is a proposed enumeration of Meter Exchange Notice in the MFIN and this has not been identified in the Comments only the addition of the ServiceOrderID field.</p>

4. Technical Delivery Specification

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
			PLUS ES has no comment on the Technical Delivery Specification.

5. Question 1 ‘Draft Report Change Pack’

Participant Name	Comments
<p>Do you have a preference between using the PIN and/or the MFIN One Way Notifications to notify participants of meter exchange dates? If so, which is your preference and why?</p>	<p>PLUS ES’ preference is for B2B to enable one transaction for the notification of a meter exchange schedule date. We have no preference which transaction it is. I.e. we are supportive of changing and repurposing the MFIN to accommodate Meter exchange notices, if all participants agree to use the repurposed MFIN.</p> <p>Where agreement cannot be reached as part of the consultation, PLUS ES strongly advocates for the MFIN to remain a Fault and Issue notification and the PIN to be utilised as a meter exchange notification. Most of our Retailers (except for 5 Retailers) currently receive the PIN as their notification of meter exchange notice. The 5 Retailers who currently accept the MXN as a meter exchange notification would have to build for a new OWN when these changes are implemented.</p> <p>DBs are also stakeholders of the PIN. The current use of PIN by contestable MPs to notify Retailers of meter exchange dates has not impacted the use of the PIN by DBs.</p> <p>What we do not support is to have 2 transactions as options to deliver a meter exchange notification and incurring unnecessary costs to implement/amend system changes and logic.</p> <p>Refer also to PLUS ES General B2B Principle comments</p>