

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (procedure changes)
- Service Order (procedure changes)
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification (version change)
- Technical Delivery Specification (procedure changes)
- B2B Guide (document changes)

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Vector Metering

Completion Date: 06/07/2021

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... 3
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 4
- 3. Service Order Process..... 7
- 5. B2B Guide 7

0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)

General Instructions

1. Please keep information in the clause numbers simple - eg no titles, comments etc. – put titles and text in the comment section.
2. Please use a individual row for each comment on any each clauses.
3. Old clauses only needed if there is no equivalent clause within the revised draft procedures.
4. If an obligation exists in another instrument please identify the instrument and clause to assist in including guidance notes.
5. Please only include comments either with suggested changes, issues or support. Please do not include ‘No Comment’.
6. See example below (please note the “comments” are sample only, they bear no relevance to the proposed changes):

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
1.42(a)	2.15(a)	Service Order response Change response list from varchar(250) to an enumerated list
1.42(a)	2.15(a)	Suggest add ‘Other’ as part of enumerated list and add free text to support other
	2.25(a)(ii)	Table 5 “Description of use” should be reworded to “Description of typical use”
	3.6(a)	The MDP SLP (c 3.5.2) requires the meter serial ID to be provided. Suggest the MeterSerialID be added to the transaction.
	3.6(a)	Ensure MeterserialID is the same field used in other procedures
	2.15	Ensure character length for MeterSerialID matches MSATS field length

1. Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 1: Do you support the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes Comment – the only time an address is used in a SO is during a “Allocate NMI” SOR from the retailer to the DNSP. Otherwise NMI is the identifying key and details are sourced from MSATs.
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 2: If the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	Yes Comment – As a MP, we don’t use these as we don’t receive Allocate NMI SOR.
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Other – as this is used during a “Allocate NMI” SOR from the retailer to the DNSP then it is up to them to agree. In principle, it is bad practice to re-purpose fields...just saying.
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 4: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No Issue – We don’t used this.
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 5: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Person Name fields? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes

Topic	Question	Comments
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 6: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No Issue
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 7: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Coincident Service Order Logic for non-regulated businesses? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	<p>No. This is placing obligations on what businesses do on the receipt of a transaction. The principles of B2B are to define the transactions that flow between Businesses, not what these trigger inside a business. Initiators and Recipients should be free to agree how transactions are to be used. Is this in the remit of the IEC to place these obligations on businesses?</p> <p>As already demonstrated the major MC’s have built mechanisms as part of the remote reen/deen offering to manage coincident SO’s without this obligation existing. While DNSP’s want regulation to define what they will do Competitive MC’s do not. We believe enshrining this in regulation is unnecessary.</p>
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 8: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No Issue
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 9: Do you support the inclusion of the process flow with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	No- Not these ones – the process should start with DNSP detecting actual interval data (zero or non-zero) on a Deenergised NMI and should make the NMI active. Retailer detects the NMI status change and then acts to deenergise site if required. No need for MDP in this flow.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 10: If the process flow proposed in this document with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process is included in the B2B Guide, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No issue – MDP’s obligations already exist in CATS procedures. No change to our systems.
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 11: Are there better options to accommodate the proposed change that better achieve the stated objectives? What are the related pros and cons? How would they be implemented?	Create a new field for DPID rather than re-purpose an existing field.
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 12: What are the main challenges in adopting these proposed changes? How should these challenges be addressed?	Nil.
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 13: What are the costs and/ or benefits if the proposed changes were not made? Consider the perspectives of process, training, system and customer impacts.	Immaterial
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 14: 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.

3. Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	2.18	Don't support the inclusion of this section. Refer to comments in question 7 above.

4. B2B Guide

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	New process flow for Unauthorised Connections	See comments on question 9 above.