

## 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:*** Alinta Energy

***Completion Date:*** 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022

# Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... 3
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 4
- 2. Service Order Process – Option 1a ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 3. Service Order Process – Option 1b..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 4. One Way Notification ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 5. Technical Delivery Specification ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 6. B2B Guide – Option 1a ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 7. B2B Guide – Option 1b ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

## 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):*

## 1. 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?  | Option 1a. Alinta Energy believes this to be the most simple solution and less cumbersome on our retail processes.   |
| 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.  | Alinta Energy has already built to Option 1a. There will be no incremental costs to work to Option 1a. There will be significant additional system build, training and internal procedural costs to work to Option 1b.   |
| 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? | Alinta Energy believes Option 1a provides better protection and greater visibility to all participants associated with the NMI.  |
| 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)?   | This is difficult to determine. Each circumstance would be different. There are too many variables to consider. Distance the customer is from the next available metering or network resource, weather conditions at the time, participants system availability at the time, just to name a few. |

| 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?                                | At this point in time no, but given the rate of change in industry at the moment and other initiatives earmarked for this same go live date, anything is possible.                               |
| 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”)                               | Yes. Alinta Energy supports this proposal because it provides an audit trail of information sent to the networks.  |
| 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?  | Alinta Energy would not have any issues adopting the changes on the proposed implementation date.  |
| 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. | Alinta Energy would like to state that if Option 1b becomes the market solution, we would not be able to deliver to the May 2023 timeline. More time would be required to deliver that solution. |