

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: Essential Energy

Completion Date: 10/4/2022

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... 3
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 4
- 2. Service Order Process – Option 1a 7
- 3. Service Order Process – Option 1b..... 7
- 4. One Way Notification 8
- 5. Technical Delivery Specification 8
- 6. B2B Guide – Option 1a 9
- 7. B2B Guide – Option 1b 9

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 |
|--|--|---|
| <p>2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders</p> | <p>Question 1: What is your preferred solution, Option 1a or Option 1b, and why?</p> | <p>Option 1a is Essential Energy’s preference, we believe the use of notified parties provides all involved participants with sufficient information to make an informed decision to manage any actual De-energisation or Re-energisation service order requests relating to smart metered sites.</p> |
| <p>2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders</p> | <p>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.</p> | <p>Have you already implemented one of the proposed options?</p> <p>With regards to option 1a, our market system has been developed to accept and consume the notified party transactions. We use these in a variety of other processes and enquiries including our outage management processes to identify where a customer is off supply and may have been remotely disconnected.</p> <p>With regards to option 1b, our market system partially supports option 1b. We already have the logic to not undertake a field visit where we reasonably believe the site will remain energised.</p> <p>What would be your expected incremental costs to deliver each of the proposed solutions? This should not include costs already spent.</p> <p>It’s not possible to obtain an accurate assessment of costs without considerable upfront investment and business requirements. We can however state that both options would require minor system changes and neither option is materially more costly than the other for us.</p> |

| 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? | <p>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?</p> <p>Our view is that for managing Coincident service orders both Option 1a and Option 1b are equally effective at ensuring open service orders are managed effectively.</p> <p>We believe that option 1b can also protect customers against customers being left off supply where a Remote disconnection service order has already been complete and the re-energisation is only sent to the DNSP.</p> <p>To what extent do you believe that your chosen option better protects customers?</p> <p>Our view is that Option 1a provides all the information required to manage open service orders between Retailers, Networks and Meter Providers. We also believe that requiring a retailer to send service orders to two parties is inefficient and unusual to knowingly send a service order request to a party that needn't be involved.</p> |
| 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)? | <p>What is the extent of the customer impact for each of the proposed solution?</p> <p>Option 1a with all parties having notified party transactions they should have enough information to determine what needs to happen if the management of coincident service orders happens to result in a customer being off supply. This should be the exception rather than the rule and participants should act in good faith to get customers on supply in these instances.</p> <p>Option 1b reduces the likelihood of customers being off supply but it could also result in wasted visits and confusion in responsibility for the re-en.</p> |

| 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? | We support a May 2023 effective start date |
| 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, we support the Shared fuse notification using the aseXML OWN. |
| 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? | We support a May 2023 effective start 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. | Nil |

2. Service Order Process – Option 1a

| Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3. Service Order Process – Option 1b

| Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

4. One Way Notification

| Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

5. Technical Delivery Specification

| Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

6. B2B Guide – Option 1a

| Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

7. B2B Guide – Option 1b

| Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |