

B2B Procedures

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

CONSULTATION – Second Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Origin Energy

Completion Date: 1st June 2022

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section) 3
- 1. Service Order Process 4
- 2. One Way Notification Process 6
- 3. Technical Delivery Specification 6
- 4. B2B Guide v3.8 7
- 5. B2B Guide v3.7.1 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. Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
N/A	N/A	Header of the document refers to (Option 1A) – it should be removed. B2B PROCEDURE: SERVICE ORDER PROCESS (OPTION 1A) OPTION 1A – COINCIDENT SERVICE ORDER MANAGEMENT
N/A	N/A	Footer of the document has two separate dates – 7 November 2022 to be deleted 7 November 2022 May 2023
2.3. (a)	2.3. (a)	Errata – <i>i.e.</i> instead of <i>ie</i>
N/A	2.3.1. (b)	For clarity, it would be worth adding ‘Where DNSP is not the current MPB, the initiator of a Service Order for Re-energisation and De-energisation must raise a Notified Party transaction, so that: (i) The DNSP is notified when the initiator is requesting a Re-energisation or Deenergisation service from the MPB. (ii) The current MPB is notified when the initiator is requesting a Re-energisation or Deenergisation service from the DNSP.
2.16.2. (a) (ii)	2.16.2. (a) (ii)	Where it states “raise a Notified Party Transaction to the appropriate party, in accordance with section 2.3.1” it appears to refer to the standalone transaction. For avoidance of doubt, it should specify that this notification can either be provided <u>as a part of</u> Service Order Transaction (by populating <i>NotifiedPartyID</i> field of ServiceOrderRequest), or via standalone NotifiedParty One Way Notification <u>along with/in conjunction with</u> the ServiceOrderRequest Transaction. Note: consistent with clause 2.3 (b)
2.16.3. (a) (ii)	2.16.3. (a) (ii)	Same as above

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.16.4. (a)	2.16.4. (a)	'to' at the end of sentence one can be deleted and added in front of clause (i) instead.
2.16.4. (a) (iii)	2.16.4. (a) (iii)	This statement can be deleted "For the avoidance of any doubt, there is no action required for any of the other NotificationStatus". Seems over-prescriptive – the first statement covers the requirement sufficiently.
2.16.4. (b)	2.16.4. (b)	ServiceOrderType and NotificationStatus to be italicised (there might be more of these throughout the document that require to be updated).
Table 13	Table 13	<p><i>NotifiedPartyID</i> for Re-energisation and De-energisation should be M/N instead of M/O/N. There are no comments provided for 'O', so we suggest updating the comments as:</p> <p>Notified Party's Participant ID. This is a repeatable field where there is more than one Notified Party. Refer to section 2.3. for managing notifications to Notified Parties. Not Required when managing notifications to Notified Parties via NotifiedParty One Way Notification separately, refer to section 2.3. Not Required for a "Cancel" ServiceOrderRequest.</p>
Figures 1, 3 and 4	Figures 1, 3 and 4	<p>In the current process map, it appears that 'Notified Party Transaction' ends the process, however with the new changes, we should reflect these in the maps at a high level. Suggest adding an additional task box after 'Receive <u>NotifiedParty</u> Transaction' as 'Take appropriate action, as required' before it ends.</p> 

2. One Way Notification Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.1.2. (e)	2.1.2. (e)	Errate change: Replace 'SharedFuse' with 'SharedFuseNotification'
3.1. (d)	3.1. (d)	Errata change: Replace 'Sharedfuse Notification' with 'SharedFuseNotification'
4.2.6. (a)	4.2.6. (a)	Heading to be either changed in Technical Delivery Specification Table 1 or to be changed in this document: SharedFuseNotification Data or SharedFuseArrangement Transaction Data Errata change: Replace this 'The Shared Fuse notification is to allow the Initiator to provide Shared Fuse information...' with 'The SharedFuseNotification is to allow the Initiator to provide shared fuse information...'
N/A	N/A	'Shared Fuse Arrangements' or 'shared fuse arrangements'? We need to apply one of these two throughout the document. Suggest <u>SharedFuseArrangement</u> Transaction as per the terminology used in Technical Delivery Specification.

3. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
2.11 Table 1	2.11 Table 1	To be either changed in Technical Delivery Specification or to be changed in One Way Notification Procedure: 'SharedFuseNotification Data' or 'SharedFuseArrangement Transaction Data'

4. B2B Guide v3.8

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
4.3 (d) and (e)	4.3 (d) and (e)	Wherever is says 'Notified Party transaction', should be replaced with 'NotifiedParty Transaction' (no space between the two words if we're referring to a transaction). To be checked throughout the document.
6.5.1.6	6.5.1.6	Same issue as above, 'Shared Fuse Notification' or 'Shared Fuse Arrangement Notification'? We should agree on one and apply it consistently across all the IEC Procedures
7.3.6	7.3.6	Same as above

5. B2B Guide v3.7.1

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
6.5.1.6	6.5.1.6	Same issue as above, 'Shared Fuse Notification' or 'Shared Fuse Arrangement Notification'? We should agree on one and apply it consistently across all the IEC Procedures
7.3.6	7.3.6	Same as above