B2B Procedures

- Service Orders
- Customer and Site Details
- Meter Data
- One Way Notification
- RoLR Part B

Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework.

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: AGL*

***Completion Date**: 2 Dec 2016*

Table of Contents

1. Consultation Questions 3
2. Service Orders 5
3. CSDN 11
4. Meter Data 13
5. OWN 15
6. RoLR Part B 18
7. Glossary and Framework 20

1. Consultation Questions

Section	Consultation Issue	AGL - Consultation Issue Response
6.2A	Do the content and the structure of the Service Order Transactions meet industry needs?	At this stage the content is what is needed including feedback provided. Implementation and practice will determine any final changes necessary.
6.3A	Who has the obligation(s) in an Embedded Network to notify any relevant participant(s) of Life Support?	The ENO has an obligation to advise its parent retailer under the AER guidelines. A child retailer should have an obligation to notify the DSNP supplying the EN.
6.3B	How do participants communicate customer Life Support information in an Embedded Network?	Clarity on the process is needed between the Child Retailer and the parent network. It is proposed to use the manual process (i.e. phone call and e-mail between participants due to the low volume of these transactions at this time).
6.3C	Are B2B communications required? Note: The Embedded Network Operator (ENO) is not required to be a B2B Participant.	At this stage the number of instances are quite low and can be accommodated with a B2B communications process, but no transaction is needed. Future workloads may require the development of a transaction.
6.3D	Should the SiteAccessNotification be available for parties related to a NMI to send new or updated site hazards and access details?	It would be valuable for parties to be able to push an update to other parties.

Section	Consultation Issue	AGL - Consultation Issue Response
6.3E	Which participant(s) should be considered the 'master of record' holder for this information?	It's unlikely there will be a master record for site details as the metering provider may be the more common party attending the site in the future, with the network only attending occasionally.
6.5A	Should the Remote on Demand Meter Read be included in the Meter Data Process or the Service Order process?	There may be value in developing a simple service order with an enumeration to request a meter service and a SO response that includes the requested information additionally allowing the data to be returned in other processes – e.g. OWN or MDFF.
6.5B	Should the Meter Installation Inquiry be included in the Meter Data Process or the Service Order process?	If the content is defined then it can remain as a meter Data Process, if there are to be varied responses, then a service order process, would be preferable.

2. Service Orders

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL – Service Orders
	General Comment	Diagrams need to be replaced as they are illegible
	1.1	Purpose and Scope There are Victorian and other jurisdictional codes Suggest re-draft as This Procedure has effect only for the purposes set out in the National Electricity Law, NER, NERR , and various Jurisdictional Codes, including the Victorian Energy Retail Code and Distribution Code. These instruments take precedence over the B2B Proceudres ~~ESC jurisdictional codes~~. ~~The NER, NERR, ESC codes and National Electricity Law prevail over this Procedure~~ to the extent of any inconsistency.
1.4.2	1.3.1 II	Seek further clarity on the following: 1.3.1 (i) Service orders can apply to unmetered supply, Service orders for connection, de-en, NMI etc. 1.3.1 (iii) – why is this excluded from this procedure – information may be Available via webservices or other mechanisms – including an update transaction – eg other and process for update can be dealt with in multiple ways • 1.3.1 (vi) – may need this functionality later

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL – Service Orders
1.5	n/a	Please clarify that aseXML and content is dealt with in technical procedure
	2.1 Process Overview Table	“Description of use” should be reworded to “Description of typical use”
2.2	2.1.1 Figure 1	Swim lanes are illegible
2.2	2.1.1 Diagrams	Need to be updated to reflect the eHub solution
2.2	2.1	All service order subtypes should start with the first word of the type. E.g. “Meter-Install”, “Meter-Exchange”.
2.2	2.1	SWG outcomes will have effect on supplied diagrams. These will subsequently need to be updated.
	2.1.2 b	Clarify if a prospective retailer can send a meter reconfig and a metering service works order?
	2.1.2 g	The words “Service Provider” should be changed to “recipient”
	2.1.2 e,f	The word “Retailer” should be changed to “initiator”
2.6	2.2 b	To be brought in line with eHub solution; There is no requirement for the Recipient to use the Notified parties. The eHub keeps a record.
2.6	2.2	There is a requirement to document how notified parties will accept requests.
	2.5 a	Clarity on the term regulated (applying to DBs) versus non regulated (commercial providers) required

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL – Service Orders
	2.5 H i	The newly negotiated date time should be communicated back to the notified party by the initiator
	2.5 d	What is the obligation to update the initiator and notified parties of amended date/times and what is the impact of not doing so
	2.5	With heavier reliance on coordination of service orders between parties, it is now imperative that a maximum time is specified between the service order completing and the service order completion notification being delivered to the market.
2.7.4	2.6 d,e	These clauses can be deleted as the eHub will take care of this.
	2.7 (ii)(iii)	Partially and not completed SOs should have text providing an explanation of why the SO was cancelled or not completed – if the event code is not adequate – refer back to the use of Event Codes for partially / not complete service orders
	2.9	The B2B guide needs to cover the timings for priority H/M/L
2.12	2.10 b	In this scenario, how does notified party become aware in point b
	2.11	New clause required to indicate that the initiator may cancel the service order request and re-send.
2.13.4	2.13.1	“Site already energised”. It needs to be indicated that this should only be used for energisation service orders

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL – Service Orders
	2.13.2	Allocate NMI – Suggest additional wording The obligations to generate and provide a NMI also apply to the ENM. The process for providing that NMI is not required to be B2B.
	2.13.3(d)	These obligations would also apply to meter providers – especially in the case of 4A meters.
	2.13.4	Re-energisation service order responses should have a sub-type associated with them to describe the method of de-energisation.
	2.13.4(d)(ii)	This clause is applicable to all parties – not only DNSPs: suggest rewording: If the Retailer receives payment before the ServiceOrderResponse is received, the Retailer must raise a cancellation ServiceOrderRequest, if the ScheduledDate is in the future. (Same day cancellations are to follow clause (d) (iv) 4 below. (iii) This does not relate to B2B Communications. Perhaps B2B Guide Material (iv) Applicable to all – not only DNSPs replace DNSP with Recipient. (v) applicable to all – not only DNSPs
	2.13	This needs to refer to Appendix 1 / Paperwork in the B2B guide
	2.13(d)	Suggest to change the words “is not required” to “may not be required”.
2.13.5	2.13.2 c d e	Needs to be updated to reflect that an ENM can also request NMI. Not just a DNSP.

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL – Service Orders
	2.13.sub numbers e.g. 2.13.1, 2.13.2	Should be re-numbered as these sections that are unrelated to service paperwork now fall under service paperwork due to their numbering.
	2.13.4 d i	The “Remove fuse (non-payment)” option is no longer available
	2.13.6	Review Abolishment request wording The Service Order applies to a NMI not a site.
2.13.10	2.13.5	Are subtypes required for special read? Do these add value?
2.13.5	2.13.7 e	Clarify the maximum time gap between the two service orders for this to apply.
	2.13.7.6 figure 6	“Retailer” should be re-worded to “initiator”
n/a	3.3 b	This point should be made at start of section, in-line with other sections
	4.1 Transactions Data	Service order sub-type

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL – Service Orders
	4.1 Transactions Data	De-Energisation reason – needs to be updated Contract should be in the enumeration Other needs the contract explanation removed
	4.1 Transactions Data	Safety certificate Number/ Method Sent – should allow fields to repeat like meter numbers

3. CSDN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - CSDN
	General	The procedure refers to a Retailer providing the CSDN. In this instance the procedure should commence with a statement that the Initiator in all instances is the current retailer. The rest of the procedure could be amended as Initiator for consistency.
	4 Business Rules	AGL suggests that an introductory component be added to business rules, clarifying that a retailer is only obligated to provide a CSDN to a Distributor.
	4 Business Rules	AGL suggests that it be clarified that if a current retailer has agreed to provide a response to a CDN from a third party service provider, then the response follows the CSDN procedure.
	3.2(b)(ii)(a)	Both service orders have to be complete (NSW exception – no service order for service works) change 'or' to 'and/or'
9.2.2	4.1	Clarification of term "customer outage details" required

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - CSDN
	4.3.2	Review information provided by Retailer to DNSP and DNSP to Retailer by telephone It is expected that the information would be the same. Suggest that the information required be shown as a bullet point list and referred to by both clauses
9.2.4.2	4.3.2 a	As there can be multiple life support recipients and devices at a premise, the details of the life support should either be a repeating structure within the aseXML or it should be clarified which details take precedence.
	4.6(a) (second (a))	Question comment on **mass updates** - what is meant – mass market updates ? Transaction is for individual NMIs
11.1	5.2	Newly introduced mandatory fields e.g. LifeSupportEquipment Patient Name needs a transition process as these may currently not have values and will thus this will create issues for a reconciliation

4. Meter Data

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - Meter Data
	General	AGL suggests that consideration be given to the provision of Minimum spec meter data services be managed through pre-defining a Meter Data Service Order, which would return a service order response with product codes etc., but with the meter data provided through a Meter Data File. For example, the misc. SPO could be used This would allow participants to make SO requests, manage product cods and billing etc., but have the data delivered in the normal manner.
	2.5.4.1	The same footnote number (3) is used multiple times throughout Table 4, but only appears once at the bottom of the first page of the table. Suggest a symbol rather than footnote (assuming that the note is identical for all terms). Also, Table header row should be repeated on each page for the table.
	3.6	Table 10 does not identify the point or points in time the data has been requested for – there is no field for time(s) to be requested – i.e. start / end time
	3.6	AGL seeks clarity on the response mechanisms for the Remote On Demand response. Unclear what the data file format should be for this – more clarity required – e.g. NEM 12 does not have a field for voltage

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - Meter Data
	3.8	Table 13 Table header row should be repeated on each page for the table.
	3.8	Table 13 Additional Event Codes which may be suitable for Meter Install and Remote On Demand may be: • No data found; and • No further data available. – MP may only have partial data

5. OWN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - OWN_
n/a	n/a	Need to clarify the payload type – refer ASEXML / SWG outcome
n/a	n/a	All regulatory obligations – amend – relevant regulatory obligations
n/a	n/a	Consider a row number of more than 4 digits to allow for more than 10,000 transactions per message
	General	No context on the new OWN transactions makes it a bit harder to understand their use. An introductory paragraph would help.
n/a	4.1.4 b	"Examples" and "standard text" should be re-worded to "available values"
n/a	4.1.4 figure 6	May be better as Start Date and Start Time & End Date and End Time Date and time to cbe clearly defined – eg dd mmm yyyy, hh:mm Column9: Time should be defined as 24hr clock or clarified as a 12 hr clock i.e. hh24mm E.g. "0700" for 7AM and "1900" for 7PM
	4.1.4 figure 6	Column10: Duration needs renamed to ENDTIME. In its current form Duration will not allow for an outage longer than 99 hours.

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - OWN_
	4.1.4(b) - Duration	This may be better as end time – cannot cope with > 99 hours Or use duration as the outage time – within the startdate/time – end date/time window for works Eg interruptions for 30 min between 12 Dec 9.00 am to 12 Dec 5 pm.
	4.1.5 b	“Examples” and “standard text” should be re-worded to “available values”
	4.1.5 figure 7	Does this message require a Meter Serial Number as an individual meter may need to be replaced?
	4.1.6 b	“Examples” and “standard text” should be re-worded to “available values”

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments AGL - OWN_
ADDITIONAL Pre-defined transactions		After considering the issue with type 4A meter exemptions and meter fault exemptions AGL recommends that two additional pre-defined OWN transactions be developed: 1. A NMI list which can be sent to an MC/MP; 2. A response from an MC/MP detailing exemption type (e.g. 4a customer, 4a comms, and fault) and exemption authorisation date. It has been identified that if a prospective retailer is negotiating with a customer with a 4A comms meter it is necessary to know if it's a comms exemption or customer opt out to ensure the appropriate contracts are sent to the customer. Similarly, if a customer is being churned and a meter fault exemption is in place, then it is necessary as the prospective retailer to be aware of this work as the prospective retailer may be the FRMP when the interruption and meter change takes place or may wish to change the planned work to be undertaken (i.e. churn the meter) at the customers premises. There is also the consideration that the interruption has been authorised by the original FRMP and not the participant who will be the FRMP at the time of the interruption.
	4.13	In Figure 5 the Field name is METERID and Format is CHAR(8) All other B2B documents show field name as MeterSerialNumber and format as VARCHAR(12) for consistency.

6. RoLR Part B

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	General Comment:	Does an ENM have any responsibility in a RoLR event? For instance does the ENM have to provide a list of in-flight service orders of the failed retailer?
	General Comment	The procedure pre-supposes that an MDP does not undertake service orders, such as remote de-en/ re-en. As such, it may be better to use a generic statement at the start that the MC obligation rolls down to MP and MDP and then use MC/LNSP or define Service Provider as MC, MP, MDP and LNSP and use Service Provider throughout the clauses to cover all parties.
	2	It is unclear if an ENM undertakes service orders within an embedded network. If they do, then they should also be responsible in clauses 54 etc.
	52.1	Table 52A will likely need review following changes to CSDN E.g. Life Support, Life Support Equipment
	54.3	Obligations relating to service orders apply not only to LNSP but also MCs, therefore the clause should start: Each MC and LNSP must

		This assumes the MC covers the function of MP and MDP as well.
	55.2 (c)	Not clear what the clause means It implies that there are existing bilateral arrangements between participants for RoLR events.
	55.3	1. What is the head of power requiring participants to provide this data to AEMO? 2. New drafting less appropriate than old drafting. The new obligation does not allow the data to be provided any earlier than between 3 to 4 months after the event. Suggest revert to old drafting and add a clause about a date agreed between AEMo and affected Participants.
	Appendix I	ENM appears in report ROLR_16m, but not throughout the procedure.
	Appendix I	Report RoLR_003 Suggest review of ENM activities with the RoLR procedure. ENMs are only responsible for MSATS obligations. A NMI listing for embedded networks should be by Embedded Networks, not ENMs – who may span multiple Embedded Networks.
	Appendix I	ROLR_12 This report should be MC / MP / MDP combinations

	Appendix I	Reports with accelerated role changes or cancelled role changes need to include the MC/MP/MDP as recipients as well as FRMPS and LNSPs.
	Appendix I	ROLR_15 to ROLR_24 Need equivalent reports where MC/MP changes are submitted into MSATS and have not taken effect

7. Glossary and Framework

Clause	Heading	Comments
	3 Glossary	The terms “regulated business” / “non regulated business” are missing from the glossary
	1.2.4 Interpretation	B2B service orders operate in local time not AEST.
	3 Glossary	**Notification** A Transaction that does not require a corresponding reply. Suggest further definition so that there is a differentiation between Transactions to Notified Parties and B2B Notifications. I.e. perhaps calling out the notifications.

	3 Glossary	**Notified Party** The receiver of a B2B Transaction or B2B Acknowledgement for notification purposes only and not required to respond. The Notified Party will be required to respond but is not required by the initiator to take any action in the market. Suggest rewording ….'and not required by the Initiator to act within the market on the B2B transaction.'
	3 Glossary	For B2B purposes we probably need to define the current retailer (as opposed to current FRMP) and prospective retailer.