

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

Participant: Jemena

Completion Date: 2/12/2016

Table of Contents

- 1. Consultation Questions 3
- 2. Guide 4
- 3. Service Orders 5
- 4. CSDN 8
- 5. Meter Data 9
- 6. OWN 12
- 7. RoLR Part B 13
- 8. Glossary and Framework 13

1. Consultation Questions

Section	Consultation Issue	Jemena - Consultation Issue Response
	Do the content and the structure of the Service Order Transactions meet industry needs?	<p>At this stage the content is what is needed including feedback provided.</p> <p>Implementation and Practice will determine any final changes necessary.</p>
	Who has the obligation(s) in an Embedded Network to notify any relevant participant(s) of Life Support?	<p>The obligation to advise relevant participant(s) are specified in the AER guidelines.</p> <p>This however should not limit a party from initiating the generation of a notice to inform relevant parties. It will depend on how the information is made available in the first instance.</p>
	How do participants communicate customer Life Support information in an Embedded Network?	The process should be similar to that used for a standard connection point.
	<p>Are B2B communications required?</p> <p>Note: The Emebedded Network Operator (ENO) is not required to be a B2B Participant.</p>	If the relationship between the parent and child NMI is maintained the B2B comms requirements may be accomodated by the Retailer of the Parent NMI.
	Should the SiteAccessNotification be available for parties related to a NMI to send new or updated site hazards and access details?	In relation to notification of site hazards it should be a requirement for parties to be able to push an update to other parties.

Section	Consultation Issue	Jemena - Consultation Issue Response
	Which participant(s) should be considered the 'master of record' holder for this information?	Each party will have different level of accountability for the data in their systems. It is unlikely that use of site detail information will be managed in the same manner. Therefore it may not provide value in identifying who is the master source.
	Should the Remote on Demand Meter Read be included in the Meter Data Process or the Service Order process?	A RoDMR is similar to a PMD in nature and therefore should be treated in the same way .
	Should the Meter Installation Inquiry be included in the Meter Data Process or the Service Order process?	It is likely that a query regarding a metering installation is a precursor to some action to be conducted via a SO rather than a request for meter data as the Initiator is most commonly the FRMP. It also deals with the nature/and configuration of the site. Therefore it should be a SO Process.

2. Guide

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	3	Jemena's acceptance of this section is pending the outcome of SWG decision on B2B solution.
	3.4	The Guide should provide more detailed guidance regarding the operation of the HUB. In particular aspects such as how the transaction flows to notified parties outlining when the initiator or

		<p>HUB it to handle the communication</p> <p>The Guide should also outline, at a high level, the processes that are involved in managing communications between parties who utilise different protocols to communicate through the HUB. For example how a support analyst tracks a transaction end to end.</p>
	5.2	<p>The updated CSDN transaction has updated information supporting the management of sites with “life support” sensitive loads. The guide needs to outline the basis for the provision of the data and be specific about how it’s to be used between parties.</p>
	5.3.1.4	<p>The “Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFN). Potentially operates as a trigger for the selection of a MC other than the initial default MC (the LNSP). The guide needs to be clear about which faults would necessitate a meter change and therefore a requirement for the FRMP to nominate a MC.</p> <p>Therefore the guide should identify the reason codes that would be used to initiate a meter change.</p>
	5.2.3.1 (Fig 11)	<p>Under Figure 11, will FRMP have after hours call centers? If not, the DB can only send an email upon receiving a customer call for LS during afterhours at the Faults Call centre.</p>

3. Service Orders

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	1.1	<p>The purpose and scope should reflect the fact that there are other jurisdictional instruments that apply and potentially modify the operation of the Procedures in each Jurisdiction.</p> <p>For Victoria in particular the Victorian Energy Retail Code and Distribution Codes have precedence over these Procedures. Therefore the Procedures as they apply in Vic should either be consistent with them or call out their operation as an over-arching regulatory instrument.</p>
	2.1(b)	<p>“If no ServiceOrderSubType is provided in a ServiceOrderRequest, the Recipient’s normal practice will apply.” This clause should only apply to a re-en SO as all other SO Types have a relevant Sub Type</p>
	2.1 Table 1	<p>Please include the valid initiator roles for each service order type and subtypes to assist in building auto validation for efficient processing of service orders</p>
	2.1.2	<p>Jemena’s acceptance of this section is pending the outcome of SWG decision on B2B solution.</p>
	2.10(b)	<p>Where there is an agreement between Initiator and Recipient to update an existing SO that has other Notified Parties, there should be an explicit requirement for the notified parties to be kept in the loop.</p>
	2.13.3(c)	<p>The requirement for the DNSP to affect a re-en upon the receipt of a ServiceOrderRequest irrespective of the transfer status in MSATS, may result in increased occurrence of network billing disputation. There</p>

		needs to be an authorised FRMP for any site that has energy flow.
	4.1 (Transaction Table)	New action Type “Resend” description not included in ServiceOrderID Definition
	2.10, 2.11 & 2.12	Jemena’s acceptance of this section is pending the outcome of SWG decision on B2B solution.
	2.13.3 (e) & (f)	The 2 clauses need re-wording as they refer to “ <i>ServiceOrderSubType</i> ” of Re-energisation SO , but as per 2.1 – There is no subtype specified for Re-energisation SO.
	2.1.2	<p>“A Prospective Retailer is only permitted to send Supply Service Works or Metering Service Works ServiceOrderRequest.”</p> <p>Does it mean that A Prospective Retailer can send e.g. a Supply Abolishment or Exchange/Remove Meter?</p> <p>Should consideration also be given to what SO sub-types a prospective FRMP is able to initiate?</p>
	4.1 (Transaction Table)	<p>Why “<i>ServiceOrderAddress</i>” field is mandatory for all Supply Service Works Service Orders?</p> <p>“<i>ServiceOrderAddress</i>” field should be mandatory only for Allocate NMI. If NMI is provided in Service Order Request Address need only be optional.</p>

4. CSDN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	2.1 Figure 3	Flow Chart not readable
	4.3.2(a & b)	Require patient name but not phone contact details. Patient name may be a confidentiality data risk, however give the nature of the sensitive load a contact number may be prudent to manage and engagement with the customer in a supply interruption (planned or unplanned)
	5.1.Table 3	"Error!Reference source not found"
	5.6 Table 2	Examples reversed? Should not Longitude be W120 58.292 and Latitude be N41 25.117?

5. Meter Data

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	2.4.4	Timing unclear for Meter Installation and Remote On Demand Meter Read Request. We request clarification on the obligation as this is currently vague, and we believe that guidance around timing is required rather than leaving the timing to participants.
	2.2.6	Clarification of why this transaction is required, including its use and purpose. Are there limits on date range / data points requested
	2.2.4	Mixed use of "Initiator", "Recipient" with "participant", needs to be consistent.
	3.1	We request NMI checksum should be mandatory
	3.8	TBC on table – these need to be defined
	2.3 (figure 3)	No readable

	2.4.4	The operation of the remote on demand meter read relying on agreed timings between initiator and recipient is impractical. A recipient (LNSP as default MC/MDP) in the first instance will need to have agreements with approximately 30 retailers. In Vic for sites that are remotely read this should be a transaction that can be responded to within one business day and that should be the overarching timeframe. For all non-remotely read sites this should be managed via SR SO.
	2.5.1(b)	This clause does not seem to make sense. Is it not the role of the Recipient to determine that the Initiator has the appropriate role in determining whether to reject or not? The initiator should not initiate any transaction if they are not allocated a role for that transaction
	2.5.6(c)	The requirement that the Recipient “must” send a MeterDataNotification should be amended to state where a remote read is possible and available (in an viable timeframe to meet the request)
	2.5.6(d)	The requirement that the Recipient “must” send a MeterDataNotification that is current as at the date and time of the response, should be modified to reflect the real world situations that may delay the response or reflect the fact that there may be data from the day before but due to congestion in the comms network current data is not available on the day of request. Should the transaction just be rejected by the Recipient or should a reasonable attempt be made to provide data from the previous day?

		Also in the case of a RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest is issued rather than a PMD, does the RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest response need to be validated data? If not then there may be opportunities for streamlined automation and faster responses.
	3.4	<i>Special notes field</i> should not be included in this transaction as it adds an operational overhead to an interaction that should be fully automated.

6. OWN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		No comments at this time

7. RoLR Part B

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		No comments at this time

8. Glossary and Framework

Clause	Heading	Comments
		No comments at this time