#### **B2B** Procedures

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

**CONSULTATION – Second Stage** 

# CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: PLUS ES

Completion Date: 17/08/2021

### **Table of Contents**

1.	Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process	3
2.	Service Order Process	4
3.	Technical Delivery Specification	5
4	R2R Guide	5

#### 1. Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		n/a

PLUS ES Response Pack
Page 3 of 6

#### 2. Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	2.18 (d)	PLUS ES supports the objective of what this clause is seeking to achieve however objects to the wording of the clause and the restrictions it imposes on a contestable MPB.
		The majority of the contestable MPB's metering is remote enabled. Remote connectivity implies the ability to enable a change in the energisation status without visiting the metering installation and could be accomplished almost near real time. A contestable MPB may also have some non-remote enabled metering installations but this volume is very minute. i.e MRAM metering.
		It is not equitable to place a generic obligation on the contestable MPB, which has been defined by the practices of regulated businesses, as their operational models are different.
		Referencing the above PLUS ES proposes that the clause is amended to:
		<ul> <li>Allow the contestable MPB the flexibility to action the Service Orders in accordance to their processes, capabilities, and bilateral agreements with the requesting party, whilst mitigating the customer being left off supply or</li> <li>Alternatively, the clause is divided into 2 separate clauses: one for energisation effected via remote services and one where the action requires a physical site visit, i.e. MRAM metering.</li> </ul>
		For example, a Re-en SO has been received on a Monday for the Friday of that week and within the same day a De-en SO is received to be actioned on the Tuesday of that same week. The metering installation is remote enabled. There is no reason why the contestable MPB should have a regulated process to cancel the De-en SO. They should have the option to action and complete the SO appropriately and then continue to action the Re-en SO for Friday. This is one of the benefits remote enabled metering can deliver.

PLUS ES Response Pack
Page 4 of 6

## 3. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		n/a

#### 4. B2B Guide

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	6.1.5	PLUS ES proposes a review of how the intent of this section is defined.
		Either the word 'Unauthorised' needs to be replaced or the definition of 'Unauthorised connection' needs to be defined concisely and accurately.
		For example, the below wording imply that the connection is unauthorised which is not accurate.
		Where this has been done by a party other than the network (unauthorised), or by the network and this has not been recorded, the status in MSATs will indicate that the NMI is still de-energised.
		An ASP could re-energise the NMI - authorised party, requested by the customer hence, authorised connection. Also, the Network not updating the NMI status to A after re-energisation does not categorise the re-energisation as unauthorised.

PLUS ES Response Pack
Page 5 of 6

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	6.1.5 – Process flow	<ul> <li>PLUS ES suggests the following:         <ul> <li>The pre cursor/trigger should be NMI status = D and actual meter data is received by Participants.</li> <li>The following step by the Retailer is to "Determine if Energisation was Unauthorised" and they cannot do that without trying to engage the customer and/or DB. i.e.:</li></ul></li></ul>

PLUS ES Response Pack
Page 6 of 6