# 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**: AusNet

**Completion Date**: 11 April 2022

# Table of Contents

## 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<br><br>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<br><br>"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.<br><br>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 |
|---|---|---|
| 2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders | Question 1: What is your preferred solution, Option 1a or Option 1b, and why? | AusNet prefers Option 1b on the basis that it is a fully effective that requires no system alterations to implement.  For those meters that are not VicAMI meters, our systems would know whether we have registered the site as manually de-energised or not and respond properly.  There are no DNSP system changes and the solution is 100% effective.<br><br>If option 1a were implemented for large Type 4 sites, many of which cannot be de-energised remotely (as they are CT connected), we would have to make extensive system changes to deliver any of the benefits to customers of avoiding wasted truck visits or shorter outages.  Due to the small volume of Type 4 metering without CTs, the business case for making the change would not be approved and current problems would remain.  To be clear, the system changes would include interface changes to the systems our call centre staff use on a day to day basis.  These staff are not accustomed to looking at incoming service orders, and could probably determine what to do by listening to the customer say "the retailer said the contestable metering provider would remotely re-energise the site". |

| Topic | Question | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders | 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. | AusNet has not implemented the Option 1a notified service order checking logic for those rare few service orders sent to remotely enabled type 4 meters (without CTs). Also we manage service orders with different staff to our call centres and the system changes to present notified party service orders would be exensive. We have not implemented these changes. The incremental cost for implementing both changes would not be financially justified by customer benefits and wasted truck savings.<br><br>Option 1b has no implementation costs for AusNet. Also all co-incident service order logic to identify pairs of re-energisation and de-energisations by different retailers has already been built. |
| 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? | Option 1b provides 100% coverage of as we know if we have pulled the fuse or not and always update our systems with that information. The co-incendent service order logic is already in effect and is working robustly.<br><br>Option 1a would require additional training of DNSP call centre staff who already required to know an extensive set of information including major storm response advice, planned outages, landholders enquires regarding our access to their property, and metering. It is unlikely that they will reliabily and correctly check the notified party service order. Therefore, option 1a is less than 100% effective. |
| 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)? | As discussed above, option 1b is 100% effective and option 1a is not 100%. Given volumes of non CT connected Type 4 meters are very small in Vic, the aggregate impact to customers is very small, hence the business case for making option 1a system changes would not be justified. If an issue with option 1a occurred the customer may be de-energised for 1 more day, until the customer calls us or the retailer to initiate the manual service order. |

| 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? | AusNet would be able implement minimum compliance changes by May 2023. This may mean only addressing schema changes and not changing the secondary interfaces needed to make option 1a fully effective. |
| 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") | No, AusNet's network has very few shared fuse situations would prefer receiving emails if the rare shared fuse were identified.  Shared fuse arrangements are not consistent with our Service and Installation Rules and have not been allowed for 2 decades.  Over our AMI metering installation program many shared fuse situations were removed. |
| 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? | Yes, would be able implement minimum compliance changes by May 2023. |
| 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. | None |

## 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 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |