

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: CitiPower Powercor

Completion Date: 11 April 2022

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... 3
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 4
- 2. Service Order Process – Option 1a 6
- 3. Service Order Process – Option 1b..... 6
- 4. One Way Notification 7
- 5. Technical Delivery Specification 7
- 6. B2B Guide – Option 1a 8
- 7. B2B Guide – Option 1b 8

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. 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?	CitiPower Powercor preference is for Option 1a as this option provides greater visibility of both de-energisation and re-energisation requests. As the distributor and meter provider will have visibility of the de-energisation request, this should lead to efficiencies in the re-energisation process as both parties will have visibility as to how a site has been de-energised.
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.	
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?	The CitiPower Powercor process for coincidental orders is manual, where all instances of coincidental service orders are reviewed and a decision is made about how each is to be actioned. This leads to good customer outcomes as service orders are actioned in a considered manner.
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)?	See response to 2.1.

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?	
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”)	CitiPower Powercor does not support the proposed change as we typically receive 1-2 shared fuse related requests per year. This extremely low volume of requests does not justify building a new B2B transaction. We believe the current process, where the retailer emails the distributor should be enhanced, i.e. a standardised email template to be used.
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?	CitiPower Powercor does not support the proposed change as the cost to implement would far outweigh the extremely low number of requests received by our business.
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.	CitiPower Powercor does not have any other feedback regarding this consultation.

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