

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: SA Power Networks

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 10
- 3. Service Order Process – Option 1b..... 10
- 4. One Way Notification 11
- 5. Technical Delivery Specification 11
- 6. B2B Guide – Option 1a 12
- 7. B2B Guide – Option 1b 13

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 an 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
-------	----------	----------

<p>2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders</p>	<p>Question 1: What is your preferred solution, Option 1a or Option 1b, and why?</p>	<p>SA Power Networks preferred option is 1b.</p> <p>Following considerable review of both options, we believe that option 1b is less likely to leave customers without supply and is the better solution option for customers.</p> <p>We believe the 2 options should be viewed the following way –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1a - the customer needing to do additional work to make life easy for industry. • Option 1b - the industry doing as much work as possible to make life easy for the customer. <p>During significant industry debate regarding the commencement of Remote Disconnection and Reconnection services, protecting the customer from being left without supply was agreed by all market segments as the key issue and driver for considering changes to current B2B Procedures.</p> <p>We acknowledge that both options do not fully resolve this issue, however, our assessment is that the gaps that remain in option 1a are larger than 1b.</p> <p>If option 1a was chosen to proceed, the available process to resolve the gap (where disconnection can still occur due to the timing of receiving and processing the Notified Party Transaction) will result in confusion, given it requires customers to identify that they have no supply (after following a process to engage with their chosen Retailer to request supply) and requires the customer to determine how and where they go to resolve this issue.</p> <p>SA Power Network have no doubt that this customer confusion will result in a significant increase in interactions that we will receive from customers and retailers, it will increase our complaint management activities and ultimately result in customer (and their advocates) frustration with the industry where excessive delays are experienced by customers when trying to resolve why they are without supply.</p>
--	--	--

Topic	Question	Comments
		<p>The industry experienced the outcomes of process confusion related to connection work at the commencement of Metering Contestability and we wish to make the IEC aware that a decision to proceed with option 1a has the likelihood of a similar outcome.</p>
<p>2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>SA Power Networks has not implemented either of the proposed options, however, option 1b is closer to current service order management practices and requires less modification compared to 1a – both options are complex and require significant system change investment.</p>
<p>2.1 Enhanced Coincident Service Order Logic using Single Notified Party or Two Service Orders</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>As stated in SA Power Networks response to Q1, we have no doubt that option 1b provides the best protections for customers.</p> <p>We do not believe that option 1a provides adequate customer protections and should not proceed as the chosen option.</p>

Topic	Question	Comments
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)?	<p>Providing an accurate response to this question is difficult because there are several scenarios and factors that are likely to impact on the timeframe.</p> <p>SA Power Networks view is that option 1a has the most potential (given the concerns raised in Q1) to result in customers being left off supply and that it would be less likely to occur in option 1b (however, still possible).</p> <p>SA Power Networks would hope that issues could be resolved quickly, however, a customer being off supply for greater than 1 day could be possible. This timeframe would be dependent on the time of day the issue of no supply is discovered by the customer and the effectiveness of the Retailer's resolution processes. Delays of this nature are not acceptable or meet customer expectations.</p>
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?	<p>SA Power Networks would see that May 2023 is the earliest possible timeframe that implementation could occur, given the current committed industry roadmap of changes and the significant work required to implement this current consultation package of work.</p> <p>However, SA Power Networks support of May 2023 is subject to the IEC ensuring that no further B2B changes are allowed to occur prior to or in addition to the work required resulting from this consultation.</p> <p>Adding any additional B2B changes would remove our support of this timeframe and likely result in needed a later effective date.</p>

Topic	Question	Comments
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”)	Yes – SA Power Networks supports the proposed changes.
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?	<p>As per answer to Q5 –</p> <p>SA Power Networks would see that May 2023 is the earliest possible timeframe that implementation could occur, given the current committed industry roadmap of changes and the significant work required to implement this current consultation package of work.</p> <p>However, SA Power Networks support of May 2023 is subject to the IEC ensuring that no further B2B changes are allowed to occur prior to or in addition to the work required resulting from this consultation.</p> <p>Adding any additional B2B changes would remove our support of this timeframe.</p>
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.	No further comments.

2. Service Order Process – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		SA Power Networks has no comments

3. Service Order Process – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		SA Power Networks has no comments

4. One Way Notification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	4.2.6 – Table 11	SA Power Networks suggest the “Date” field within the transaction be removed. We are unclear what value this adds to the process or how this information is to be used by the Distributor. If the field is to remain, clarification is needed.

5. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		SA Power Networks has no comments

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

6. B2B Guide – Option 1a

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	6.7	<p>SA Power Networks suggest the inclusion of email within this clause be removed.</p> <p>If a party determines that building capability to generate the new OWN transaction within their systems is not warranted, then that party has the option to raise the relevant transaction via the B2B Browser and this should be the only option available.</p> <p>Email should only be used during the current transition period and stop from the effective date of the OWN Procedure and this new transaction.</p> <p>Please remove all references to email.</p>
	6.7	<p>SA Power Network is unclear where the industry has documented the current Shared Fuse file format and process that is being used for the transition period.</p> <p>Could this be clarified to ensure the format of any files being provided is consistent.</p>

7. B2B Guide – Option 1b

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	6.7	<p>SA Power Networks is confused by the inclusion of email within this clause.</p> <p>Providing a participant with the option to provide this content via email should not be possible (apart from during the current transition period which will continue until the effective date of this procedure and transaction).</p> <p>If a party determines that building capability within their systems is not warranted, then that party has the option to raise the relevant transaction via the B2B Browser and this should be the only option available.</p> <p>Please remove all references to email in this context.</p>
	6.7	<p>SA Power Network is unclear where the industry has documented the current Shared Fuse file format and process being used for the transition period.</p> <p>Could this be clarified to ensure the format of any files being provided is consistent (consistency with the 2 Meter Providers currently provide files should occur).</p>