

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 – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: TasNetworks

Completion Date: 6 July 2021

Table of Contents

0.	Example Submission (Please delete this section).....	3
1.	Issues Paper Questions.....	4
2.	Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process	8
3.	Service Order Process.....	8
4.	Technical Delivery Specification	9
5.	B2B Guide	9
6.	Technical Delivery Specification	Error! Bookmark not defined.

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
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 1: Do you support the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes, TasNetworks supports this change.
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 2: If the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No, it makes sense to align this with the MSDR changes.
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes, TasNetworks supports this change, although Section Number and Delivery Point (DP) Number is not used in Tasmania.
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 4: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 5: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Person Name fields? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Other. Whilst TasNetworks considers there may be benefit in bringing the use of the PersonName fields in line with the current Australian Standard, this may impose a reasonable cost individually and as a collective across industry participants to implement changes if required to their respective systems. We would therefore question the cost of facilitating such a change without some analysis of the true benefit this will provide. Is there ability to consider deferring this change until a point in time when there may be other B2B changes required that provide more broader customer or industry benefit?
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 6: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	Yes, as noted by response in question 5.
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 7: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Coincident Service Order Logic for non-regulated businesses? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes, TasNetworks supports this change.
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 8: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No.

Topic	Question	Comments
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 9: Do you support the inclusion of the process flow with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	No. TasNetworks does not see any benefit of including the suggested process flow. There is no context or explanation that supports the diagram. Participants should have existing processes to manage unauthorised connections as this is not new, and the process for managing such instances may be individual to each participant based on their own internal process.
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 10: If the process flow proposed in this document with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process is included in the B2B Guide, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	Yes, as per response to question 9, TasNetworks does not support the inclusion of the proposed process flow.
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 11: Are there better options to accommodate the proposed change that better achieve the stated objectives? What are the related pros and cons? How would they be implemented?	
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 12: What are the main challenges in adopting these proposed changes? How should these challenges be addressed?	
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 13: What are the costs and/ or benefits if the proposed changes were not made? Consider the perspectives of process, training, system and customer impacts.	

Topic	Question	Comments
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 14: 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.	

2. Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

3. Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

4. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

5. B2B Guide

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Section 8 – Appendix 1		The paragraph that appears below the table should refer to the SO field as “FormReference”, not “FormDocumentReference” or “FormDocument”.