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: Jemena

Completion Date: 11th 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 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?	Jemena's option is for Option 1a. Jemena believes that this provides the relevant notifications whilst being a lower cost solution. Jemena expects the number of NP transactions to increase due to the mandatory nature of the transaction.
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.	Jemena's system already processes notified party transactions. No incremental cost as solution already in place.
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?	Jemena's solution is automated to an extent based on the scenarios/timings of the re-en service order being received. Those de-en transactions which has not been issued to the field when re-en service order is received, will be automatically closed – not complete. De-en transactions which have been issued to the field at the time of the receipt of the re-en servie order will be managed manually and a decision made on closure/completion of the de-en. Jemena considers this to be the more holistic solution which will lead to the better customer experience.

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)?	See response above (question 3).
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?	Not known to Jemena.
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")	Jemena does not support the proposed change. The volumes are expected to be low and can be managed via email. The proposed solution would be cost prohibitive.
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?	Jemena does not support the proposed change.

Topic	Question	Comments
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.	Jemena does not have any other comments/questions at this point of the 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