

B2B Procedures

- RoLR Procedures Part B

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Vector Metering

Completion Date: 31/03/2023

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section) 3
- 1. Issues Paper Questions..... 4

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 Update of 'Table 102 A: Customer and Site Details to Provide to RoLR'	Question 1: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to RoLR Procedures table 102-A? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")	-

<p>2.2 Update of in-text referencing errors and obligations in section 104.4 and 104.5 of the RoLR procedure</p>	<p>Question 2: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to RoLR Procedures table section 104.4? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)</p>	<p>104.1 Says this. This needs to be expanded if MC, MP,MDP are to be included.</p> <p>104.1. Application</p> <p>Clause 104 applies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Suspended Retailer. (b) LNSP. (c) RoLR that becomes the retailer for RoLR Event Affected NMIs where the Suspended Retailer was the FRMP. <p>-----</p> <p>104.4 current wording “Each LNSP (and/or MC, MP, MDP and other relevant participants, as appropriate) must:” needs to be more specific. It is unclear who the ‘other relevant participants’ maybe. Are this participants bound by B2B requirements? Recommend the removal of ‘and other relevant participants’ unless they can be specified.</p> <p>104.4 (b) should be reworded to reflect the correct rejection code to be used. Unclear which one is required. Options are 1945 or 2007 or 1957.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 879 2047 1254"> <tr> <td>Initiator Is Not Permitted To Raise This Service Order Type.</td> <td>No</td> <td>Error</td> <td>1945</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service Not Provided.</td> <td>No</td> <td>Error</td> <td>2000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No Contract for service.</td> <td>No</td> <td>Error</td> <td>2007</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service Order Sub Type.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Request falls outside the Recipient's regulatory obligations.</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Error</td> <td>1957</td> </tr> </table>	Initiator Is Not Permitted To Raise This Service Order Type.	No	Error	1945	Service Not Provided.	No	Error	2000	No Contract for service.	No	Error	2007	Service Order Sub Type.				The Request falls outside the Recipient's regulatory obligations.	Yes	Error	1957
Initiator Is Not Permitted To Raise This Service Order Type.	No	Error	1945																			
Service Not Provided.	No	Error	2000																			
No Contract for service.	No	Error	2007																			
Service Order Sub Type.																						
The Request falls outside the Recipient's regulatory obligations.	Yes	Error	1957																			

Topic	Question	Comments
		<p>104.4 (c). This process requires on AEMO producing a NMI list of “ROLR Event Affected NMI’s” and this will be provided up to 2 business days after the ROLR has been declared. Customers for the failed retailers will still be deenergised until the list is provided, and then these obligation will only be effective for 1 day as it is expected AEMO will change the FRMP by the 3rd business day. CL 104.6(e) says obligations under 104.4(c) must be completed by the end of the next business day. This obligation in effect only stop schedule DNP’s for one day, after which all Remote DEENS (include DNP’s) will automatically be cancelled as the FRMP will have changed in the market. We question the benefit of this obligation for remote services.</p> <p>104.4 (c). Text should be reworded to include other service providers. Should read “except where the Recipient considers the work requested is unable to be cancelled”. It is expected that most of the processes related to Cancelling DNP Deenergisations will involve manual steps. Therefore there will be some lag between being advised of the ROLR NMI List and cancelling scheduled jobs. If a DNP was scheduled to occur it may still happen until the MP gets to it and cancels it.</p>
2.2 Update of in-text referencing errors and obligations in section 104.4 and 104.5 of the RoLR procedure	<p>Question 3: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to RoLR Procedures table section 104.5?</p> <p>(Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)</p>	Yes
General	<p>Question 4: If the changes proposed were to be expedited, would your organisation have any issues in implementing the changes by 15 May 2023?</p>	We are ok with this date.

Topic	Question	Comments
General	<p>Question 5: 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.</p>	<p>Clause 104 in its entirety needs review to consider the implications for remote services (remote REEN/DEEN). It may no longer be relevant for these transactions.</p> <p>AEMO also needs to clarify if a failed retailer can still issue B2B SOR after being suspended in the market. If a failed retailer cannot issue B2B SOR then a number of these obligations are redundant because Service Providers will not be able to receive a B2B transaction.</p>