B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (version change)
- Service Order
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification
- Technical Delivery Specification

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: AusNet Services

Completion Date: 13th January 2019

Table of Contents

1. Service Order Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
AusNet Services	2.2.1	2.2.1	**Table 3 Service Order Types and Subtypes** As the additional text for NSW pertains to MSATS Standing Data activities only, can this text be moved underneath the text for the other jurisdictions where the physical process is impacted?
AusNet Services	4.1	4.1	**Table 13 Transaction table** New Field: *CustomerNotificationMethod* Suggest this field be made enumerated for data consistency. The current format of 'VARCHAR (40)' suggests the field is free text which makes automation impossible.
AusNet Services	4.1	4.1	**Table 13 Transaction table** New Field: *CustomerNotificationMethod* Why do 'Post' and 'Email' only have separate Fields and not also 'SMS' and 'Phone'? Re-iterating the telephone/SMS information would be just as useful as Address and Email.
AusNet Services	4.1	4.1	**Table 13 Transaction table** New Field: *CustomerNotificationAddress* Suggest this field be made mandatory where 'Post' has been selected for 'CustomerNotificationMethod'.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
AusNet Services	4.1	4.1	**Table 13 Transaction table** New Field: *CustomerNotificationEmail* Suggest this field be made mandatory where 'E-mail' has been selected for 'CustomerNotificationMethod'.
AusNet Services	4.1	4.1	**Table 13 Transaction table** New Field: *Escalation* AusNet Services do not support the introduction of this field for the following reasons; 1) The field has the potential to be misused by initiating parties to escalate work that is not critical or to meet their SLA's without considering the impact on the downstream processes. 2) There is no way for the recipient to validate whether the escalation is appropriate or not. 3) Where the escalation is not accepted by the recipient, how will this be communicated to the initiator if the transaction cannot be rejected? E.g. An initiator has included an escalation of 'VIP' but the recipient has chosen to ignore the escalation as there is no agreement and has scheduled the work as per their standard SLA but cannot formally communicate this to the initiator (unless via email). This places an expectation from the initiator (and the customer) on the recipient to complete the work sooner than expected, without the recipient's agreement. This field seems to transfer the obligation of managing customer expectations from the initiator onto the recipient unjustly.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
AusNet Services	4.1	4.1	**Table 13 Transaction table** Updated Definition for '*CustomerType*' field: 'NCONUML' AusNet Services supports this change.

2.   Response to Questions raised in the Consultation Issues Paper

Question no.	Question	AusNet Services Response
Question 1:	Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.1? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")	Yes. AusNet Services, in principle, supports the addition of these fields; however, enumeration and additional validation would be required to be able to continue the automated processing of these Service order types. Further information can be found in AusNet's feedback to the specific procedure.
Question 2:	Are there additional enumerated fields whose addition to the Metering Service Works SO the IEC should consider? Please detail them.	Suggest adding the additional communication methods for 'CustomerNotificationMethod' fields. Further information can be found in AusNet's feedback to the specific procedure.
Question 3:	Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2?	Yes. However, the hierarchy of rules needs to be considered. Further information can be found in AusNet's feedback to the specific procedure.

	(Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No" / "Other – provide reason")	
Question 4:	Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.3? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")	Yes.
Question 5:	Given that the MFIN, which is XML-based, can be used for the same purpose as the MXN and avoids the issue related to partial acceptance of the MXN, do participants support the continued usage of the CSV-based MXN?	No comment.
Question 6:	If the MXN were to be retired, would your organisation prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as presented above?	No comment.
Question 7:	If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it?	No comment.
Question 8:	Will a 10 MB maximum file size for MTRD transactions cause substantial problems for your organisation?	No.
Question 9:	Does limiting the number of transactions within the MTRD group mitigate the potential problems caused by an increased maximum file size	AusNet Services would like to know how the count of transactions is expected to be calculated, i.e. based on the number of 200 records in a file?

Question 10:	Is the volume limit of 1000 transactions per file appropriate for the PMD and VMD transactions?	Yes.
Question 11:	Does your organisation have any concerns about the cost or business risk associated with the above changes? If so, please specify which change in particular concerns your organisation and why.	No.
Question 12:	If your organisation raised concerns in the above question, what alternative less-costly solutions might meet the requirements for the changes outlined in section 5?	N/A
Question 13:	If one or more of the changes proposed in this document were to be adopted, would your organisation prefer an implementation date of 2 December 2020 or November 2021?	AusNet Services would prefer an implementation of November 2021.
Question 14:	Do you see value in the development of new Verify Standing Data Transactions?	No.
Question 15:	If "No": Please provide reasons why you do not see value in the development of a new Verify Standing Data transaction.	AusNet Services does not support the development of the Verify Standing Data Transaction without proper impact analysis being performed. What types of standing data would be queried? What are the expected volumes? What are the SLA's? Verification of standing would require manual investigation and possible field visits, which would increase operational costs and result in higher bills for customers. Respondents may charge requesters field visit fees. We request a cost/benefit analysis across the industry been performed.

Question 16:	If "Yes": What areas of Standing Data are causing you issues today (please list individually)?	AusNet Services is experiencing issues with unstructured addresses – however this should be resolved as part of the MSDR consultation.
Question 17:	Who is involved in the interactions to resolve the issue (e.g. Retailer to Distributor – please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?	No comment.
Question 18:	What are the volumes of each type of Standing Data item (please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?	No comment.
Question 19:	To resolve the issue, is there a need for multiple interactions between parties to gain a full understanding of the issue and agree the resolution (please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?	No comment.
Question 20:	If pursued, which B2B Procedure should these new transactions be included within?	No comment.
Question 21:	Do you have any further information/thoughts that would be relevant to this topic (please provide)?	No comment.