

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: United Energy

Completion Date: 23rd December 2019

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... 3
- 1. Service Order Process..... 4
- 2. One Way Notification Process..... 5
- 3. Technical Delivery Specification 6

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):

| Participant Name | 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. Service Order Process

| Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

2. One Way Notification Process

| Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

3. Technical Delivery Specification

| Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Issues Paper Questions

Metering Service Works (5.1.1)

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”) **Other – not applicable to Victorian DBs**

Question 2: Are there additional enumerated fields whose addition to the Metering Service Works SO the IEC should consider? Please detail them.

Supply Abolishment (5.1.2)

Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No” / “Other – provide reason”) **Other – not applicable to Victorian DBs**

Allocate NMI (5.1.3)

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**

One Way Notification changes (5.2)

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, no longer required for Vic DBs**

Question 6: If the MXN were to be retired, would your organisation prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as presented above? **Option 1**

Question 7: If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it? **At the same time as implementing this package of changes**

Increase to transaction size limit for Meter Data (5.3)

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? **Yes**

Question 10: Is the volume limit of 1000 transactions per file appropriate for the PMD and VMD transactions? **Yes**

Costs (5.7)

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?

Consultation timeframes (6.1)

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?

United Energy strongly recommends a later than November 2021, ideally after February 2022, timeframe for introduction of these changes. Key reasons behind this position include:

- There are many industry changes (including the 5MS & GS program) that need to be implemented over the next 18 - 24 months, adding this package of changes, increases complexity and risk as these changes have a proposed earlier go live date.
- The proposed B2B changes to NCONUML do not take effect till July 2021 so it would be more logical to introduce this package of changes after then.

New Verify Standing Data Transaction (6.1)

Question 14: Do you see value in the development of new Verify Standing Data Transactions?

If “No”: **No at this stage**

Question 15: Please provide reasons why you do not see value in the development of a new Verify Standing Data transaction.

Key reasons for this position include:

- We don't believe the timing is right and would rather the NMI Standing Data review takes place first, followed up by implementation of associated changes.
- Following the introduction of these changes, we would then support a review into whether a Verify Standing Data transaction was required.

- The design would also need to cater for the many possible permutations to reduce follow up emails if the appropriate response is not received.

If “Yes”:

Question 16: What areas of Standing Data are causing you issues today (please list individually)?

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)?

Question 18: What are the volumes of each type of Standing Data item (please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?

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)?

Question 20: If pursued, which B2B Procedure should these new transactions be included within?

Question 21: Do you have any further information/thoughts that would be relevant to this topic (please provide)?