



**Information Exchange Committee**  
C/ - IEC Secretariat – AEMO Ltd

Level 22

530 Collins Street

Melbourne VIC 3000

Tel: (03) 9609 8000

Fax: (03) 9609 8080

# B2B Procedures Change Pack

*Prepared by: Information Exchange Committee*

*Version No: 1.0*

*Date: 29 November 2019*

## Table of Contents

<b>1. NOTICE OF CONSULTATION</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 B2B PROCEDURE CHANGES	2
1.2 MATTER UNDER CONSULTATION	2
1.3 THE CONSULTATION PROCESS	2
1.4 INVITATION TO MAKE SUBMISSIONS	3
1.5 MEETINGS	3
1.6 CLOSING DATE AND TIME	3
1.7 PUBLICATION	3
<b>2. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. SCOPE / ISSUES STATEMENT</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. CONSULTATION DATE PLAN</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5. ISSUES RAISED FOR CONSULTATION</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1 SERVICE ORDER CHANGES	7
5.1.1 Metering Service Works	7
5.1.2 Supply Abolishment	8
5.1.3 Allocate NMI	9
5.2 ONE WAY NOTIFICATION CHANGES	9
5.3 B2B PRINCIPLES	10
5.4 B2B FACTORS	11
5.5 BENEFITS	12
5.6 COSTS	13
<b>6. OTHER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 CONSULTATION TIMEFRAMES	15
6.2 NEW VERIFY STANDING DATA TRANSACTION	16
<b>7. B2B PROPOSAL</b>	<b>18</b>

## 1. Notice of Consultation

### 1.1 B2B Procedure changes

**Date of Notice:** 29 November 2019

This Notice informs all B2B Parties, relevant B2B Change Parties, AEMO and such other persons who identify themselves to the Information Exchange Committee as interested in the B2B Procedures (**Consulted Persons**) that AEMO is conducting a consultation on B2B Procedures on behalf of the Information Exchange Committee (IEC).

This consultation is being conducted under clause 7.17.4 of the National Electricity Rules (**NER**), in accordance with the Rules consultation requirements detailed in rule 8.9 of the NER.

### 1.2 Matter under consultation

The proposed changes are to:

- Amend the Service Order Process to:
  - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions. Currently this information is being communicated using special instructions in the service order (SO).
  - Add a new enumeration to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a non-contestable unmetered load (NCONUML) can be communicated.
  - Clarify that the Supply Abolishment SO can be used in New South Wales.
- Amend the One Way Notification Process to introduce a new optional field to the Meter Exchange Notification (MXN) and the Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFIN) transaction to link this transaction with the initiating SO.
- Increase the maximum file size and introduce a transaction number limit for the MTRD transaction group.

Instrument	New / Amended
Customer Site Details Notification	Amended (Version control only)
Service Order	Amended (Procedure changes)
Meter Data Process	Amended (Version control only)
One Way Notification	Amended (Procedure changes)
Technical Delivery Specification	Amended (Procedure changes)

### 1.3 The consultation process

The consultation process is outlined below. Dates are indicative only and subject to change.

Process Stage	Indicative Date
Publication of Issues Paper	29 November 2019
Closing date for submissions in response to the Issues Paper	13 January 2020
Publication of Draft Report and Determination	12 February 2020

Closing date for submissions in response to the Draft Report	26 February 2020
Publication of Final Report and Determination	24 March 2020

#### **1.4 Invitation to make submissions**

The IEC invites written submissions on the matter under consultation, including any alternative or additional proposals you consider may better meet the objectives of this consultation and the national electricity objective in section 7 of the National Electricity Law.

Please identify any parts of your submission that you wish to remain confidential and explain why. The IEC may still publish that information if it does not consider it to be confidential but will consult with you before doing so.

Please note that material identified as confidential may be given less weight in the decision-making process than material that is published.

#### **1.5 Meetings**

In your submission, you may request a meeting with the IEC to discuss the matter under consultation, stating why you consider a meeting is necessary or desirable.

If appropriate, meetings may be held jointly with other Consulted Persons. Subject to confidentiality restrictions, the IEC will generally make details of matters discussed at a meeting available to other Consulted Persons and may publish them.

#### **1.6 Closing Date and Time**

Submissions in response to this Notice of Draft Stage of Rules Consultation should be sent by email to [NEM.Retailprocedureconsultations@aemo.com.au](mailto:NEM.Retailprocedureconsultations@aemo.com.au), to reach AEMO by 5.00pm (Melbourne time) on 13 January 2020.

All submissions must be forwarded in electronic format (both pdf and Word). Please send any queries about this consultation to the same email address.

Submissions received after the closing date and time will not be valid, and the IEC is not obliged to consider them. Any late submissions should explain the reason for lateness and the detriment to you if the IEC does not consider your submission.

#### **1.7 Publication**

All submissions will be published on AEMO's website, other than confidential content.

## 2. Background

This document has been prepared to detail proposed amendments to the B2B Procedures, which have been developed under the IEC's power to manage the ongoing development of B2B Procedures as contemplated by National Electricity Rules (NER) clause 7.17.7(a)(2). The information provided meets the requirements for changing the B2B Procedures as detailed in sections 7.17.4 and 8.9 of the National Electricity Rules.

This document also provides information considered by the IEC in determining if a prima facie case exists for amending the B2B Procedures, namely:

- An issues statement (see section 3).
- A summary of changes to the B2B Procedures, including consideration of the B2B Principles (see sections 3 and 5).
- An impact statement, including consideration of the B2B factors (see section 5).

The proposed changes have been considered and recommended by the IEC's Business-to-Business Working Group (B2B-WG).

The impacted Procedures are the:

- B2B Procedure: One Way Notification Process v3.4.
- B2B Procedure: Service Order Process v3.4.
- B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification v3.4.

### 3. Scope / Issues Statement

The IEC has developed the changes in this document to improve the functionality of existing B2B transactions and to incorporate routine communication between electricity retail market participants into B2B transactions. These changes were recommended to the IEC by the B2B-WG on behalf of industry.

The members of the B2B-WG are:

<b>Retailers</b>	<b>Distributors</b>	<b>Metering</b>
AGL	AusNet Services	IntelliHUB
Alinta Energy	Energy Queensland	PlusES
Origin Energy	Endeavour Energy	Vector AMS
Red Energy and Lumo Energy	SA Power Networks	
Simply Energy	TasNetworks	

This document lists the proposed changes to the B2B Procedures as developed, discussed, and primarily agreed through the IEC’s consultation with the B2B-WG. The proposed changes under the B2B consultation have an effective date of 2 December 2020.

In summary, the proposed changes are:

- To amend the Service Order Process to:
  - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions. Currently this information is being communicated using special instructions in the SO.
  - Add a new enumeration to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML can be communicated.
  - Clarify that the Supply Abolishment SO can be used in New South Wales.
- To amend the One Way Notification Process to introduce a new optional field to the MXN and the MFIN transactions to link this transaction with the initiating SO.
- Increase the maximum file size and introduce a transaction number limit for the MTRD transaction group.

Detailed amendments are shown in the draft B2B Procedures published with this report.

#### 4. Consultation Date Plan

The following table details the proposed consultation date plan:

Action	Start Date	End Date
IEC to issue notice of consultation for publication by AEMO	29 November 2019	
Participant submissions to be provided to AEMO	29 November 2019	13 January 2020
Submission receipt date	13 January 2020	
IEC to consider all valid submissions and prepare the Draft Determination consultation pack, which change-marked procedures	13 January 2020	12 February 2020
AEMO to publish Draft Determination consultation (incl. change marked B2B Procedures)	12 February 2020	
Participant submissions to Draft Determination to be provided to AEMO	12 February 2020	26 February 2020
Submission receipt date	26 February 2020	
IEC to consider all valid submissions and prepare the Final Determination report. This includes the change marked procedures	26 February 2020	11 March 2020
AEMO to publish B2B v3.4 Final Determination	11 March 2020	
B2B Procedures v3.4 effective date**	2 December 2020**	

\*\*The IEC is requesting feedback on this effective date; please see section 6.1.

## 5. Issues raised for consultation

The proposed changes directly impact the Service Order Process, the One Way Notification Process, and the Meter Data Process. This impact statement sets out an overview of the likely impacts (including expected benefits and costs) on B2B Parties and AEMO as a result of the proposed amendments to the B2B Procedures.

### 5.1 Service Order changes

#### 5.1.1 Metering Service Works

A recent change in the National Electricity Rules has placed obligations on Retailers to ensure that certain metering works (such as new connections, replacements due to meter fault, and customer-initiated replacements) are carried out in short timeframes.

Experience has shown that additional information is required to be exchanged between the Retailer (Initiator) and their contestable metering service providers (Recipient) to ensure that metering work can progress in an orderly and timely fashion. Using existing B2B transactions, participants are currently required to use inventive ways to convey this information, such as by using the special instructions fields, by repurposing other fields not designed for the conveyance of this information, or by using off-market communications methods (phone calls, emails, and spreadsheets). These approaches typically require additional human resources in both Initiator and Recipient businesses to manually populate and review fields which is time-consuming, error-prone, and introduces significant delay in progressing work requests. The proposed changes are to include the critical identification of this information within formal SO fields to ensure that these requests can be managed, tracked, and audited more efficiently.

The completion of fields in the SO can currently be Mandatory, Required, Optional, or Not Required. As the SO is multi-purpose (i.e. will be sent to both Distributors and contestable Metering Providers), the IEC proposes that the completion of a field can be marked "Agreement Only" (AO) — as opposed to Mandatory, Required, Optional, or Not Required — to indicate that an Initiator must obtain agreement from the Recipient before they populate an 'AO' element in the SO. The B2B-WG does not expect the Retailer to populate the new information when they send an SO to the Distributor (in which instance the fields would be treated as optional).

Participants have indicated that the following types of information are currently being communicated in the SO via alternative methods:

- **Purpose of visit** – The current SO does not contain sufficient detail to clearly articulate the reason for the visit. For example, a Meter Service Works (Exchange Meter) request can be triggered as part of a customer-initiated solar upgrade, as the result of a meter malfunction reported to the Retailer by the network, or as part of a family failure.
- **Regulatory classification** – The current SO does not clearly articulate whether a request is part of a customer-initiated request, a Retailer new deployment, or a metering malfunction. These all have different regulatory timeframes under the Rules and as such have different process and reporting requirements.
- **Customer-agreed date** – The current SO does not clearly articulate whether the customer has already agreed to a fixed date or date window for the service to be performed. Understanding this impacts process and reporting requirements for metering businesses.
- **Customer notification method** – where a formal notification of a supply interruption to the customer is required, the lead time for delivering this notice differs based on the method of delivery. This impacts a service provider's scheduling processes — e.g. a customer who receives their notice via postal services requires scheduling in a shorter timeframe to allow

for physical delivery of the letter, whereas a customer receiving notification via digital methods has a longer timeframe before scheduling must occur. An enumerated value(s) will identify the contact method.

- **Customer notification address** (postal or email) – In circumstances where the Retailer has made arrangements for the service provider to generate a Retailer planned interruption notice to the customer on the Retailer’s behalf, the current SO request does not allow for a Retailer to provide the details of the customers contact details, such as the phone number or e-mail address. Specific fields in the SO for this information will allow for better automation.
- **Escalation indicator** – the current SO does not clearly articulate that a SO is to be treated with an agreed level of priority and/or sensitivity over other SOs (e.g. ombudsman, off supply, etc). It is proposed to include a field to designate the level of escalation / urgency.
- **Malfunction exemption details** – the current SO does not allow for details related to AEMO exemptions to be conveyed from the Initiator to the service provider. Understanding the details of any exemption period informs the metering service provider which timeframes apply and allows for appropriate scheduling. It is proposed to include fields to allow the exemption code allocated by AEMO and the end date by which the malfunction must be remedied.

To address these issues, additional fields with enumerated lists are proposed to be added to the relevant SO.

**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”)

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

### 5.1.2 Supply Abolishment

In NSW the field work to abolish supply to a connection point is performed by an Accredited Service Provider (ASP) rather than the Local Network Service Provider (LNSP). This means that a customer engages the ASP directly and the LNSP is not involved in the field work.

For the LNSP to make the NMI extinct in MSATS where a Type 1–4A meter is installed, they require confirmation from the Metering Provider (MP) that the metering installation is no longer installed and has been removed from site. MPs regularly identify supply abolishment when they investigate communications failures of their metering installations. The MP would notify the Retailer who would then request the LNSP to make the NMI extinct in MSATS.

Currently the Retailer request to make the NMI extinct is performed via email, or alternately the MP sends a Notice of Metering Works (NOMW) - Meter Removed transaction to the LNSP (although not all MPs submit a NOMW if they did not perform the meter removal work). Over 6,000 NMI extinctions occurred in NSW in 2018; as such, participants have expressed a desire for this communication to be done via B2B transactions.

The proposed change clarifies that the Supply Abolishment SO can be used in NSW, with the difference that—unlike in other jurisdictions—the use of this SO in NSW will not result in any field work by the LNSP, as the field work will continue to be performed by an ASP. Instead, Retailers will use the Supply Abolishment SO in NSW to request only that the LNSP make the NMI extinct in MSATS.

**Question 3:** Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No” / “Other – provide reason”)

### 5.1.3 Allocate NMI

The Allocate NMI is a B2B SO that is used when a Retailer wants a site to be registered in MSATS. Usually the Initiator of the Allocate NMI is a Retailer and the Recipient is the LNSP. The LNSP would usually perform a number of validations, such as ensuring the site is not already registered in MSATS and that sufficient addressing information has been provided to identify the site in their Geographic Information System (GIS). If it passes validation then the LNSP must determine the appropriate value for number of the NMI standing data items (such as distribution loss factor, transmission node identifier, NMI classification, and so on), assign a NMI for the site, and assign the Retailer as the FRMP. The NMI would then be published in MSATS.

With the change of the settlements methodology under Global Settlements, there is now a requirement for NCONUML to be registered in MSATS. However, the Allocate NMI SO does not allow an Initiator to indicate that the request is for a NCONUML, which then allows the LNSP to perform the necessary validation and meet their obligation to populate the NMI Classification as defined by the CATS Procedure.

The proposed change is to add the value of “NCONUML” to the CustomerType field so that Initiators can communicate an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML via B2B transactions.

**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”)

## 5.2 One Way Notification changes

The one-way notifications transactions used for informing parties of pending metering works — namely, the MXN and the MFIN — do not currently allow contestable metering service providers to include the SO ID when sending a transaction to Retailers. This makes it onerous for the Retailers to match the request back to the original SO. By including the original SO ID with the scheduling information contained in the MXN and MFIN, the Initiator can more efficiently link the jobs.

- The MFIN is an XML-based transaction that is defined by the aseXML schema. Adding in a new optional field to be included within this transaction will result in a schema change.
- The MXN is a pre-Power of Choice transaction that uses a CSV payload to contain one or more notifications for NMIs that are scheduled for a meter exchange. Fields within this payload are comma-separated into a file-like structure. The MXN was developed to meet the requirements of the Victorian AMI program where Distributors were required to provide notice to Retailers of a pending meter exchange.

While the ability for CSV payloads to carry multiple transactions allows for efficient transport between participants, it also introduces complexity for participant systems in dealing with errors contained within the file — e.g. partial acceptance where one notification is incorrect but the remainder are correct. This is similar to other CSV-based payloads such as MDFF where data can be partially accepted.

**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?

If industry chooses to retire the MXN (CSV) transaction, there are two options:

1. **Retire the MXN as part of the updating of the MFIN.** This would mean that there would be no need for the proposed changes to the MXN.
2. **Give the MXN an extension past this change window.** This could mean either updating or not updating the MXN. If the MXN is to be used on an ongoing basis, the IEC considers that the proposed updates should be made to the MXN. If it is to be retired within 12 months of

the MFIN change, then the benefits will be diluted owing to the shorter timeframe over which they can be realised.

The IEC recommends that the MXN be retired (Option 1) as part of the change but is seeking feedback from participants on this view.

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

**Question 7:** If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it?

### 5.3 Increase to transaction size limit for Meter Data

As part of the implementation of 5 Minute Settlement, meter data files will often contain a larger number of rows—for an interval meter over a day, instead of 48 rows, there will be 288. AEMO has therefore recommended that industry increase the maximum file size of the meter data file from 1 to 10 MB.

The simplest way to do this is to increase the maximum message size for the MTRD transaction group; however, this group includes:

- Meter Data Notification (MDN).
- Provide Meter Data (PMD).
- Verify Meter Data (VMD).

The latter two transactions (PMD and VMD) are quite small, and a significant number of transactions could be sent in a 10 MB file. Initial analysis by some businesses has indicated that such a large number of transactions could impact system processing, leading to degradation of participant services.

The IEC, together with AEMO and on the recommendation of the B2B-WG, has considered the issue and proposes two changes to the B2B Technical Delivery Specification that it believes would address the issue:

1. The MTRD group maximum file size be increased from 1 MB to 10 MB.
2. A limit of 1000 transactions per file be applied to the MTRD group.

The fundamental change to the B2B Technical Specification would be to specify the file size for each transaction group, as shown below:

Transaction Group	Message Size	Transaction Volume Maximum Limit
MTRD	10 MB	1000
SORD	1 MB	N/A
CDN	1 MB	N/A
SITE	1 MB	N/A
OWNX	1 MB	N/A
NPNX	1 MB	N/A

**Question 8:** Will a 10 MB maximum file size for MTRD transactions cause substantial problems for your organisation?

**Question 9:** Does limiting the number of transactions within the MTRD group mitigate the potential problems caused by an increased maximum file size?

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

#### 5.4 B2B Principles

The IEC considers that the B2B Proposal supports each of the B2B Principles as follows:

B2B Principle	Justification
<i>B2B Procedures should provide a uniform approach to B2B Communications in participating jurisdictions.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures are not jurisdiction-specific and therefore do not create any jurisdictional differences.
<i>B2B Procedures should detail operational and procedural matters and technical requirements that result in efficient, effective and reliable B2B Communications.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures improve the communications and operational processes between participants through the development of consistent information exchange.
<i>B2B Procedures should avoid unreasonable discrimination between B2B Parties.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures do not introduce changes that would discriminate between B2B Parties, as the proposed changes are either optional or apply equally across all parties.
<i>B2B Procedures should protect the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures do not introduce changes that would compromise the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information.

#### 5.5 B2B Factors

The IEC, on recommendation from the B2B-WG, has determined that the B2B Factors have been achieved for this B2B Proposal as described below.

B2B Factors	Justification
<p><i>The reasonable costs of compliance by AEMO and B2B Parties with the B2B Procedures compared with the likely benefits from B2B Communications.</i></p>	<p>The proposed changes will require an aseXML schema version change; however, participants who do not intend to use these modified transactions can utilise the <math>n-1</math> functionality which will convert the latest version to one prior version with the effect of insulating the change to those who want it.</p> <p>As with all schema changes, this <math>n-1</math> will only delay the need for a participant to upgrade to the latest schema until the next schema version change is deployed.</p> <p>As such, greater information is needed from industry regarding the cost–benefit ratio of each of the proposed changes.</p>
<p><i>The likely impacts on innovation in and barriers to entry to the markets for services facilitated by advanced meters resulting from changing the existing B2B Procedures.</i></p>	<p>The proposed B2B Procedures do not impose barriers to innovation or market entry; instead, they allow participants to streamline their operations, better meet the recently introduced regulatory metering timeframes, and allow for all relevant information to be contained within the SO structure to allow for a more efficient support process.</p>
<p><i>The implementation timeframe reasonably necessary for AEMO and B2B Parties to implement systems or other changes required to be compliant with any change to existing B2B Procedures.</i></p>	<p>These proposed changes require a new version of the aseXML schema to be generated, which will require a low level of change to participant gateways.</p> <p>AEMO will be required to update the LVI screens to allow the smaller Retailers who to take advantage of these new fields.</p> <p>The timeframe for implementation has balanced the time required for this change and the benefits gained (see below).</p>

## 5.6 Benefits

The B2B Proposal supports the B2B Factors in the following ways:

- Metering Service Works SO changes:** As outlined in section 5.1.1, the proposed Metering Service Works change will minimise the need for manual population and review of the SO’s regulatory requirements. This will enable more efficient SO generation, processing, and scheduling.

This change also provides participants with a more efficient process to track and audit SOs, in particular those participants with regulatory obligations.
- Supply Abolishment SO changes:** The proposed Supply Abolishment change create a clear and auditable process for Retailers requesting that a NMI be made extinct in NSW. This

would result in customers' having their account finalised and their final bill issued much sooner as opposed to continuing to receive estimated bills.

- **Allocate NMI SO changes:** The proposed Allocate NMI change will provide benefits by allowing the use of a B2B transaction to be used for the request of a NMI for non-contestable unmetered loads.
- **One Way Notification changes:** By allowing for the linking of a meter exchange notice (MFIN or MXN) to the originating SO to allow participants to link SOs and responding actions (e.g. interruption dates), allowing for more efficient communications between Retailers and service providers, leading to reduced costs that will ultimately be passed onto customers.
- **MTRD changes:** The proposed changes will ensure that Meter Data Notification files do not now have to be split across several files and will ensure consistency across message size limits between MSATS and B2B Procedures.

## 5.7 Costs

The following proposed changes will require a schema change:

- To amend the Service Order Process to:
  - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions.
  - Add a new value to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML can be communicated.
- To amend the One Way Notification Process to introduce a new optional field to the MXN and the MFIN transaction to link this transaction with the initiating SO.

The B2B e-Hub supports the current schema version and the most recent previous schema version.

If your organisation is currently on schema version r38 (the latest version), it will therefore have the option to upgrade to the version proposed with this change or to stay on r38. If your organisation stays on r38, then it will not receive the benefit that the new schema offers. Your organisation should consider the impact to its business if it decides to stay on r38. Note further that if your organisation remains on r38 then it will need to upgrade at the next schema change.

If your organisation is currently on the previously supported schema version r36, then it must upgrade to r38 or the version proposed with this change.

The following proposed changes will require changes to the Low Volume Interface (LVI):

- To amend the Service Order Process to:
  - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions.
  - Add a new value to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML can be communicated
- To amend the One Way Notification Process to introduce a new optional field to the MXN and the MFIN transaction to link this transaction with the initiating SO.

Participants should consider the impact of the proposed changes, including:

- The costs and resources required to implement the changes and the required ongoing operational cost and resources.
- Participants' ability to implement the changes on the proposed date, considering other known or upcoming industry changes as well as any internal projects.

**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.

**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?

## **5.8 MSATS Procedures**

AEMO has advised that there is no assessed impact to the Market Settlements and Transfers Solution (MSATS) Procedures as a result of this B2B Proposal.

## 6. Other questions

### 6.1 Consultation timeframes

B2B schema releases are normally deployed in May or November, but AEMO is unable to deliver a schema change to B2B systems in November 2020 owing to 5 Minute Settlement resourcing requirements. As such, the proposed implementation date for the changes proposed in this consultation is 2 December 2020.

The IEC is conscious that this consultation is occurring in a changing external regulatory environment, with a number of changes proposed for implementation in the next two years. While the scope and timing of some of these are well known, the timing and impact on B2B processes for other initiatives are less clear. Changes that do not have any direct impact on B2B processes affecting participants' appetite and/or ability to implement new changes. The below table outlines the changes that are currently in the public domain. These changes will not impact all participants equally, with variation by participant category and jurisdictions (in some cases).

Reform	Effective date
Consumer Data Right	TBC, late 2020–sometime 2021
5 Minute Settlement	1 July 2021
Global Settlement	6 February 2022
Default Market Offer 2	1 July 2020
Victorian Default Offer 2	1 January 2020
Family Violence Implementation (VIC)	1 January 2020
Embedded Networks	TBC, 1 July 2021
Customer Switching	TBC, sometime 2020
MSATS Standing Data Review	TBC, consultation commencing mid-Feb 2020
Stand-alone Power Systems	AEMC to commence rule change development in December 2019
Wholesale Demand Response	AEMC Final Determination due in December 2020

As such, the IEC is aware that a later implementation date may be preferable to one on 2 December 2020. The IEC therefore seeks participant feedback on whether November 2021 is a preferable implementation date for participants. Given the number of reforms with an effective date of 1 July 2021, the IEC does not believe that May 2021 will be an acceptable implementation date for B2B system changes, which therefore means that the next available opportunity to deliver a B2B schema change would be November 2021.

**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?

## 6.2 New Verify Standing Data Transaction

The B2B-WG have been considering the introduction of new transactions to support the verification of current MSATS standing data with a data owner (LNSP, Retailer, MDP or MP). This is usually the result of receiving alternate information from another source that may call into question the validity of the MSATS data. Currently these interactions occur outside of formal B2B transactions (generally via email exchange) and rely on manual handling within participant businesses. Initial investigations indicate that queries are at volumes to justify the development of a formal B2B transaction.

If this change was to be pursued, it is proposed that two new transactions would be created:

- **Verify Standing Data Request** – this transaction would be sent in order for the Recipient to verify the standing data in MSATS (and update MSATS where required). This transaction would contain details related to the nature of the request, e.g. tariff mismatch, address updates, NMI abolishment, NMI status mismatch, or meter status mismatch.
- **Verify Standing Data Response** – this transaction would be sent from the Recipient in response to a Verify Standing Data Request and will contain a description of the action taken.

These transactions will not be included in this release and version of B2B Procedures and require further input from industry participants to determine if there is broader levels of support and tangible benefits that would warrant further work on this initiative.

The IEC therefore requests input and feedback on the following questions.

Participants should take into account the work that AEMO has completed under the MSATS Standing Data Review<sup>1</sup> and be aware that AEMO is about to commence further work on this project. This may therefore resolve current issues and therefore remove the need for any additional B2B transactions.

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

If “No”:

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

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?

---

<sup>1</sup> See here for the consultation page: <https://www.aemo.com.au/Stakeholder-Consultation/Consultations/MSATS-NMI-Standing-Data-Consultation>

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

## 7. B2B Proposal

The proposed changes are detailed within the attached draft procedures published with this report.