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: *AGL*

Completion Date: *13 Jan 2020*

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):*

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
Agl	2.1 Table 3		AGL Supports the change for NSW Supply Abolishment
AGL	4.1 Reg Classification		AGL supports this Change as it will assist in more efficient processing
AGL	4.1 Purpose		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1 CustomerDate		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1 Custagreedate		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1CustNotifMethod		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1CustNotifAdd		AGL does not support this as it can be done via CDR/CDN
AGL	4.1CustNotife-mail		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1Escalation		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1Exemption		AGL believes that this data is available to the recipient via SpecialNotes
AGL	4.1NMICreation		AGL notes that this can be done via Special Instructions
AGL	4.2 SO Response		AGL does not support the concept of A/O as a SO response, as the logic processes required to manage this would be far too complex.

2. One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
AGL	4.1.3		AGL supports the inclusion of the Service Order ID in the MXN
AGL	4.2.3		AGL supports the inclusion of the Service Order ID in the MFN
AGL			AGL is not in a position to support the retirement of the MXN, but does see the long term value in aligning the transactions in the future. AGL suggests that this be reconsidered following the AEMC PoC Review being undertaken in 2020.

3. Technical Delivery Specification

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
AGL	Various		AGL supports the various editorial changes provided within this document.
AGL	5.8		AGL supports the amended fiel size/transaction limit for B2B messages and associated edits.

Other Questions

Question	AGL 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")	AGL supports the inclusion of Regulatory Reason and believes other information is available through other processes.
Question 2: Are there additional enumerated fields whose addition to the Metering Service Works SO the IEC should consider? Please detail them.	None Identified at this time. Although AGL notes that the AEMC PoC review is being undertaken in 2020 and could result in the need for future changes.
Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No" / "Other – provide reason")	AGL supports the changes for NSW Supply abolishment
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")	AGL notes that the NMi type can be manged through Special Notes.
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?	AGL does not support the removal of the MXN at this time, but notes that the AEMC PoC review may require further changes to industry processes.
Question 6: If the MXN were to be retired, would your organisation prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as presented above?	See above
Question 7: If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it?	AGL is not in a position to retuire the MFIN at this time.
Question 8: Will a 10 MB maximum file size for MTRD transactions cause substantial problems for your organisation?	10MB has been assessed and with transaction limits should be acceptable.
Question 9: Does limiting the number of transactions within the MTRD group mitigate the potential problems caused by an increased maximum file size?	10MB has been assessed and with transaction limits should be acceptable. Without tarsnaction limits, this file size will be probolematic for excessive tarsnactions.
Question 10: Is the volume limit of 1000 transactions per file appropriate for the PMD and VMD transactions?	AGL considers 1000 to be an appropriate limit.

Question	AGL response
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.	AGL notes the issues of timing of these changes, but is also aware that there may be no other windows for some years.
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?	None provided
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?	Nov 2021 may be less risky as the majority of 5ms Global changes shoduol be implemented. However, there are other work programs arising which may further delay these changes, and AGL does not consicder that industry efficiency improvements should be indefinitely placed on hold due to imposed changes.
Question 14: Do you see value in the development of new Verify Standing Data Transactions?	AGL does not support this tarsnaction at this time, notiing that AEMO recently has recommenced the review of NMI standing Data.
If "No":	
Question 15: Please provide reasons why you do not see value in the development of a new Verify Standing Data transaction.	AGL does not support this tarsnaction at this time, notiing that AEMO recently has recommenced the review of NMI standing Data. If the NMI standing data program was to take too lomng or stop again, then the value of this transnaction gains value again.
If "Yes":	
Question 16: What areas of Standing Data are causing you issues today (please list individually)?	For example Shared Supply Points, Number of Phases, CT metering indicator, Controlled Load owner (DB or MP) See AGL response to the NMI Standing Data pre-consultation review for more details.
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)?	Rb to DB, MC to DB.

Question	AGL response
Question 18: What are the volumes of each type of Standing Data item (please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?	Data not captured due to lack of time, but significant enough.
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)?	AGL believes that the NMI standing data review may resolve this question.
Question 20: If pursued, which B2B Procedure should these new transactions be included within?	May be resolved with updates to MSATS.
Question 21: Do you have any further information/thoughts that would be relevant to this topic (please provide)?	AGL believes that the NMI standing data review may resolve this question.