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: PLUS ES

Completion Date: 13/10/2020

Table of Contents

1. Service Order Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		Version Release History -3.4	The updates to the service orders have not been defined in the Comments field
Section 4.1 ServiceOrderRequest Transaction Data			
		Key	**Introduction of AO = Agreement Only (May be provided with agreement of the Recipient. If provided without agreement may be ignored)** PLUS ES proposes that the 'R' field would work just as well, with a few extra clarifications in its definition. Not all participants will build for the AO field as they do not build for the 'O' fields, negating the benefit of introducing this field and the cost involved.
		General	• PLUS ES proposes that more time is allowed to review the matrix of the proposed new fields and the assigned status against the various service orders prior to the release of the 2nd stage consultation. • PLUS ES also proposes that the B2B Working Group considers the effectiveness of the 'Optional' status for any new B2B SO fields moving forward. The 'Required' status would meet the objective, where the 'Optional' Status is not generally built by a number of participants, hence restricting future opportunities to deliver process efficiencies.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		ReqClassification	• PLUS ES suggests, in accordance to the definition of this proposed field, that some SSW service orders (TBD) would also impact the metering timeframes and it would drive operational efficiencies to make this field available for those service orders. i.e. meter installations requiring alteration to supply (Reference NER clause 7.8.10C (a)(2). • Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected.
		Purpose for visit	• **'Relocate existing meter' enumeration -** PLUS ES suggests this is superfluous and does not add value. If the predominant purpose is for the meter to be moved, then a MSW – Move Meter should be raised. Propose the MSW – Move Meter to be 'N' and any additional information could be captured by Special Instructions. • Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

		CustomerAgreedStart Date	• Whilst the intent of the field is understood and required – there are existing fields:
			    o ScheduledDate
			    o AppointmentReference
			    o CustomerPreferredDateAndTime
			
			which need to be considered so there is no duplication and confusion with fields to be used.
			
			PLUS ES proposes the following:
			
			• the requirement could be met by the above fields, with perhaps an amendment of the status against each service order i.e. 'R' instead of 'O'.
			• A review of the service orders in the matrix and their assigned statuses. i.e. This requirement would add value to more than just the few service orders identified. i.e. all MSW service orders etc.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

		CustomerAgreedEndate	• MSW – Remove Meter would also benefit from the availability of this field
			  • *If customer has agreed to a fixed date the customer start date and end date will be the same.*
			
			  PLUS ES suggests this is equivalent to an appointment/customer agreed date. The existing fields in the B2B service order meet this requirement. If the existing fields are to be used, then this sentence should be removed. Please see PLUS ES comments for CustomerAgreedStartDate field.
			
			  • PLUS ES proposes all date or schedule date reference fields relating to the delivery date of the service works should be located together in the table. i.e. This field should be located near or adjacent the ScheduledDate field etc.

		CustomerNotificationMethod	• PLUS ES suggests that this field would create more issues. What if the customer notification method does not align with the agreed processes? Does one reject the service order and create delays in the delivery of the metering installation?
			• If this field is to be retained, PLUS ES proposes:
			  o Removing the 'Waiver' enumeration as ultimately the Metering Provider will know if an outage is required or they may be able to get an agreed date with the customer which will not require an outage notification to be sent to the customer. This would not be known to the initiator at the time the B2B service order was raised.
			  o MSW – Install Control Load requires an outage; amend status from 'N' to 'R'

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		CustomerNotificationAddress	• PLUS ES agrees this field delivers a process efficiency to parties concerned; irrespective if the CustomerNotificationMethod field is delivered or not. • Spelling error in the Definition field – puposes amend to purposes.
		CustomerNotificationEmail	• PLUS ES agrees this field delivers a process efficiency to parties concerned; irrespective if the CustomerNotificationMethod field is delivered or not. • Spelling error in the Definition field – puposes amend to purposes.
		Escalation	PLUS ES proposes the following: • Renaming the field – the objective of this field is to identify prioritised service orders and 'Escalation' is more appropriate as an enumeration of the field rather than the name. Possibly renaming the field as Prioritisation. • Remove 'Normal' enumeration. This field should only be populated when required and the absence of any enumeration implies normal status. • 'VIP' enumeration – doubt the value this field would deliver. How does one monitor the VIP status so that it is not abused? • Include 'Escalation/Complaint' enumeration – complaint/escalation which has not been referred to the ombudsman • Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected. • This field should be made available to all MSWs and could also be applicable to other service order types as well.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		Exemption code	• PLUS ES recommends that this field is removed. What is the value of this field? Exemption codes in most cases would not be known at this stage by the initiator. • If the intent is to know that an exemption has been raised, then the B2B SO is not the place for this information. Perhaps a field in MSATS would better serve the intent. The MP is generally the participant who tells the MC that an exemption must be raised, even though this implies a particular process.

2. One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		General	PLUS ES understands the concept and benefits of the ServiceOrderID and agrees to its addition. PLUS ES recommends that the PIN is also amended to include the ServiceOrderID as participants also use it as a meter exchange notification. This is to ensure a consistency behind the intent, objective and outcome of proposed changes.
		Version Release History 3.4	There is a proposed enumeration of Meter Exchange Notification in the MFIN and this has not been identified in the Comments only the addition of the ServiceOrderID field.
		MFIN - Table 8 MeterFaultAndIssueNotificationfield values	•**Meter Exchange Notice (Used when the MFIN is used as a meter exchange notification) enumeration.** PLUS ES does not support the addition of the above enumeration in the MFIN. Please refer to Section 4: One Way Notification Changes – General (below) for further detail.

3. Technical Delivery Specification

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
			PLUS ES has no comment on the Technical Delivery Specification.

4. B2B Procedures Change Pack Consultation Questions

Topic	Question	PLUS ES Comments
Metering Service Works	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 – Details/feedback provided against specific fields in Comments field of Section 1. PLUS ES' concern is that the approach in some instances presumes a process and as such have resulted in a field or enumeration being introduced. Some fields would also deliver benefits and efficiencies to more than just the few service orders identified.

Topic	Question	PLUS ES Comments
	2.Are there additional enumerated fields whose addition to the Metering Service Works SO the IEC should consider? Please detail them.	As per feedback provided in the Comment field in Section 1. In addition to the existing proposed fields or associated enumerations PLUS ES would like to propose the following to be considered: • Advanced communications – with the introduction of customer refusal, fields or enumerations, instead of Special Instructions, would remove a lot of ambiguity and errors associated with these requests. In addition, the volume of these requests is slowly increasing and whilst very small, they still require a large resource effort to rectify. • Embedded Network changes – possible enhancements to accommodate the industry changes earmarked for the Embedded Networks.
Supply Abolishment	3. Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No" / "Other – provide reason")	Yes - in the absence of a robust industry NMI Abolishment process, PLUS ES supports the changes with respect to provisioning the information of a supply abolishment to trigger the NSW DB to make the NMI extinct.
Allocate NMI	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

Topic	Question	PLUS ES Comments
One Way Notification Changes	General	Currently there are 2 OWN which support the notification of meter exchange dates and used in the industry: • MXN – CSV payload • PIN - XML based The proposal seeks to introduce a 3rd option, the MFIN OWN. This would involve renaming and repurposing the MFIN. PLUS ES does not agree to have the MFIN amended and repurposed to include and support the process of a meter exchange notification: • The PIN OWN currently exists and could serve the purpose as per BAU participant agreed practices • The participants incurring extra cost to implement the system and business process changes with no additional benefits; especially in a period where the industry is undergoing significant changes. i.e the current use of the MFIN vs the intended use of a repurposed transaction. • Not all participants would be inclined to make the changes – system/business processes. i.e. there would not be a consistent approach in participant processes. Participants would still have to build for variances.

Topic	Question	PLUS ES Comments
	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?	PLUS ES currently uses the MXN to notify several participants of the meter exchange schedule date; we support the continued usage of the CSV – based MXN for the immediate future.
	6. If the MXN were to be retired, would your organisation prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as presented above?	PLUS ES supports Option 2, acknowledging that there is also a 3rd option as per PLUS ES comments against the OWN changes – General.
	7. If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it?	Given the changes happening in the industry over the next 2 years, PLUS ES would support the retirement of the MXN, following the 5MS and Global settlement changes as part of a process efficiency enablement; late 2022.
Increase to transaction size limit for Meter Data	8. Will a 10 MB maximum file size for MTRD transactions cause substantial problems for your organisation?	The concern would be that PLUS ES as a Meter provider would get flooded with transactions.
	9. Does limiting the number of transactions within the MTRD group mitigate the potential problems caused by an increased maximum file size?	It will not mitigate the potential problems.
	10. Is the volume limit of 1000 transactions per file appropriate for the PMD and VMD transactions?	Yes

Topic	Question	PLUS ES Comments
	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.	PLUS ES has provided feedback against the fields. As per above comments.
	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?	PLUS ES already has workaround processes in place which deliver a lot of the efficiencies of the proposed changes, not without challenges. We also understand overall the changes will deliver process efficiencies.
	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?	PLUS ES would prefer Nov 2021 or later.