

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:** SA Power Networks*

***Completion Date:** 9/01/2020*

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 – These changes will not be used by Distributors acting as the initial MC and MP for Regulated metering, however will have an impact on the B2B schema. We support changes that improve the services to customers to obtain their required metering but have a preference to minimise any further changes ahead of July 2021 (5MS/GS).

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

No

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 – Changes only applicable to NSW.

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 – however, happy for this change to be held off until after July 2021 (5MS/GS).

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?

SA Power Networks has never used the MXN transaction and there is no plans or requirements to alter this position.

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

MXN not used – see response to Q5.

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

MXN not used – see response to Q5.

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.

Yes – our concerns are linked to implementation timeframes – see response to Q13 (6.1).

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?

NA

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?

SA Power Networks does not support an implementation date ahead of November 2021.

We appreciate the majority of proposed changes are within the competitive metering area, it is unclear to SA Power Networks if all participants that operate within this space will adopt the changes and whether these changes provide true benefits that would warrant this work being implemented ahead of the significant industry changes (5MS/GS) that are already underway.

We have a significant internal program of work underway and the proposed changes will add complexity and risk to a successful implementation that could be avoided by targeting a effective date of November 2021 or after.

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

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

Changes and requirements in this area should not be considered until the NMI Standing Review takes place and associated changes/improvements are determined and implemented. Following the introduction of any changes, we would then support a review into whether a Verify Standing Data transaction was required. (Noting that the design would need to cater for the many and varied interactions that occur today to resolve any issues – this is not a simple request and response 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?

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