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: TasNetworks

Completion Date: 10/01/2020

Table of Contents

1. Service Order Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.1, Table 13 – RegClassification	If 'other' is selected, is it intended that a participant needs to provide details in SpecialInstructions?
TasNetworks		4.1, Table 13 – PurposeforVisit	Marked as O (optional) for Move Meter, should be AO.
TasNetworks		4.1, Table 13 – PurposeforVisit	Some of the values specified seem superfluous, for instance; 'Additional Meter' could be implied from the SO Sub Type 'Install Meter' 'Relocate existing meter' could be implied from SO Sub Type 'Move Meter' If 'other' is selected, is it intended that a participant needs to provide details in SpecialInstructions?
TasNetworks		4.1, Table 13 – CustomerNotificationAddress CustomerNotificationEmail	These two pieces of information are duplicated from what can be provided via the CDR/CDN process. To ensure consistency and a single source of truth it is suggested that the CDR/CDN process should be the source of this information.
TasNetworks		4.1, Table 13 - CustomerType	TasNetworks recommend that this value could be provided in SpecialInstructions
TasNetworks		4.2 - Key	AO does not need to be referenced in the 'Key' as there are no fields in the ServiceOrderResponse with this state
TasNetworks		4.3 - Key	AO does not need to be referenced in the 'Key' as there are no fields in the BusienssAcceptance/Rejection with this state

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		General	Consideration may need to be giving to any updates required to the B2B Guide as a consequence of modification to the Service Oder Process

2.   One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.1.3(b)	Example should be updated in line with the proposed additional new ServiceOrderID field
TasNetworks		4.2.3 Table 8	See response to question 5 in regards to the proposed change to the MFIN. As an alternative to adding in new fields to the MFIN, is it acceptable for participants to agree to add this information into the existing Notes field?
TasNetworks		General	Consideration may need to be giving to any updates required to the B2B Guide as a consequence of modification to the One Way Notification Process

3.   Technical Delivery Specification

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		6.4.1.1(c)	Grammatical - Error reference source not found

4.   Questions raised in the v3.4 B2B Procedures Change Pack Issues Paper

Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
1	Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.1? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")	No. Rather than introduce these new proposed fields in the Service Order Process which requires a B2B schema change, TasNetworks would recommend that consideration be given to utilising the existing function available via the Peer-to-Peer (P2P) transaction, which was introduced during the PoC reforms. By utilising the P2P transaction it will eliminate the need for a schema change on participants that have no direct need to use the new fields. Participants could also bi-laterally agree to commence using the P2P immediately,

Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		not having to wait until a schema change is made. Additionally, where small volumes prevail that require this data by agreement, participants could continue to use the special instructions to transport the information, again negating the need for a schema change. The P2P transaction may also provide a further level of flexibility to allow parties to agree what data attributes and values are appropriate for their specific needs, which may also evolve over time. If this change was to proceed, then even if participants (e.g. DNSP) who do not need to utilise the new fields choose to stay on n-1 schema until a second schema change is introduced, they will be required to incur cost and effort to make system changes to cater for the introduction of these fields at a later date.
2	Are there additional enumerated fields whose addition to the Metering Service Works SO the IEC should consider? Please detail them.	No.
3	Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No" / "Other – provide reason")	Yes.
4	Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.3? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")	No. TasNetworks questions the cost v's benefit aspect of this change given it requires a B2B schema version change. What would the AEMO B2B hub do if a participant remains on n-1, as this is a mandatory field? Would the

Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		hub not pass through this attribute and participants systems would then be required to manage a mandatory field not being provided? TasNetworks currently manage allocation of such NMI's by identifying the appropriate NMI Classification from the Network Connection Application process and/or the EWR. Alternatively, the Special Instructions field could be used by the Retailer to provide this information.
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?	Yes, MXN should continue to be used. TasNetworks do not support the change to the MFIN to add the ServiceOrderID field and additional ReasonForNotice value. TasNetworks recommend that the MXN be modified and used for this purpose. This assumes it would remove the need for a schema update to support this change, and more so aligns with the intent of the transactions as described in the B2B Guide.
6	If the MXN were to be retired, would your organisation prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as presented above?	Option 1. TasNetworks do not currently support use of the MXN, therefore would not be impacted by retiring it.
7	If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it?	TasNetworks do not currently support use of the MXN, therefore would not be impacted by the timing of retiring it.
8	Will a 10 MB maximum file size for MTRD transactions cause substantial problems for your organisation?	No.

Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		As part of 5ms/GS system changes being implemented by TasNetworks, modifications will be made to ensure inbound and outbound 10MB file sizes are managed appropriately.
9	Does limiting the number of transactions within the MTRD group mitigate the potential problems caused by an increased maximum file size?	Yes. TasNetworks believes limiting the number of transactions is appropriate mitigation.
10	Is the volume limit of 1000 transactions per file appropriate for the PMD and VMD transactions?	Yes, TasNetworks believes this is appropriate.
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, whilst TasNetworks acknowledge that the proposed changes may assist improvement with some participants communications, there is still cost and effort to be incurred by other participants that may have no benefit (or need) from the proposed changes as a result of a schema change. There is additional cost and risk should a schema change be required to be scoped, tested, and implemented into production prior to, and independently from the 5ms and GS changes being implemented. Risks may be incurred by the respective participant businesses as well as by software vendors who need to facilitate these changes for participants. This may impact on participant timings for 5ms/GS readiness activities and preparedness.

Question No.	Question	Participant 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?	Investigate utilisation of the Peer-to-Peer transaction for the fields proposed to be added to the Service Order Process. Use the SpecialInstructions field to communicate NCONUML classification required. Modify the MXN csv transaction content, rather than the MFIN, assuming a schema change is not required. Else, evaluate the impact of continuing the existing process as is without having the SO ID provided. The Peer-to-Peer transaction may also be an alternative to be used for this purpose.
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?	TasNetworks strong preference would be for an implementation date of November 2021.
14	Do you see value in the development of new Verify Standing Data Transactions?	No
15	If "No", please provide reasons why you do not see value in the development of a new Verify Standing Data transaction.	TasNetworks do not consider the benefit potentially to be realised from the implementation of these new transactions would outweigh the cost and effort of participants undertaking works to implement the transaction. We further believe that the use cases for such a transaction may be many and varied, which may be better suited to email communications, which can also be directed to multiple parties collectively. There is

Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
		potential that these new transactions may not be widely adopted by participants.
		The content that would possibly need to be included in such transactions would need to be generic and free text in nature to explain what is required, therefore would be difficult to build automated processes from it. The main benefit would be to track message delivery, lifecycle management, and timings.
		Over time new scenarios may arise that may not fit with the proposed transaction field values and thus require the use of an email anyway.
16	If "Yes", what areas of Standing Data are causing you issues today (please list individually)?	N/A
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 16)?	N/A
18	What are the volumes of each type of Standing Data item (please list and link to each data item from Question 16)?	N/A
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 16)?	N/A
20	If pursued, which B2B Procedure should these new transactions be included within?	One Way Notification Process

Question No.	Question	Participant Comments
21	Do you have any further information/thoughts that would be relevant to this topic (please provide)?	No