

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (version change)
- Service Order
- Meter Data
- One Way Notification
- Technical Delivery Specification

CONSULTATION – Draft Report

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant:** Origin Energy*

***Completion Date:** 11 March 2020*

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section)..... 3
- 1. Service Order Process..... 4
- 2. One Way Notification Process..... 7
- 3. Technical Delivery Specification 9

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

Metering Service Works

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin Energy	4.1 Table 13		Origin Energy reiterates that there are mechanisms in place today that can provide and support participants with a means to communicate the proposed additional fields for a Metering Service Works. If the suggested fields are to be used based off a bilateral agreement between participants then this can be achieved today by using shared market protocol as well as peer to peer transactions. While Origin acknowledges that there may be a preference to manage the additional information within specific transaction fields, as the implementation date has been moved to November 2021, there is concern given the cost to implement these changes and that they may not be fit for purpose in 21 months time, given industry change is happening so rapidly. Origin also questions the criticality of these fields if industry is willing to wait till November 2021 for them.

Supply Abolishment

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin Energy	2.1 Table 3		Origin Energy supports the use of the B2B Supply Abolishment service order in NSW. Given this change would be to processes only and require no major system changes, Origin suggests the implementation of this service order does not need to wait until November 2021 and should be brought forward so industry could gain benefits sooner.

Allocate NMI

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin Energy	4.1 Table 13		Origin Energy supports the addition of NCONUML to the "Customer Type" field however request clarification if this change in isolation requires a schema change? If there is no schema change required to add this customer type, Origin suggests to implement NCONUML into the "Customer Type" field earlier as it will support the introduction of NCONUML as part of 5 Minute Settlements, scheduled for 1 July 2021. Without this transaction, workarounds will need to be adopted.

2. Meter Data Process

Reference No	Question No	Respondent Name	Comments	IEC Response
	1			

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin Energy	2.4.3(a)(iii)		The proposed wording change to “Unmetered Device Market Loads” was driven by the introduction of NCONUML as part of 5 Minute Settlements. As this is a minor amendment of wording, Origin suggests that it does not need to wait till November 2021 and the change should align with 5 Minute Settlements, scheduled for 1 July 2021.

3. One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin Energy	4.1.3 Table 5		<p>Origin Energy has concerns around retiring the Meter Exchange Notification (MXN) as there are no current issues with this transaction other than it is CSV and not asexml. As participants have been using this transaction for 2+ years and has been embedded into current processes, Origin does not see the benefit of using the Meter Fault Issue Notification (MFIN) for the same purpose as the MFIN was not designed to notify of an exchange rather when there is an issue with the metering at a specific site. As a result, participants would need to build their systems to distinguish between where there is a genuine fault at the meter and where it is notification of an exchange. This will add unnecessary cost, complexity and compliance risks to participants.</p> <p>Origin would like to reiterate that this change may not resolve any outstanding issues in the market and rather than patch these One Way Notifications, the outage scheduling process be looked at holisitically. Industry should work together to develop a single process that improves the overall customer experience. Origin would like to propose that as the process is currently working participants be given the choice if they want to remain using the MXN or if they want to use the MFIN.</p> <p>Consideration also needs to be given to the current MC Outage Rule change as well as the forthcoming AEMC PoC review that will be undertaken in 2020 and industry should wait for the outcome of these reviews and then assess what is required.</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin Energy	Do you have a preference between using the PIN and/or the MFIN One Way Notifications to notify participants of meter exchange dates? If so, which is your preference and why?		<p>The MXN already provides this function to the industry however, if the final decision is to retire this transaction and the choice is between the MFIN/PIN, then PIN would be the preferred transaction as the fields are more relevant as it has a "Start", "End" and "Duration".</p> <p>Origin would like to propose that as the process is currently working participants be given the choice if they want to remain using the MXN or if they want to use the MFIN/PIN.</p>

4. Technical Delivery Specification

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments