B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: Bluecurrent

Completion Date: 11 July 2024

1. Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1.2 Legacy Meter Replacement Plans (LMRP)	Question 1: Do you agree that the new Regulatory Classifications of 'LMRP' should be added to the B2B Procedures? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.1.2 Legacy Meter Replacement Plans (LMRP)	Question 2: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No
2.1.5 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes	Question 3: Do you agree that a new allowable value of 'Defect Rectified' should be introduced to the 'Purpose of Request' field to better articulate why the initiator is raising the service order? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes – procedure should clarify what the <i>Reg classification</i> for a meter exchange raised on a previously defected site should be (see proposal below).
2.1.5 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes	Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed changes to the B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes (see comments below)
2.1.5 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes	Question 5: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach	No

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1.5 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes	Question 6: Please indicate your preference for sending and receiving Nature-of-defect information, between:	Option 1.
	1) Using modified SAR and SAN as described in this Issues Paper and marked up procedures,	
	2) Introducing two new B2B transactions dedicated to requesting and receiving nature-of-defect information.	
2.1.7 Shared Fusing Meter Replacement	Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.1.7 Shared Fusing Meter Replacement	Question 8: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No
2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements	Question 9: Do you agree with the principles that the IEC have applied in determining proposed procedure and schema changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred principles.	Yes

Topic	Question	Comments
2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements	Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed procedure and schema changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements	Question 11: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No No
2.3 B006/22 - PERSONNAME definition spec correction	Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.3 B006/22 - PERSONNAME definition spec correction	Question 13: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No

Topic	Question	Comments
2.4 B007/22 - Discrepancy between B2B SO Process and B2B Guide	Question 14: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.4 B007/22 - Discrepancy between B2B SO Process and B2B Guide	Question 15: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No
2.5 B011/23 - Amending the definition of Unknown Load Exception Code)	Question 16: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.5 B011/23 - Amending the definition of Unknown Load Exception Code)	Question 17: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No

Topic	Question	Comments
2.6 B014/23 - Define obligations for managing inflight service orders sent to metering service providers when a ROLR event is declared.	Question 18: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.	Yes
2.6 B014/23 - Define obligations for managing inflight service orders sent to metering service providers when a ROLR event is declared.	Question 19: Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach.	No No

Topic	Question	Comments
2.12 Questions on proposed changes	Question 20: Do you have any other suggestions, comments, or questions regarding this consultation? If you have any comments outside of the scope of this consultation, please reach out to your relevant B2B-WG representatives.	Yes. We recommend that the definition of a Coordinated Interruption ID (CIID) that is generated by the DNSP as part of the One-in-all-in process should be documented. The current draft introduces the term but doesn't really explain what it is and how it can be used. This definition could be included as a term in the AEMO glossary. We note that other B2B terms exist here. Suggested definition: Coordinated Interruption ID (CIID) — "The CIID is a unique identifier generated by the Distribution Network Service Provider (DNSP) and provided to all impacted parties when DNSP work is requested that affects multiple stakeholders, such as retailers and metering providers. This ID allows for the tagging and association of all related tasks requiring coordination. For instance, in a shared fuse 'one-in-all-in' process, the CIID will be issued by the DNSP to all retailers who are required to arrange for meter exchanges at the site. These retailers can then pass the CIID to their respective metering service providers, enabling more efficient management of all associated meter exchanges."

2. Service Order Procedure

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting
2.6 (ii)	2.6(ii)	This drafting is creating confusion. For the 'One in all in' process it would be simpler to introduce a clause that prohibits loading both fields. "Where a ServiceOrderRequest has been raised requesting a meter replacement as part of a 'One In All In' shared fuse process the
		ScheduledDate must not be populated and CustomerPreferredDateAndTime should be populated with the date and time provided by the DNSP in the MFIN OWN".
2.15	2.15	It is unclear what the relationship between the newly introduced 'no access' codes and the old 'no access' code is. If a legitimate use case for the old no access code cannot be identified, then it should be retired. New codes:
		No Access – Customer support #Required No Access – Network support Paguined
		 No Access – Network support Required Old code:
		Unable To Access

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Prop	osed Drafting		
Table 5	Table 5	Editorial - Markups hav		mer on-site Value. 'Not Completed' should be	reinstated.
		Value	Definition	Used with ServiceOrderStatus	
		Customer On-Site	There is a Customer at Site and the Site was not de-energised.	Limited to a physical De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'. Not allowed for De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with ServiceOrderSubType of "Remove Fuse" or "Pillar-Box, PitorPole-Top" and De- energisation Reason "Non-Payment (DNP)".	
		0 . 0			i
Table 5	Table 5	exchange is not valid. I Recommend that the of "Partially Completed —	Retailers can determine that a TYPE4A has be lause read:	er install is <u>unsuccessful</u> . Therefore 'Partially co een installed by referencing the <i>InstallationTyp</i> eleted and communications have not been ena install."	eCode in MSATS.

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting
2.16	2.16.7	Recommend a new section in 2.16. Specific Service Order Requirements to standardise the requirements of a meter service works request after a Defect resolution.
		2.16.7. Meter Exchange after defect resolution
		 (a) Where an initiator has been informed that a previously identified defect that is stopping a meter exchange from proceeding has been resolved and wishes to arrange for a meter exchange, the initiator must: raise a Metering Service Works Service Order request with a Subtype of Meter Exchange containing all mandatory and required fields populate the <i>Regclassification</i> field with a value of 'Customer Initiated''. populate the <i>purposeofvisit</i> field with 'Defect Rectified'.
Table 5	Table 5	A new reject code is required for where MSW Exchange Meter SOR is received for NMI where the defect flag is still set in MSATS and the PurposeofRequest does not say "Defect Rectified". This will allow for a recipient to communicate back to the Initiator that the SOR may have been raised incorrectly and avoid a wasted truck visit.
		Defect still registered in MSATS A request for a meter exchange has been received without indicating the customer has resolved the issue. Likely to result in wasted truck visit.

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Commen	ts / Propo	sed Drafting																	
Table 13	Table 13	current time classificatio increasing i	eframes spec n should diffe mportance of <i>sification</i> field	recommends different regulified in the NER but family forentiate these types of male and the regulated rather than using other field rather than using other	ailur lfunc ory d	es w tion driver Ther	ill nove.g. " for a	w be 'malf a met	requ unct ter ex	iired ion - xcha	l to b - ind nge,	e rep ividu we p	placed lal" ar propo	d with nd "m se tha ecome	nin 7 Ialfui at th e ma	O Bus nctio e init	sines n - f iato	ss da amily or sho	ys. Th y failu ould b	ne regu ure". Di pe requ	llatory ue to the lired to use

Clause	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting
Table 13	Table 13	Allowable values in <i>PurposeofRequest</i> should be updated to include 'Defect Rectified' and to remove family failure as this changes to <i>regclassification</i> .
		VARCHAR(40) Used to clearly indicate the purpose of visit — allowable values

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Pro	oposed Drafting			
Table 13	Table 13	FormReference has	not being updated to	Varchar(20) as per ICF B002/22 <u>ServiceOrderRequest</u> .		
		Form Reference	VARCHAR(15)	In NSW and ACT, the Deposited Plan (DP) Number is required with the letters 'DP' appearing before the Deposited Plan (DP) number (eg 'DPXXXXXXXX) for the Allocate NMI. In all other jurisdictions, reference to the forms associated with Supply Works Request and Meter Service Works. Refer to the Service Paperwork reference table in the B2B Guide. Not Required for a "Cancel" ServiceOrderRequest.	R/N	
		-	14400111046	I HOW LIST I O I H I I		

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting			
Table 13	Table 13	Hazard description has not being updated to Varchar(100) as per ICF B002/22			
				Allocate NMI.	
		HazardDescripti on	VARCHAR(80)	Description of any hazards associated with the Site. This field repeats to allow the reporting of multiple hazards. Refer B2B Procedure: Customer and Site Details Notification for the list of codes. This information does not replace information previously provided in a SiteAccessNotification. Not Required for a "Cancel" ServiceOrderRequest.	
Table 14	Table 14	See comment on cla	ause 2.15 If a legitim	ate use case for the old 'no access' code canno	

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting
Table 14	Table 14	Editorial - Clarify current drafting of <i>RecipientReference</i> field values to be more consistent with other fields.
		Recommend clause to read.
		Recipient defined reference, used for reference and tracking. Not necessarily unique. This field is for information only and must not be used for validation of the Response.
		Where the ExceptionCode of Defect is used, the defect type is to be provided in this field. The following values must be used, where applicable.
		"ASBESTOS" means Friable Asbestos is present and must be removed.
		"PANELNCOM" means Meter panel is non-compliant and must be upgraded.
		"PANELLOC" means current location of meter panel is non-complaint and must be relocated.
		"NOSPACE" means the existing metering installation cannot accommodate all metering equipment and must be upgraded.
		"NOFUSE" means the current metering installation has no service fuse present or the service fuse cannot be safely operated.
		"ISONCOM" means Isolation device (non-service fuse) is present but cannot be operated.
		"WIRINGDET" means damaged or deteriorated wiring present and repaired. Includes presence of Vulcanised Indian Rubber (VIR) cables
		"LIVEWIRING" means suspected exposed terminals or parts behind panel making opening of panel unsafe.
		"WIRINGNCOM" means non-compliant wiring identified including earthing system issues that must be repaired.
		"BOXDAMAGED" means meter box is damaged or not weatherproof.
		"OBSTRUCTION" means vegetation or other material is impeding safe access to metering installation.

3. Customer and site details Notification process procedure

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting
Table 8	Table 8	Editorial - Hazard field description revised to be consistent with other fields.
		Revised Definition:
		"Where the SAN is being provided in response to a SAR with a reason of 'Nature of Defect requested' then one of the following capitalised values should be provided where applicable.
		"ASBESTOS" means Friable Asbestos is present and must be removed.
		"PANELNCOM" means Meter panel is non-compliant and must be upgraded.
		"PANELLOC" means current location of meter panel is non-complaint and must be relocated.
		"NOSPACE" means the existing metering installation cannot accommodate all metering equipment and must be upgraded.
		"NOFUSE" means the current metering installation has no service fuse present or the service fuse cannot be safely operated.
		"ISONCOM" means Isolation device (non-service fuse) is present but cannot be operated.
		"WIRINGDET" means damaged or deteriorated wiring present and repaired. Includes presence of Vulcanised Indian Rubber (VIR) cables
		"LIVEWIRING" means suspected exposed terminals or parts behind panel making opening of panel unsafe.
		"WIRINGNCOM" means non-compliant wiring identified including earthing system issues that must be repaired.
		"BOXDAMAGED" means meter box is damaged or not weatherproof.
		"OBSTRUCTION" means vegetation or other material is impeding safe access to metering installation.
		"NONE" means no defect is known"

4. One Way Notification procedure

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting			
Table 6 PlannedInterruptionNotification field values Table 6 PlannedInterruptionNotification field values		On review, the need for the metering providers to indicate 'Distribution Works' for PINs sent to the retailer to confirm the planned exchanged date for a meter exchange when it related to the "One-in-all-in" job, is not necessary. The metering provider includes the SOR ID as part of the PIN. This will allow the retailers to refer to the originating SOR and determine if it is part of a OiAi job and take appropriate action. Recommend that this change be reverted.			
		ReasonForInter VARCHAR(50) M The reason for planned interruption. Allowed values: • Meter Exchange - Individual • Meter Exchange - Rollout • Meter Replacement - Family Maintenance • Meter Test • Meter Fault Investigation • Distribution Works (Note — when issuing PINs for 'LMRP One In All IN' outages, use This Reasone Code to supress Retailer outage notices) • Meter Installation - Additional • Install Controlled Load • Remove Meter • Move Meter • Meter Reconfiguration • Other			

5. ROLR PART A & B

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments / Proposed Drafting
104.5. Non-regulated MC, MP and MDP Obligations	104.5. Non-regulated MC, MP and MDP Obligations	Clause (e) iii – this currently reads 'each row identified with a field name' . This should be 'each column identified with a field name'
		(e) At a minimum, the list to be provided in compliance with clause 104.5 d) must be in csv format and must:
		(i) Contain all ServiceOrderRequest transaction fields as described in the B2B Procedure: Service Order Processes Transaction Table
		(ii) Contain all ServiceOrderResponse transaction fields as described in the B2B Procedure: Service Order Processes Transaction Table.
		(iii) Be in csv format with each row identified with the field name in the same order as those described in the B2B Procedure: Service Order Processes Transaction Table, with ServiceOrderRequest data preceding ServiceOrderResponse data