

B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: CitiPower Powercor

Completion Date: 08/07/2024

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.	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
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.	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
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.	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
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.	CitiPower Powercor seeks clarification on the new proposed Service Order Response Exception Codes only apply to the new proposed Service Order Sub Types 'Temporary Isolation -Scoping Request' and 'Temporary Isolation – One In All In'.
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 comment

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: 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.	CitiPower Powercor supports option 2
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.	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors. <i>Note: new Service Order Sub Types have not been included in the draft B2B Procedure Service Order v3.9 section 2.17 Multiple Service Orders.</i>
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 comment

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 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.	CitiPower Powercor supports the principles applied by the IEC.

Topic	Question	Comments												
		<table border="1" data-bbox="1137 288 2069 435"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 288 1384 325"><i>HouseNumber</i></td> <td data-bbox="1384 288 1520 325">NUMERIC(5)</td> <td data-bbox="1520 288 1630 325">R</td> <td data-bbox="1630 288 2069 435"> <p>Defines the house number per Australian Standard AS4590-1999. Defines the house number as per Australian Standard AS4590-1999.</p> <p>The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="1137 325 1520 435">IN RANGE: 0-99999</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <ul data-bbox="1137 475 2047 576" style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Delivery Specification v3.9, section 3.4, table 4 - “The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times” hasn’t been deleted from <i>HouseNumberSuffix</i> <table border="1" data-bbox="1137 584 2069 730"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 584 1384 620"><i>HouseNumberSuffix</i></td> <td data-bbox="1384 584 1520 620">VARCHAR(1)</td> <td data-bbox="1520 584 1630 620">R</td> <td data-bbox="1630 584 2069 730"> <p>Defines the house number suffix as per Australian Standard AS4590-1999.</p> <p>The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times.</p> <p>This field may only contain alphanumeric characters.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<i>HouseNumber</i>	NUMERIC(5)	R	<p>Defines the house number per Australian Standard AS4590-1999. Defines the house number as per Australian Standard AS4590-1999.</p> <p>The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times.</p>	IN RANGE: 0-99999				<i>HouseNumberSuffix</i>	VARCHAR(1)	R	<p>Defines the house number suffix as per Australian Standard AS4590-1999.</p> <p>The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times.</p> <p>This field may only contain alphanumeric characters.</p>
<i>HouseNumber</i>	NUMERIC(5)	R	<p>Defines the house number per Australian Standard AS4590-1999. Defines the house number as per Australian Standard AS4590-1999.</p> <p>The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times.</p>											
IN RANGE: 0-99999														
<i>HouseNumberSuffix</i>	VARCHAR(1)	R	<p>Defines the house number suffix as per Australian Standard AS4590-1999.</p> <p>The combination of House Number and House Number Suffix may occur up to two times.</p> <p>This field may only contain alphanumeric characters.</p>											
<p>2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>CitiPower Powercor strongly recommends proposed schema changes are bundled with the AEMC accelerate smart meter rollout changes to minimise unnecessary schema changes.</p>												

Topic	Question	Comments
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.	<p>CitiPower Powercor recommends that the Optional/Mandatory or Required element for <i>PersonNameTitle</i> and <i>PersonNameGiven</i> remains as “Required” and the element should not be supplied if the Title or Name is not known.</p> <p>CitiPower Powercor suggests the following description amendments:</p> <p><i>“Defines a person's title as per Australian Standard AS4590-2017 – AMD1 2020. Where no title is available to populate PersonNameTitle, the element should not be supplied”.</i></p> <p><i>“Defines a person's given name as per Australian Standard AS4590-2017 – AMD1 2020. Where no title is available to populate PersonNameGiven, the element should not be supplied”.</i></p>
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 comment
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.	CitiPower Powercor supports the proposed changes
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 comment

Topic	Question	Comments
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.	CitiPower Powercor supports the proposed changes
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 comment
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.	CitiPower Powercor supports the proposed changes

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 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 comment
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.	CitiPower Powercor would like to know when is the proposed go live date?