

B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: Origin Energy

Completion Date: 11th 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.	Origin agrees with the new value of 'LMRP' under the Regulatory Classification field of Service Order Request transaction.
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.	Notwithstanding the effective dates of various requirements might change due to the delay of the final AEMC rule, Origin agrees with the approach laid out in the B2B issues paper in relation to the LMRP objectives.
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.	Origin suggests that since a new value of 'RemediationSuccessful' has been proposed in MSATS as Site Remediation Status, which serves the same purpose, the 'Defect Rectified' value is redundant. Origin understands that it might be useful to reinforce customer's advise of defect remediation and if the recipients see additional benefit of this value in a MSW Service Order, Origin does not have any objections. However, where multiple values of 'Purpose of Request' field could be applicable, e.g. 'Defect Rectified' for 'Additional Meter,' it would be better if this field allows repeated values.

Topic	Question	Comments						
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.	<p>Table 5 ExceptionCodes Usage Rules</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1144 320 1323 344">Value</th> <th data-bbox="1323 320 1675 344">Definition</th> <th data-bbox="1675 320 2051 344">Used with ServiceOrderStatus</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1144 344 1323 384">Customer On-Site</td> <td data-bbox="1323 344 1675 384">There is a Customer at Site and the Site was not de-energised.</td> <td data-bbox="1675 344 2051 475"> <p>Limited to a physical De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'.</p> <p>Not allowed for De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with ServiceOrderSubType of "Remove Fuse" or "Pillar-Box, PitorPole-Top" and De-energisation Reason "Non-Payment (DNP)".</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It should be allowed for all de-en scenarios, where applicable. Errata fix: Not Completed should not be struck-off.</p> <p>Throughout the Service Order Processes Procedure, there is inconsistent use of terminology, i.e. <i>ExceptionCodes</i> and <i>ExceptionCode</i> and <i>exception codes</i>. Need to verify the correct field name.</p>	Value	Definition	Used with ServiceOrderStatus	Customer On-Site	There is a Customer at Site and the Site was not de-energised.	<p>Limited to a physical De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'.</p> <p>Not allowed for De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with ServiceOrderSubType of "Remove Fuse" or "Pillar-Box, PitorPole-Top" and De-energisation Reason "Non-Payment (DNP)".</p>
Value	Definition	Used with ServiceOrderStatus						
Customer On-Site	There is a Customer at Site and the Site was not de-energised.	<p>Limited to a physical De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'.</p> <p>Not allowed for De-energisation ServiceOrderRequests with ServiceOrderSubType of "Remove Fuse" or "Pillar-Box, PitorPole-Top" and De-energisation Reason "Non-Payment (DNP)".</p>						
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	Agree with the proposed approach						

<p>2.1.5 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes</p>	<p>Question 6: Please indicate your preference for sending and receiving Nature-of-defect information, between:</p> <p>1) Using modified SAR and SAN as described in this Issues Paper and marked up procedures,</p> <p>2) Introducing two new B2B transactions dedicated to requesting and receiving nature-of-defect information.</p>	<p>Origin’s preference will be to introduce two new transactions to record this information. The reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing field will have to be leveraged to store both Hazard and Defect information, which could lead to potential loss of data and version control issues. - This could cause confusion when communicating the issue with customers (unable to differentiate hazard vs defect issues) and potential errors when updating the same. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For example – Actual Hazard could be “Dog” and Defect could be “None” so unless we make any changes to the way we store information in our source system and split it based on the values from the same field (which would be complex), it would record “Dog None.” - Agree with the enumerated values to classify the nature of defect. However this field alone would not suffice conversation with customer, so we suggest free text to record additional details which could be an optional field. - <p>We recommend the structure of new transactions as below:</p> <p><u>DefectInformationRequest Data</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1122 986 2074 1316"> <thead> <tr> <th>Field</th> <th>Format</th> <th>Use</th> <th>Definition/Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>NMI</i></td> <td>CHAR(10)</td> <td>M</td> <td>NMI</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>NMIChecksum</i></td> <td>CHAR(1)</td> <td>O</td> <td>NMI Checksum</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Reason</i></td> <td>VARCHAR(40)</td> <td>M</td> <td>The Initiator should provide a Reason for the request in this field, Allowed Values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Retailer for site • Nature of Defect </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Field	Format	Use	Definition/Comments	<i>NMI</i>	CHAR(10)	M	NMI	<i>NMIChecksum</i>	CHAR(1)	O	NMI Checksum	<i>Reason</i>	VARCHAR(40)	M	The Initiator should provide a Reason for the request in this field, Allowed Values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Retailer for site • Nature of Defect
Field	Format	Use	Definition/Comments															
<i>NMI</i>	CHAR(10)	M	NMI															
<i>NMIChecksum</i>	CHAR(1)	O	NMI Checksum															
<i>Reason</i>	VARCHAR(40)	M	The Initiator should provide a Reason for the request in this field, Allowed Values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Retailer for site • Nature of Defect 															

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other <p>Note: Where the initiator is a new Retailer requesting defect information from the recipient, it should use the value of 'New Retailer for site'</p> <p>Where the existing Retailer is seeking Defect Information it should use the value of 'Nature of Defect'</p>	
		<i>SpecialNotes</i>	VARCHAR(240)	O/M	Any additional information the Initiator wishes to convey to the Recipient. Mandatory if Reason is "Other"
<u>DefectInformationResponse Data</u>					
		Field	Format	Use	Definition/Comments
		<i>NMI</i>	CHAR(10)	M	NMI
		<i>NMIChecksum</i>	CHAR(1)	O	NMI Checksum
		<i>DefectInformation</i>	VARCHAR(40)	M	<p>This field repeats to allow the reporting of multiple defects.</p> <p><u>Standard values</u> One or more of the following standard values in bold can be used, where applicable:</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Topic	Question	Comments			
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WIRINGNCOM means non-compliant wiring identified including earthing system issues that must be repaired • BOXDAMAGED means meter box is damaged or not weather proof. • OBSTRUCTION means vegetation or other material is impeding safe access to metering installation. • NONE used where no defect code is known
		<i>LastModifiedDateTime</i>	DATETIME	M	Date and time that the record was updated in the Initiator's system.
		<i>SpecialNotes</i>	VARCHAR(240)	O	Any additional information the Recipient wishes to convey to the Initiator. Any information that does not require an electrician to rectify the defect could be provided in this field instead. E.g. OBSTRUCTION means vegetation or other material is impeding safe access to metering installation.

Topic	Question	Comments
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.	Origin agrees with the proposed approach however recommends adding a new value of 'One In All In' as ReasonForInter field, instead of repurposing 'Distribution Works' of the PIN transaction.
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.	Origin agrees with the proposed approach
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.	Origin agrees with the proposed principles

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.	Origin understands that AEMO is considering aligning the ‘address’ elements across B2M, B2B and Gas Markets via creation of the Energy Addressing Guide. While these ICFs have been endorsed by the IEC, Origin supports a single release cycle to implement these schema changes across the board to ensure there are no address element mismatches in participants’ application systems, especially for those who operate in both electricity and gas markets.
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.	Origin supports implementing the address field element changes across B2B, B2M and Gas Markets altogether.
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.	Origin supports the proposed changes
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.	Origin supports the proposed approach

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.	Origin 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 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.	Origin supports the proposed approach
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 comments

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.	Origin supports the proposed approach
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 comments

Topic	Question	Comments
<p>2.12 Questions on proposed changes</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>General comments</p> <p>Service Order Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table 7 & 8 in page 27 need to be updated for new SSW SO Subtypes - Section 2.6 (ii) reword as follows: Where both the ScheduledDate and CustomerPreferredDateAndTime fields are completed for the purposes of a 'One In All In' Shared fusing meter replacement process, procedure ('One In All In') the ScheduledDate and CustomerPreferredDateAndTime should be populated by the Retailer in the MSW Meter Exchange Service Order to the MC with the date and time provided by the DNSP in the MFIN OWN - FormNumber definition to be updated along the same lines as above, i.e. 'Shared fusing meter replacement procedure' to be replaced with 'Shared fusing meter replacement process.' - Table 12 Supply Service Works definition to be updated similar to the above. <p>Technical Delivery Specification Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It appears that StreetName/type/suffix can occur up to two times and it is supported in schema however not sure if it has ever been used this way? If so, there could be other fields e.g. HouseNumber, etc. that can also occur up to two times.