Meeting Notes – B2B-WG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MEETING: | Business-to-Business Working Group |
| DATE: | Tuesday, 9 August 2022 |
| TIME: | 9:30am-12:00pm  |
| LOCATION: | Teleconference |
| meeting #: | 09 |
| CONTACT | b2bwg@aemo.com.au  |

ATTENDEES:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Company  |
| Blaine Miner (Chair) | AEMO |
| Nandu Datar | AEMO |
| Meghan Bibby | AEMO |
| Aakash Sembey | Origin Energy |
| Adrian Honey | TasNetworks |
| Carla Adolfo | intelliHub |
| Christophe Bechia | Red/Lumo |
| David Woods | SA Power Networks |
| Dino Ou | Endeavour Energy |
| Graeme Ferguson | Essential Energy |
| Helen Vassos | PLUS ES |
| Jo Sullivan | Energy Australia |
| Mark Riley | AGL |
| Paul Greenwood | VectorAMS |
| Robert Lo Giudice | Alinta Energy |
| Robert Mitchell | EnergyQueensland |
| Wayne Farrell | Yurika |

# Preliminary matters

## Acknowledgment and Apologies

Kate Gordon and Lenard Bull were noted as apologies.

## Confirm agenda

The B2B-WG confirmed the agenda. No other items.

## Action items from previous meeting and standing list of consultation items

Blaine Miner noted that the following items were being proposed to be closed since the last meeting:

| **Action Meeting Date** | **Description** | **Responsible** | **Outcome** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1005-01 | Alignment between aseXML schema and the Australian standard. (This replaces action item 0803-11) | B2B WG | ICF has been raised |
| 1005-05 | Consider the potential impact of flexible trading arrangement and the ability for an IRP to raise a metering related service order | B2B WG | To be considered as part of 2303-01 |
| 1207-06 | Consider what additional information they may require completing their IESS impact assessments | B2B WG | Links to relevant documents provided by AEMO to the B2B WG |
| 1207-08 | Interact with David Woods to further review the DL AEMO USER GROUP email and then remove it from the distribution list | Nandu Datar (AEMO) | The email DL AEMO USER GROUP removed from B2B WG distribution list |
| 1207-10 | Perform initial analysis of the survey responses and provide a summary to the B2B WG. Also provide the actual survey response details | Nandu Datar (AEMO) | Initial Analysis completed and report made available to the B2B WG |

Discussion on Open action items:

* Open action items were discussed.

# Items for discussion or noting

## B2M Update – Blaine Miner

Discussion:

* Blaine Miner provided an overview of the current B2M activities, more details were provided in the appendix of the slide pack. Two new ICFs were recently raised in the ERCF.
* Helen Vassos, Mark Riley, Wayne Farrell and Robert Lo Giudice spoke to the ICF related to the ‘CT ratio available’ field.

## IEC ICFs – Current and emerging – B2B WG

Discussion:

B002 and B004

* Blaine Miner spoke to the list of current ICFs and queried if there was any additional feedback from members re ICFs B002 and B004.
	+ Wayne Farrell queried about the FormNumber and FornReference fields and their link to DP and Section Number fields. Aakash Sembey noted the fields FormNumber and FornReference fields are used to capture DP and Section Number fields in NSW and ACT.
	+ David Woods raised concerns around the risk of making changes without sufficient benefit. He mentioned that the proponents should present examples of where any mismatch of fields lengths between B2M and B2B were creating issues to the industry and support these examples with indicative volumes. David agrees that there doesn’t appear to be any urgency in progressing these changes. Addressing these changes are likely to have a flow on impact to Participant systems and therefore need to ensure any changes are considered on a field-by-field basis.
	+ Mark Riley responded, ‘While AGL agrees with SAPN over the potential impact of a field length change, AGL is concerned that wherever data elements can be created by outside bodies (e.g. address information), B2B and B2M field lengths should match the Australian Standards, to ensure that as participants we can accommodate these data elements.
	+ Aakash questioned if previously provided benefits supporting the B2M field length changes could be shared with the WG.
	+ Blaine noted that the ‘status’ of the 2 ICFs will be updated to ‘analysis’.
	+ Blaine asked if the WG would prefer to combine the 2 ICFs or keep them separate. The members preferred to keep them connected but separate.

Actions:

* Mark Riley and Aakash Sembey to provide further justification regarding the benefits of the proposed B002 and B004 ICFs.
* AEMO to attempt to locate previously provided B2M field length change justifications.

B001

* Mark Riley confirmed that this ICF has not yet been drafted.
* Mark Riley offered to draft the ICF provided that members were supportive of the ICF’s intent.
* David Woods and Dino Ou requested additional justification for this proposed change.

Actions:

* Mark Riley to draft the ICF, including justifications
* B2B WG to provide potential use cases to Mark in support of the ICF drafting

B003 and B005

* Blaine reminded members to send their feedback through re these ICFs.

Actions:

* B2B WG to review ICFs B003 and B005 and to send through any feedback.

B006

* Nandu Datar provided context re the proposed ICF (ICF has not yet been drafted). Nandu noted the discrepancy related to FormReference and FormNumber fields between the Service Order Process and B2B Guide. Nandu also noted inconsistencies against the field FormReference in Table 13.
* Nandu Datar also spoke to the issue about inconsistent descriptions against PersonNameTitle and PersonNameGiven fields in the Technical Specification. Nandu also noted Helen Vassos’ suggestion to notify wider participants about any ‘temporary corrections’.
* Mark Riley suggested publishing a running errata sheet for such minor corrections that would be formally consulted on and implemented at a later date.
* As part of the discussion, Blaine suggested the inclusion of a ‘magnitude’ e.g. minor or major change and the ‘target effective/implementation date’ in the ICF table and register.

Actions:

* Nandu and Helen to discuss and develop an ICF for the PersonNameTitle and PersonNameGiven issue
* AEMO to consider publishing a running errata sheet for minor procedure corrections that will be implemented at a later date.

## IESS impact on B2B procedures – Blaine Miner

Discussion:

* Blaine provided some context re the potential impact of IESS on the B2B procedures.
* As a thought starter, Blaine queried if the IRP should be explicitly defined, and referenced as required, in the B2B procedures or for the term of ‘retailer’ to be replaced where appropriate across the procedures with a more generic term.
	+ Mark Riley noted that in certain circumstances the initiator can only be certain roles and not be left as generic.
* Members discussed the situations where the IRP will have access to B2B, require a retailer license and the link between IRP, FRMP and retailer.
* Members discussed potential scenarios associated to the ‘Small Resource Aggregator’ slide in the Appendix.
* Helen Vassos noted that until there is sufficient clarity about what the rule enables the IRP to do or not do in B2B, it is not possible to perform a comprehensive review of the B2B procedures.
	+ Helen noted that a review of the rule is required to understand its obligations on the IRP.
	+ Mark Riley noted that the members need to review the rules from their perspective.
* Paul Greenwood noted that transactions are designed to support a process and it is not clear what processes are applicable to an IRP.
* Blaine suggested that the B2B WG needs to collectively review the IESS Rule and then determine which B2B procedures/artifacts may be impacted and how they are impacted.
* Paul Greenwood noted that following the review of the Rule, a table like the one in the B2B Guide (showing various processes applicable to an IRP) should be developed.
* Mark Riley noted that the group review the Rule and then have a group discussion to explore scenarios and impacts. Any applicable questions, resulting from these discussions, can then be provided to the IESS team for their consideration and advice.
* Mark Riley requested for an editable version of the SGA diagram to be sent to him for scenario development purposes.
* Helen Vassos suggested the members review and interpret how the rules apply to their sector and then collectively as a group identify any discrepancies in those interpretations and arrive at an aligned position.
* Paul Greenwood suggested that the review of the rules can be divided by chapters among the members. Jo Sullivan offered to review chapter/s on retailer. Mark Riley offered to reviewed chapters on wholesale.

Actions:

* B2B WG to review the rule and identify potential impacts on the industry sector they represent in 6 weeks
* AEMO to organise an out of session IESS meeting for late Sept
* Mark Riley to prepare and circulate scenario diagrams over the next 2 weeks
* Paul Greenwood to prepare and circulate a table in MS Excel based on the Table 1 - B2B Transactions and Typical Participant combinations from the B2B Guide in the next 2 weeks

## B2B Guide Survey (Review Survey)

Discussion:

* Nandu Datar provided an over of the analysis of the B2B survey responses. Nandu noted that 11 responses were received from the B2B WG and then another 15 from the wider participants.
* Nandu spoke to key themes from the questions related to suggestions for improvements to the guide, additional information in the guide and the network handbook.
* Nandu spoke to his interpretation of certain collection of questions that was listed in the analysis document.
* David Woods noted ‘My summary of reading the feedback to the B2B Guide - 1. Still worth having the guide. 2. Make some formatting and content improvements - but with no urgency.’
* Nandu noted that the members need to identify the points from the survey responses that will not be considered for further action.
* Mark Riley suggested to propose to the IEC to provide funding to use an external resource to assist with improvements to the guide.
* Christophe Bechia suggested identifying which responses to the network handbook questions were from the networks and identify responses that were from the B2B WG members.
* Paul Greenwood queried networks’ thoughts on how the guide and their handbooks interact.

Actions:

* B2B WG to identify which of the survey responses will not require any further action.
* AEMO to identify which responses to additional information in network handbook were from the networks.
* AEMO to identify which responses to questions about improvements and additional information in the guide were from the B2B WG members.
* Networks to provide their view on how the guide and their handbooks interact.

# Other business

## MSATS outage windows

* Blaine Miner noted that an internal AEMO meeting is occurring on 15 Aug to subsequently support engagement with Industry.

## Wrap-up, actions, questions, parked issues

* The next B2B-WG meeting is scheduled for 13 September 2022.
* Members to send through any proposed agenda items, plus associated content, to the B2B WG mailbox.

Parked items:

* None