

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (procedure changes)
- Service Order (procedure changes)
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification (version change)
- Technical Delivery Specification (procedure changes)
- B2B Guide (document changes)

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Jemena

Completion Date: 28/6/2021

Table of Contents

- 0. Example Submission (Please delete this section) 3
- 1. Issues Paper Questions 4
- 2. Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process 9
- 3. Service Order Process 9
- 4. Technical Delivery Specification 10
- 5. B2B Guide 10
- 6. Technical Delivery Specification **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

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):

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. Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 1: Do you support the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes. See also Topic 2.10 below.
2.1.1 Remove Unstructured Site Address	Question 2: If the Changes in respect of Removal of Unstructured Site Address were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	No - N/A to Jemena
2.1.2 Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number	Question 4: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Add Section and Delivery Point (DP) Number were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	No - N/A to Jemena
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 5: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Person Name fields? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes

Topic	Question	Comments
2.2 Changes to Person Name Given and Person Name Title fields	Question 6: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	Yes
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 7: Do you support the changes detailed with regards to Coincident Service Order Logic for non-regulated businesses? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes
2.3 Treatment of Coincident De-Energisation and Re-Energisation SOs by Non-Regulated Businesses	Question 8: If the changes proposed in this document with regards to Person Name fields were to be adopted, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	Yes
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 9: Do you support the inclusion of the process flow with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Yes

Topic	Question	Comments
2.4 Unauthorised Connection Process	Question 10: If the process flow proposed in this document with regards to Unauthorised Connection Process is included in the B2B Guide, would your organisation have any issues with an implementation date of 7 November 2022?	Yes

Topic	Question	Comments
<p>2.10 Questions on proposed changes</p>	<p>Question 11: Are there better options to accommodate the proposed change that better achieve the stated objectives? What are the related pros and cons? How would they be implemented?</p>	<p>Q1) Can AEMO synchronised the Structured Address format in B2M & B2B? Specifically, the handling of second house number?</p> <p>1) MSDR Ph 1 (B2M) will introduce “HouseNumberTo” (May 2022) in it’s roadmap to use “Structured Address”. i.e. <code><HouseNumber>4</HouseNumber></code> <code><HouseNumberTo>10</HouseNumberTo></code></p> <p>2) However, in B2B, the current way is repeating <code><HouseNumber></code> field and we don’t see any change suggested in B2B v3.7 (Nov 2022). i.e. <code><HouseNumber>4</HouseNumber></code> <code><HouseNumber>10</HouseNumber></code> Can B2B v3.7 follows the same as MSDR?</p> <p>Q2) Change to Structured Address has been introduced in section 5.5 – only for Life Support Notification (LSN) Transactions. Why the same change hasn’t been introduced for Customer Details Notification (CDN) Transactions ? There should be consistency between those 2 Transactions – LSN & CDN.</p>

Topic	Question	Comments
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 12: What are the main challenges in adopting these proposed changes? How should these challenges be addressed?	<p>The benefits of having structured address is accuracy of information and streamlined development effort.</p> <p>However, having 2 structured address XML format (B2B vs B2M) from AEMO defeats this purpose.</p>
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 13: What are the costs and/ or benefits if the proposed changes were not made? Consider the perspectives of process, training, system and customer impacts.	
2.10 Questions on proposed changes	Question 14: 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>Q1) In <i>B2B PROCEDURE: TECHNICAL DELIVERY SPECIFICATION v3.7</i>, will AEMO consider update all reference to AS4590 to AS4590-2020 instead of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS4590-1999 for Address & Telephone • AS4590-2006 for BusinessName, and • AS4590-2020 for PersonName and related, etc. <p>Q2) In <i>B2B PROCEDURE: TECHNICAL DELIVERY SPECIFICATION v3.7</i>, Table 3 (pg 20) , Item 16, PERSONNAME id “Defines a person’s legal name as PER <u>AS4590-1999</u>. See Section 3.5” but in Section 3.5 (pg24), Table 5, the reference are all updated to “<u>AS4590-2020</u>”.</p> <p>I suppose Table 3 will need to be corrected to AS4590-2020.</p>

2. Customer Site Details Notification Process Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

3. Service Order Process

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

4. Technical Delivery Specification

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments

5. B2B Guide

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments