

B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: Ausgrid

Completion Date: 11/7/24

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.	Agree with change.
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.	Agree with change.
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.	Ausgrid believes there should be an exception code which identifies a defect AND Shared isolation. As the MP needs to inform the retailer that it is a shared fuse and a defect so the retailer can trigger the defect process and not raise a one in all in scoping service orders to the LNSP until the defect is rectified.
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	<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>	Ausgrid supports option 2.
2.1.7 Shared Fusing Meter Replacement	<p>Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.</p>	<p>Ausgrid supports this procedure change.</p> <p>Ausgrid believes further consideration should be given to additional fields to include original MC and the Coordinated Interruption ID' in the meter malfunction notification raised by the LNSP.</p>
2.1.7 Shared Fusing Meter Replacement	<p>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.</p>	No.
2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements	<p>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.</p>	Agree with change.

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.	Agree with change.
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.
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.	Agree with change.
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.	Agree with change.
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.	Agree with change.
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.	Agree with change.
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.
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.	No.