

B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: *Evoenergy*

Completion Date: *04/07/2024*

[AEMO | B2B Procedures v3.9](#)

Issues paper
[b2b-v39-issues-paper.pdf \(aemo.com.au\)](#)

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
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 alternative proposed
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.	Yes
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.	Yes
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	Yes. Tampering with an existing B2B transaction with important metering location details is a high risk as this existing information may be lost. A new B2B between the Initiator and Recipient parties (as this will only encompass FRMP and MC).

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>	Prefer 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>	Agree
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

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.	Yes
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.	Yes
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.	Yes
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.	Yes
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.	Yes
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