

B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: Intellihub

Completion Date: 11/07/2024

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.	We agree with adding 'LMRP' as a new Regulatory Classification.
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.	We suggest the fields RegClassification and PurposeOfRequest be made mandatory for the sub type of Install Meter, Move Meter, Exchange Meter and Remove Meter. This will help to promote a more consistent and defined information exchange, which will help avoid miscommunication on the timeframe and process that needs to be followed by the recipient.
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.	<p>We agree with adding 'Defect Rectified' as a new Purpose of Request.</p> <p>Table 13 Transaction table PurposeOfRequest field: We suggest the description for 'Defect Rectified' be amended to describe what it means as opposed to defining an obligation. We suggest the following: 'Defect Rectified' is to be used to inform the Recipient that the customer has advised the defect has been remediated.</p>

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.	We believe the exception code of 'Shared Fuse - Scoping Required' is not required because 'Shared Supply Point' already exists. As per the draft rule the DNSP is responsible for determining if the one-in-all-in process is required, as opposed to the MP. We suggest the B2B Procedure be aligned with the draft rule to allow participants to better meet their regulatory obligations and where possible to have a consistent process for all shared fuse scenarios. Therefore we suggest the exception code of 'Shared Fuse - Scoping Required' be removed and the retailer always raise a Temporary Isolation -Scoping Request when they receive an exception code of 'Shared Supply Point'.
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	We wish to suggest additional exception codes, see Appendix A below, so the reason for the service order not being completed can be communicated effectively (noting that usually this will often drive a process to remove the barrier and allow the service order to be raised again).
2.1.5 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes	Question 6: Please indicate your preference for sending and receiving Nature-of-defect information, between: 1) Using modified SAR and SAN as described in this Issues Paper and marked up procedures, 2) Introducing two new B2B transactions dedicated to requesting and receiving nature-of-defect information.	Our first preference is to have the nature of defect information populated in MSATS as this will provide a more effective way to communicate this information to entitled participants. If the defect information is not available in MSATS then we suggest utilising the SAR and SAN with a new field added for the defect information, which will allow for access, hazard and defects to be communicated within one request and response process.

<p>2.1.7 Shared Fusing Meter Replacement</p>	<p>Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.</p>	<p><u>Glossary and Framework</u></p> <p>We suggest the following terms be defined in the glossary:</p> <p>Original MC Participant ID: the participant id of the Metering Coordinator who identified a shared fuse as per clause 7.8.10D of the NER</p> <p>Coordinated Interruption ID: an id that comprise of two information separated by - as a delimiter. The first information is a unique id from the DNSP denoting a job number for a temporary isolation job. The second information is the number of NMIs that requires a meter exchange under the temporary isolation job. For example, 1234567890-10 where 1234567890 is a unique id from the DNSP and 10 is the number of NMIs that requires a meter exchange. Note for a job that requires a temporary isolation over multiple days then the unique id must be different for each day and the number of NMIs must be the number of NMIs that requires a meter exchange for that day.</p> <p><u>Service Order Process</u></p> <p>Table 3 Service Order Types and Subtypes:</p> <p>Temporary Isolation - Scoping Request subtype: Replace ‘and can be successfully completed’ with ‘and has not identified a defect’. We believe this is more reflective of the criteria for this service order sub type.</p> <p>Temporary Isolation - One In All In subtype: suggest description be ‘DNSP is requested to proceed with the temporary isolation for a one in all in process’. We believe this is more reflective of the usage for this service order sub type.</p> <p>Clause 2.6.a.ii:</p> <p>We suggest this clause be reworded to be clearer on what must be done and when it must be done. We suggest this clause be reworded to (note, this suggestion is made on the basis that the above suggestion to remove the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>exception code of 'Shared Fuse - Scoping Required' is accepted. If this suggestion is not accepted then we believe another Regulatory Classification value is required e.g. a new value of 'One In All In'):</p> <p>When the Service Order is 'Metering Service Works' and the Regulatory Classification value is 'Shared Fuse' then the Initiator must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • populate the ScheduledDate in the service order with the StartDate provided by the DNSP in the MFIN OWN • populate the CustomerPreferredDateAndTime in the service order with the StartDate and StartTime provided by the DNSP in the MFIN OWN <p>Table 13 Transaction table</p> <p>FormNumber:</p> <p>We believe the Coordinated Interruption ID should not be in the Form Number field because currently this field is required to be populated for an Exchange Meter service order which means there may be a conflict in having to provide two different information in the same field.</p> <p>We suggest the Coordinated Interruption ID be populated in the Special Instructions field because it will also allow for the duration of the temporary isolation to be communicated. Therefore, we suggest the following be added to the Special Instructions field:</p> <p>Mandatory when the Service Order is 'Metering Service Works' and the RegClassification is 'Shared Fuse'. The initiator must, as the first characters within this field, provide the Coordinated Interruption ID and the Duration provided by the DNSP in the MFIN OWN separated by # as the delimiter. For example: 1234567890-10#08:00#</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Mandatory when subtype is Temporary Isolation – One In All In. The initiator must, as the first characters within this field, provide the Coordinated Interruption ID provided by the DNSP in the MFIN OWN with # as the end delimiter. For example: 1234567890-10#</p> <p>Co-ordinatingContactName: Should say: must be populated with the Original MC Participant ID for ‘Temporary Isolation – Scoping Request’. We don’t believe this information is required for a Temporary Isolation – One In All In subtype.</p> <p><u>One Way Notification Process</u></p> <p>Planned Interruption Notification (PIN): ReasonForInter field: the note under ‘Distribution Works’ is not appropriate in the procedure because this describes how a retailer may treat this value. We suggest this note be removed from the procedure (or if desired it could be added to the B2B Guide).</p> <p>Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFIN): Notes field: suggest that this be made clearer</p> <p>Mandatory when ReasonForNotice of ‘Other’ or ‘One In All In’ is used.</p> <p>When ReasonForNotice of ‘One In All In’ is used then the initiator must, as the first characters within this field, provide the Coordinated Interruption ID and the Original MC Participant ID separated by # as the delimiter. For example: 1234567890-10#MYMC#</p>
--	--	---

Topic	Question	Comments
		Note for a job that requires a temporary isolation over multiple days then the unique id must be different for each day and the number of NMIs must be the number of NMIs that requires a meter exchange for that day
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.	See above
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..	
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.	

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 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.	
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.	
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.	
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.	

Topic	Question	Comments
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.	
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.	
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.	
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.	104.5.a: it is not clear what is meant by 'the original AEMO Communication notification' – could this be made clearer? 104.5.b: this clause should reference the NMI list report from AEMO (as suggested by clause 104.7.i)

Topic	Question	Comments
<p>2.6 B014/23 - Define obligations for managing inflight service orders sent to metering service providers when a ROLR event is declared.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<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>We suggest a new event code be added to table 16 to support the use case where a service order without 'defect rectified' is received and MSATS has the defect flag set to 'yes'. We suggest the business event be described as: Recipient believes a defect exist and has not received confirmation that the defect has been rectified</p>

Appendix A – suggestion for additional service order exception codes

Value	Definition	Used with ServiceOrderStatus
Not Ready	The metering installation is not ready for a meter to be installed. Customer is required to engage a licenced person to get the metering installation ready for a meter to be installed	Not Completed
Mismatch with standing data	Standing data in MSATS not aligned with metering installation. Could be crossed metering or incorrect labelling etc	Not Completed
Wrong service order	Wrong service order or sub type raised. Service order raised is not applicable for the metering installation	Not Completed
Coordination failure	Another required party did not attend or cancelled	Not Completed

Defect identified on shared fuse scenario	DNSP was requested to scope a shared fuse scenario and has identified that an impacted NMI has a defect flagged in MSATS	Not Completed
---	--	---------------