**B2BWG notes 7th and 8th Sept 2016**

**CDN**

CDN’s can be sent to DB, MP’s and Retailers.

Four blocks of customer information required as opposed to the one block that is available today. The description of the use of this information needs to be updated to reflect the four different blocks of information.

The four different blocks discussed were:

Outage Contact

Account Holder Contact

Life Support Contact

Evidence

There was some discussion around seeking legal advice on allowing the Retailers to provide account holder contact information. What needs to be done from a privacy act perspective? Do the Retailers need to change contracts/scripts/etc? Do the DB’s need to update documentations to ensure they are only using this information for its intended use? DB’s advise they would use account holder information for mail outs for POEL’s, vegetation issues etc.

Where life support is flagged then the life support contact mandatory information must be completed. If life support not flagged then this block is not required.

The Life support contact name is to be the contact name required for DB’s to contact to enable them to provide any information of outages or any other emergency reasons. It should be a person who is capable of making decisions and providing information on behalf of the person on life support.

New field for evidence of life support. If this is Y then the mandatory information in the evidence block needs to be completed. Retailers advised they may not have all of the evidence at the time of initial notification of life support. This would be provided in a new CDN when this information was received. DB’s could build processes for follow up of evidence.

**Fields required for each block - \* equals mandatory #required**

Outage Contact:

\*Contact Name

\*Contact Number (at least one)

Mobile

Home

Work

\*Postal Address

#Business Name

#email address

Account Contact:

\*Contact Name

\*Contact Number (at least one)

Mobile

Home

Work

\*Postal Address

#Business Name

#email address

Life Support Contact:

\*Contact Name

\*Contact Number (at least one)

Mobile

Home

Work

\*Postal Address

#Business Name

#email address

Evidence Block (from forms sent by Mark R)

\*Govt Form Received Y/N

\*Equipment type (list)

Positive Airway Pressure (24 hours)

Home Dialysis

Ventilator

Other

(free txt field)

**CDR**

AEMO to review reasons list for raising CDR.

Update who can send CDR

New rejection codes (if required)

**SAHN (site access hazard notification)**

Pre-installation was discussed with the view that this info was at a point in time. Hazards and access information to be provided in this request. All parties are to update other relevant parties when they become aware of any new or removal of any old hazards or access issues.

A SAHR (site access hazard request) was discussed and agreed by participants that is it required. This could be sent by any party to any party for them to provide any information that they may have. MP’s and Retailers would have primarily have the customer related hazards and access issues where as the DB’s would historically have site information (this may become less relevant as DB’s would not be visiting the site as often in the future).

Discussion around removal of hazards/access: participants discussed that hazards should only be removed if an assessment was done on the existing hazards/access and deemed to be no longer relevant. All parties will need to start believing the information they’re receiving is correct at the time of being sent. Customer hazard/access information to be removed when a customer vacates the property.

**Planned Interruptions**

Retailer initiated, 4 days’ notice must be provided to customer and DB.

OWN (one way notification) was discussed as the transaction for this notification. A two week window was discussed as a maximum date range.

Can have the capability of including more than 1 NMI

**Fields - \* equals mandatory #required**

\*NMI

\*Start Date

\*End Date

\*Duration

#Time

**8th Sept**

Participants discussed:

The use of some of the transactions wasn’t clear or agreed.

Desktop walk through was required

Supporting documentation required.

AEMO advised this would be taken on notice and we have discussed the possibility of a guideline document.

**Meter Fault Notice**

Failure vs fault

Failure

Not meeting metrology

Fault

Electronically malfunctioning

Fault and off supply

HV injection

Single meter not safe to connect

Must have a flag Cust on Supply - Y/N

**Some reasons in the notification**

Comms failure

Accuracy failure (metrology)

Family failure

T/sw failure

Controlled load failure

Contactor failure

Potential meter fault

No display

Meter Verification ( to be used where DB has performed safety checks including opening and resealing the meter (where allowed under contract or jurisdiction)) This will advise the MP they have done the work and a business decision can be made as to whether they visit the site to ensure everything is fine.

Other

Anna from Endeavour suggested a flag could be put into MSATS to show a meter faulty. This would enable current and prospective parties to discover it.

Miscellaneous – no change to s/o other that parties that can initiate and receive s/o

**New potential naming conventions**

High level transaction names:

Meter works

Supply works (dnsp works)

**OWN to advise Retailer of tariff change**

This is existing and needs to be reviewed to see if it’s still fit for purpose in the new world. Review when it would be used.

**Actions from both days:**

Mark R to send life support forms to AEMO - done

David S to send list of Sensitive Load reasons/sites eg Traffic lights, pumps etc

AEMO to investigate the suggestion of adding latitude and longitude to the NOMW s/o

Chris C to send papers that were sent to the IEC to the B2BWG

MP’s to chase up Sean C with information required for Meter Request Form

AEMO to review wording in OWN procedure to incorporate any business language for peer to peer.

Brett Mc to circulate NMI enquiry fields.

**Issues/risks and Other from both days:**

New Issues:

* Are LNSPs/Other B2B Parties access customer data relating to the contract holder with the Retailer – the CSDN will now have the ability to hold the customer contact information for outage, Life support and for the contract holder which may be different in each case.  There was an Issue raised by Retailers in relation to passing this information on to MPs or LNSPs – privacy or commercial concerns may limit the ability of retailers to share this information – however contact details in relation to outage or life support should not be affected.  Retailers to obtain Legal advice on this matter as appropriate.
* Life support customers in Embedded Networks.  It was discussed that a Life Support customer that is in an embedded Network will need to inform not only there retailer but also the retailer of the parent meter or Embedded Network Operator to ensure that they are contacted in outage situations.  It was discussed that the responsibility for this would fall to the Embedded Network Operator – and potentially to the new accredited B2B representative party the ENM or Embedded Network Manager – although they would not hold any responsibility for this matter under law.   The new CSDN B2B transaction will allow parties to advise one another of the Life Support status of the customer and meet there regulatory obligations (ENO could ask ENM to do this on their behalf)
* Life Support Contact detail removal – one of the issues with transfer of Life Support contact details between B2B parties is that there is no agreed way for these to be removed from Retailer/Distributor or now Metering Provider systems.  Once they have been entered it is not in the interests of the party to remove this flag.  This had led to the growth of Life Support flagged sites across the network.   Unless there is a centralised database this issue is unlikely to be resolved in the short term.
* Bridging Meter during storm or HV cross-over incidents – Brett informed the group that Victorian DBs had a problem with bridging  – connecting the power supply to the house bypassing the Meter – and regarded it as not a safe practice.  Other DNSPs indicated that this might be a practice they would undertake in certain circumstances.  However the Meter Fault notice was a transaction designed to allow the DNSP to inform the Retailer that the Meter may need to be replaced in a storm or similar situation.  It was noted that these are rare events.
* Planned retailer outage for Group supply – no automation at this stage, co-ordination will need to be facilitated between the parties via other communication (email, phone call).

New Risks

* Risk of not including detailed Process Flows in the procedures will mean that participants use the B2B procedures and B2B transactions incorrectly or not as they were intended.  AEMO responded that we are designing the procedures to be flexible enough for participants to use them as best they see fit – while still allowing them to meet regulatory requirements.
* There is a risk that without a full test of use of the new procedures that there may be critical elements of the communications missing which may not be picked up before we take the procedures to formal consultation.  AEMO will attempt to redraft procedures as quick as practicable to allow for this to happen before we go to formal consultation – in addition AEMO and the B2B WG will look to draft a Common Business Practice or Usage Handbook which may be owned by the IEC and sit alongside the formal procedures to provide guidance on the usage of the transactions for B2B participants.

MSATS updates

* A question arouse relating to the storage of Hazard and Access information in a NMI update Details field – however the group felt that more often the Hazard detail held by a DNSP or MP would be customer rather than site related which meant that MSATs may not be the best place to hold this information.
* Anna Russo mentioned that Endeavour Energy was looking to store faulty meter information in MSATs at a NMI level – to be available in a NMI discovery.  This would flag that the meter would need to be exchanged within a 6 month period from the time it was entered into MSATs – this would give the current and prospective retailer an opportunity to choose to churn the meter or win or not win the site based on the fact that they would be responsible for a meter upgrade at some point.  Anna and Endeavour will need to recommend to AEMO a change to MSATs to allow this information to be input.

P2P transactions – a question was raised as to whether this was included in the B2B procedures – AEMO noted that these would be mentioned in the B2B Technical guidelines document.