

B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation First Stage

Participant Response Template

Participant: SA Power Networks

Completion Date: 11-July-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.	SAPN supports this 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 comment
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.	SAPN supports this 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.	SAPN supports the proposed changes.
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 comment

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>	<p>Comparing to sending and receiving the Nature-of-Defect information via B2B transactions, SAPN sees having the data maintained in MSATS and sending and receiving the data via B2M transactions would be a more efficient approach, as well as allowing better data consistency. However, if the data cannot be maintained in MSATS and exchanged via B2M transactions and must be exchanged via B2B transactions, then SAPN sees option 2 would be a less preferred option comparing to option 1.</p>
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>SAPN supports the proposed changes.</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>	<p>No comment.</p>
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>	<p>SAPN supports the principles.</p>

<p>2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements</p>	<p>Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed procedure and schema changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.</p>	<p>In Table 7 “Field Lengths and Enumerations Procedural and schema modifications”, for the field “FormReference”, it is proposed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a Procedural change: “CHANGE to B2B Procedure Service Order Process v3.9 > Section 4.1 > Table 13: Field: FormReference Field Format: VARCHAR2(15) > VARCHAR2(20)”; 2. As a Schema change: “CHANGE the MaxLength Value FormReference from 15 to 20 in Electricity_r4n.xsd”. <p>However, the proposed changes are not reflected in B2B Procedure Service Order Process v3.9. On the other hand, in the same document the definition of the field “FormNumber” has been updated to include the additional sentence “To be populated with ‘Coordinated Interruption ID’ when raising SSW ‘Temporary Isolation – One In All In’ or MSW ‘Exchange Meter’ under a Shared fusing meter replacement procedure.”. Should it be the length of the field “FormNumber” instead of “FormReference” in the B2B Service Order Request be increased from 15 to 20? Furthermore, in B2B Procedure Service Order Process v3.9 the field “FormNumber” are still marked as “N” for Supply Service Works Temporary Isolation – All”, which does not reflect the change required for SSW ‘Temporary Isolation – One In All In’. Suggest it should be updated as “R/N” instead of “N”. Also please specify whether or not any information should be populated in the field “FormReference” for this use case to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Definition of the field “Notes” in Table 7 MeterFaultAndIssueNotification field values of B2B Procedure One Way Notification Process v3.9 suggested that “Where ‘One In All In’ is used, the sender should also populate the notes with the Coordinated Interruption ID (Job Number#meters) and initiating MC Participant ID in a concatenated form: Eg nnnnnnnnnn-nn-#MC#”. Note: Should an interruption need to rescheduled, a new MFIN is to be sent out with the same Coordinated Interruption ID as the original MFIN”. SAPN sees it is better to keeping the same full value and hence</p>
---	--	--

Topic	Question	Comments
		<p>also including the MC Participant ID value “#MC#” in the Notes when sending the new MFIN to allow better consistency and avoid extra logic to changing the value. Please advise if there’s reason not to. Along the same thinking, SAPN sees the value of the field “FormNumber” in the B2B Service Order Request should follow the same to and be populated with the Coordinated Interruption ID (Job Number#meters) and initiating MC Participant ID in a concatenated form: Eg nnnnnnnnnn-nn-#MC#, instead of only the Coordinated Interruption ID.</p> <p>Other than the above, SA Power Networks support the proposed change. However, we do not believe there is any urgency to implement this change. Given this change require changes to the schema, SAPN see it should not proceed on its own and wait to be included with other changes where a schema change is justified.</p>
<p>2.2 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 - B2B/B2M field lengths – Address elements</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Nothing further other than what have been provided in the response for Question 10.</p>
<p>2.3 B006/22 - PERSONNAME definition spec correction</p>	<p>Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes.</p>	<p>SAPN supports the proposed changes.</p>

Topic	Question	Comments
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 comment.
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.	SAPN supports the proposed changes.
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 comment.
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.	SAPN supports the proposed 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.	No comment.

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.	SAPN supports the proposed changes.
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 comment.

Topic	Question	Comments
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2B Procedure Customer and Site Details Notification Process v3.9: SAPN noticed that in Table 8: Data Requirements for SiteAccessNotification, one of the additional enumeration values for the field “HazardDescription” is “NONE”, which the intention is to be used where no defect code is known. SAPN sees that this might lead to ambiguity as “NONE” can potentially be misinterpreted as no defect. SAPN suggests using the existing stand hazard value “Not Known To Initiator” can help avoid the ambiguity. Or should the existing value “Not Known To Initiator” is reserved for Hazard only and cannot be used for Nature of Defect, then SAPN sees using value such as “UNKNOWN” or “UNCLASSIFIED” would still better reflect the meaning of “no defect code is known” as comparing to using the value “NONE”. • B2B Procedure Service Order Process v3.9: In the Comments column of Version 3.9 of the Version Release History table, please consider adding “PurposeOfRequest” as one of the bullet points under “New and amended enumerations for:” given the new enumeration value “Defect Rectified” is being introduced in this version (v3.9).