Meeting Notes – B2B-WG

MEETING:	Business-to-Business Working Group
DATE:	Monday, 6 December 2021
TIME:	9:30am-12:00pm
LOCATION:	Teleconference
MEETING #:	12
CONTACT	b2bwg@aemo.com.au

ATTENDEES:

Name	Company
Blaine Miner (Chair)	AEMO
Nandu Datar	AEMO
Kate Gordon	AEMO
Meghan Bibby	AEMO
Lenard Bull	AEMO
Aakash Sembey	Origin Energy
Adrian Honey	TasNetworks
Christophe Bechia	Red/Lumo
David Woods	SA Power Networks
Dino Ou	Endeavour Energy
Helen Vassos	PLUS ES
Mark Riley	AGL
Paul Greenwood	VectorAMS
Robert Lo Giudice	Alinta Energy
Mathew Tanzer	EnergyQueensland
Wayne Farrell	Yurika
Carla Adolpho	IntelliHub

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Acknowledgment and Apologies

Justin Betlehem (Ausnet Services) was noted as an apology.

Confirm agenda

The B2B-WG confirmed the agenda.

Action items from previous meeting and standing list of consultation items

Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that the following items were being proposed to be closed since the last meeting, responsible owners were asked to provide the group an explanation as to why the actions should be closed:

Action Meeting Date	Description	Responsible	Outcome
2106-04	Meghan Bibby to ask Lenard Bull about 'NOMW' transaction, if a new field is added to the NOMW does it trigger a new schema.	Meghan Bibby (AEMO)	Meghan confirmed that a new field would require a schema change.
2009-06	AEMO to organise an analyst resource to look at description changes and if they have any technical impact	AEMO	AEMO confirmed that Kate Gordon and Nandu Datar (AEMO) have been assigned to this activity.
2009-07	Add Australian Standards to the December meeting agenda	AEMO	AEMO added the item to the December agenda.
1110-07	Provide analysis of Coincident SO feedback for review to B2B WG	AEMO	AEMO provided the analysis on 16 Nov.
1011-01	Check with AEMO IT if the proposed changes to MFIN require schema changes	AEMO	AEMO confirmed that the proposed change would require a schema change.
1011-02	Amend the shared fuse ICF as per the outcome of the meeting by 17 Nov for B2B WG to review	Paul Greenwood (Vector)	Paul confirmed that the ICF had been updated.
1110-05	Check with AEMO IT if MFIN reasons are outside or inside schema	AEMO	AEMO confirmed that ReasonForNotice is an enumerated list inside the schema.
1110-06	Send the Coincident SO IEC paper to B2B WG for review	Meghan Bibby (AEMO)	Meghan confirmed that the paper had been provided to the WG for their review.
1110-07	Organise meeting to discuss the Coincident SO IEC paper	Meghan Bibby (AEMO)	Meeting was organised for 19 Nov 2021

Actions:

- Change the layout of closed action items to include the outcome.
    - Closed, the outcome will be included in future packs

- Further clarification to action 1011-04, is the CSVNotificationDetail (NTN) built into the schema or is it an external element
    - Closed, CSVNotificationDetail (NTN) is not built into the schema, it is a payload that is wrapped in xml headers. Just like the MDN is.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION OR NOTING

Shared Fuse ICFs – Review of Feedback - Paul Greenwood (Vector) / Nandu Datar (AEMO)

Discussion:

- Nandu Datar (AEMO) summarised the feedback received for the amended ICF. Paul Greenwood (Vector) agreed with the summary.

- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) noted that there was a risk that the standing data in MSATS may not be correct due to time lags between the information being provided to the LNSP and the LNSP updating the standing data.

- David Woods (SAPN) questioned if there would be some value in MPs creating logic so that Shared fuse information is not sent to the LNSP unless the data needs to be updated in MSATS.

- Paul Greenwood (Vector) suggested that since MPs would not be visiting the site often after the meter is initially hung that potential the volume issue would not be a concern.

- Robert Lo Giudice (Alinta) noted that the MP would, as per the obligations, notify when the shared fuse is identified. David Woods (SAPN) agreed with Rob Lo Giudice (Alinta) and noted that the business practice may sort this out.

- There was a discussion regarding the initial population of the field and how this may impact transaction volumes. Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that the MSDR FG would be discussing preferred approaches in the last week of Jan 2022 and that some LNSPs have mentioned to AEMO that they intend to populate the field with accurate data.

- From a B2B point of view, Blaine Miner (AEMO) asked the group what the implications were if the MP was to only send updates to the LNSP where the standing data needed to change i.e. by exception only.

    o Paul Greenwood (Vector) mentioned that that would result in the MP having to check MSATS to see what the current value is to determine if the value needed to be updated

    o The question was raised as to what obligations the LNSP had to ensure the information it was provided was correct, as they have the obligations in the Procedures

    o David Woods (SAPN) suggested that the information received from the FRMP, MC and MP was going to be deemed as accurate

    o David Woods (SAPN) also suggested that LNSPs would likely need to build the value change logic into their systems

- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) noted that in PLUS ES' experience, LNSPs do not currently capture the shared fuse information. The value of 'U' was introduced as a starting point until someone visited the site to confirm the existence of shared fuse.

- Blaine Miner (AEMO) queried if the group was comfortable that B2M obligations should be progressed through MSDR focus group and that the B2B WG should only consider scenarios where a one way notification (OWN) is sent to the LNSP?

    o David Woods (SAPN) agreed with this approach

- o Paul Greenwood (Vector) noted that the B2B WG would need to consider if a change to the B2B procedures would be required, as a result of the agreed B2B process
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) confirmed that the DB has the obligation to maintain the field in MSATS and that this obligation needed to be supported by B2B processes
- Paul Greenwood (Vector) noted that when the MP has installed the meter on the wall and were able to isolate it, the value would change from 'N' potentially to 'I' and could not see a scenario where they will need to change the status after that.
    - o Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that if the field was populated in error then an update would be required.
    - o Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) also noted that a change may be required as a result of a site visit or if a customer contacts the retailer which would inform the LNSP, or go via an MC.
- Mark Riley (AGL) suggested that the priority is to get the transaction 'up and running' and suggested that any changes in clauses could be done at a later stage, if there were any subsequent issues. The procedural change could be done quite quickly, if needed.
    - o David Woods (SAPN) only concern was not knowing what validations he needed to build up front
- Paul queried if the C7 report change would be included in the May 2022 release?
    - o Meghan Bibby (AEMO) confirmed that the change to the C7 report is currently included in the May 2022 release
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) queried if a consultation would be the most appropriate method for exploring the preferred B2B communication methods/processes between MCs, MPs and FRMPs to the LNSPs?
    - o Mark Riley (AGL) agreed
    - o Dino Ou (Endeavour Energy) queried the timing of the B2B consultation
    - o Blaine Miner (AEMO) queried if this consultation could progress before the scheduled MSDR focus group.
        - ▪ Paul Greenwood (Vector) noted that since it is proposed to develop a new transaction, how the population of the field happens is not relevant.
        - ▪ Meghan Bibby (AEMO) confirmed that if the IEC approves the ICF, the ICF would come back to the B2B WG for them to develop the 'change pack', once that has occurred the consultation can commence
        - ▪ Paul Greenwood (Vector) mentioned that the proposed changes to the B2B procedures have been completed, suggesting that the creation of the change pack should be able to be done quite quickly
- David Woods (SAPN) noted that if the volume of transactions is very small, then instead of building a new transaction, the use of workaround of sending information in an email may be justified.
    - o Paul Greenwood (Vector) noted that this has already been discussed in the ERCF and a decision has been made, to create a new transaction

- o Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) queried if there had be justification for the building the new transaction in the ICF
- o Paul Greenwood (Vector) noted that the justification had been provided in the ICF
- o Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) noted that the proposal to create a new transaction is potentially setting a poor precedent i.e. new transactions being required whenever you want to provide information to the DB
- o Blaine Miner (AGL) queried the criterion used by the B2B WG to arrive at a decision
  - ▪ Mark Riley (AGL) noted that the criterion depends on the type of problem being considered
- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) mentioned that consideration should be made as to how the LNSP can be most efficiently informed of a change to the Shared fuse data e.g. the MP being able to provide information to the LNSP directly, instead of having to go through the MC
  - o There was discussion around perceived responsibilities of various roles in the draft wording of the B2B Procedures
    - ▪ Paul Greenwood (Vector)suggested that we can remove the role references in the draft procedures and that focus should be on 'initiators' and 'receivers', to allow for efficiencies

Actions:

- No actions were captured, awaiting the decision from the IEC to determine next steps

Fields tied to an Australian Standard – B2B WG, Mark Riley (AGL), David Woods (SAPN)

Discussion:

- Mark Riley (AGL) noted that they are waiting on feedback from AEMO regarding non enumerated changes.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that the group will be notified following the analysis by AEMO.
- David Woods (SAPN) noted that there is an issue around the address attributes particularly to the DBs to make sure there is no impact.

B2B Guide Refresh – B2B WG

Discussion:

- Nandu Datar (AEMO) spoke to the action items related to the B2B guide refresh. Mark noted some of the DBs have provided feedback and the guide has been updated.

Actions:

- Members to provide technical feedback by 4 Feb 2022.
- Updated B2B Guide will be on the agenda for February 2022 B2B WG meeting.

B2B CSDN Business Events – Nandu Datar (AEMO), B2B WG

Discussion:

- Nandu Datar (AEMO) spoke to the question from Telstra related to the business events.

- Following discussions, David Woods (SAPN) provided the following response, "The B2BWG have confirmed that the only Business Events required for Life Support transactions are those listed under All Notifications. If Telstra believe there are scenarios where other event codes should be used, please provide further information to justify this change."

OTHER BUSINESS

Wrap-up, actions, questions, parked issues

Nandu Datar (AEMO) informed the B2B-WG of the actions generated at this meeting. These are reflected in the Action register. The next B2B-WG meeting scheduled for 11 January 2022 will be rescheduled to 20 January 2022.

Action:

- AEMO to change the next B2B WG meeting from 11 Jan to 20 Jan

Aakash Sembey (Origin) noted the B2B WG may need to consider the impact of Consumer Data Right (CDR).

- Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that the initial assessment stated that there was no impact on B2B

Action:

- AEMO to confirm the impact assessment in the Jan 2022 meeting

Parked items:

- None