B2B Procedures v3.9 Consultation

First Stage

Participant Response Template

***Participant****:*

***Completion Date****:*

# 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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. |  |
| 2.1.7 Shared Fusing Meter Replacement | Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed procedure changes? If no, please provide your reasoning and preferred changes. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |
| 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. |  |