

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details
- Service Orders (version change)
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification (version change)
- Technical Delivery Specification (version change)

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: TasNetworks

Completion Date: 24/04/18

Table of Contents

- 1. Customer and Site Details 3
- 2. Option and commentary for long term solution 13

1. Customer and Site Details

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		2.1(b)(ii)	<p>The term “Life Support Confirmation” is not clear. It is also very similar, and may be confused with the term “Medical confirmation” which must be provided by the customer to the Process Registration Owner.</p> <p>Proposed improvement: Change the title of the notification to “Life Support Acceptance”. This more accurately reflects what the recipient is doing when they respond to a Life Support Notification that is not rejected.</p> <p>This change would require updates throughout the procedure document wherever “confirmation” is used.</p>
TasNetworks		2.2	<p>Process Diagrams:</p> <p>TasNetworks considers it necessary to include a detailed process diagram(s) to illustrate the process flows between participants for a customer move-out/move-in scenario which also may incorporate a retailer churn.</p> <p>The process flow should consider the transaction and email flows and the life support information that should be contained within these communications. Depending on the timings of customer move-out/move-in and the 15 business day de-registration period, there is potential for the recipient to receive conflicting information.</p>
TasNetworks		3.1(f)	<p>Formatting Error: The Timing Periods are defined in 0Table 4</p> <p>Remove the '0' in front of “Table 4”</p>
TasNetworks		4.1(g)	<p>Reference error: The reference should be “4.3” and 4.4</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.3.1(e)	<p>The last line of this clause states “.....and the DNSP <u>must</u> update their records accordingly”.</p> <p>With reference to the new NERR clause 125(12) it states “A distributor <u>may</u> deregister a customer’s premises.....”</p> <p>Suggest changing 4.3.1(e) to “may”.</p>
TasNetworks		4.3.2(b)	Grammar error: Remove the word “and” after NMI.
TasNetworks		4.3.3	<p>Vacant Sites:</p> <p>The current clause suggests it is appropriate for the Current Retailer to send a CDN as “site vacant” once a site is vacated, however, the de-registration period may not have yet expired.</p> <p>It is recommended the clause be updated to:</p> <p>[Guidance Note 2] When a site is vacated;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) If a site is vacated and the de-registration process has not yet been completed, the Initiator must send a CustomerDetailsNotification containing NMI, LastModifiedDateTime, MovementType value of “Site Vacant”, and SensitiveLoad value of “Life Support”, or; b) If a site is vacated that was not classed as life support, or the Current Retailer has since completed the de-registration process, the Initiator must send a CustomerDetailsNotification containing NMI, LastModifiedDateTime, a MovementType value of ‘Site Vacant’ and SensitiveLoad of ‘None’ to the relevant Recipient.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.4.1	<p>TasNetworks recommends adding a new subclause (g) that allows Recipients to order LifeSupportNotifications received.</p> <p>(g) All LifeSupportNotifications are deemed to be LastModified based on the DATETIME the email is received by the Recipient.</p>
TasNetworks		4.4.1(b)	<p>Current clause:</p> <p><i>"...The email subject header must be in the form of: 'Life Support Notification # NMI'."</i></p> <p>Proposed improvement:</p> <p>It is not clear in the procedure as to how participants are to treat the '#' within the email subject of the four notifications.</p> <p>Should participants use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life Support Notification # 8000123123 • 'Life Support Notification # 8000123123' • Life Support Notification 8000123123 <p>An example should be provided within the procedure to alleviate any ambiguity.</p> <p>This suggestion applies to the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.4.1.b, 4.4.2.a, 4.4.3.a, 4.4.4.a
TasNetworks		4.4.1(b)	<p>For consistency, the procedure should detail the format/layout that the emails should be provided between parties, or provide a proforma template for each email message type.</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.4.1(c)	<p>Current clause:</p> <p><i>In addition to (a), where the Retailer is the Current Retailer or becomes the Current Retailer, they must send a CustomerDetailsNotification. In this case, the changes are effective from the earliest date notified between the parties.</i></p> <p>This statement does not align with the DateRequired field within the Life Support Notification. The changes should be effective from whichever is earlier out of the DateRequired in the Life Support Notification or the receipt of the CustomerDetailsNotification.</p> <p>Proposed improvement:</p> <p><i>In addition to (a), where the Retailer is the Current Retailer or becomes the Current Retailer, they must send a CustomerDetailsNotification. In this case, the changes are effective from whichever is earlier of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i) The DateRequired in the Life Support Notification; or</i> <i>ii) The receipt of the CustomerDetailsNotification.</i>
TasNetworks		4.4.1(e)(i)	Suggest adding the word “promptly” between “must” and “send” to add some context to when the email needs to be sent.
TasNetworks		Table 5	<p>Table 5 Data Requirements for Life Support Notification</p> <p>Life Support Status field - Deregistered – No Customer Confirmation – It is not clear as to when this value would apply and it does not seem to align with any scenario outlined in the corresponding rule change.</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		Table 5	<p>Table 5 Data Requirements for Life Support Notification</p> <p>Proposed Improvement:</p> <p>A new mandatory field should be added to the Life Support Notification of 'Notification Reason'. The allowable values should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 'New'- 'Update'- 'Remove' <p>This would make it much clearer as to the intent of the notification and facilitate more efficient business processes upon the receipt of Life Support Notifications.</p>
TasNetworks		Table 5	<p>Table 5 Data Requirements for Life Support Notification.</p> <p>Query:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DateRequired field – Is this required to be populated in response to a Life Support Request?

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		Table 5	<p>Table 5 Data Requirements for Life Support Notification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LSEquipment field – Currently the use of this field is R/N <p>Proposed Improvement:</p> <p>An allowable value of “Unknown” should be added to the list, and the LSEquipment field use should be made M/N.</p> <p>As the procedure currently stands, the field is only REQUIRED. Under the definition, ‘Required’ means this information must be provided if available.</p> <p>If the information is not available (e.g. the customer does not know), then the initiator should be able to populate “Unknown”.</p> <p>In which case, the field would be better defined as M/N.</p>
TasNetworks		4.4.2(a)	<p>Current clause:</p> <p><i>“Life Support Confirmation emails must be sent to the email address it was received from. The email subject header must be in the form of: ‘Life Support Notification # NMI # Confirmed’.”</i></p> <p>The current wording is unclear. The Life Support Confirmation must be sent back to the email address that the Life Support Notification was received from.</p> <p>Proposed improvement:</p> <p><i>“Life Support Confirmation emails must be sent to the email address the Life Support Notification was received from. The email subject header must be in the form of: ‘Life Support Notification # NMI # Confirmed’.”</i></p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.4.3(a)	<p>Current clause:</p> <p><i>“Life Support Rejection emails must be sent to the email address it was received from. The email subject header must be in the form of: ‘Life Support Notification # NMI # Rejected # Reason.’</i></p> <p>The current wording is unclear. The Life Support Rejection must be sent back to the email address that the Life Support Notification was received from.</p> <p>Proposed improvement:</p> <p><i>“Life Support Rejection emails must be sent to the email address Life Support Notification was received from. The email subject header must be in the form of: ‘Life Support Notification # NMI # Rejected # Reason.’</i></p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.4.4	<p>Life Support Request process</p> <p>The Procedure is not clear regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A) What parties are permitted to generate Life Support Requests; andB) What parties are permitted to respond to Life Support Requests. <p>Proposed improvement: An additional three clauses should be added to section 4.4.4 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Only Current Retailers and DNSPs are permitted to raise Life Support Requestsb) Only Current Retailers and DNSPs are permitted to respond to a Life Support Request with a corresponding Life Support Notification.c) The party responding to a Life Support Request does not need to be the Registration Process owner.
TasNetworks		4.4.4	<p>Life Support Request process</p> <p>The Procedure does not facilitate the rejection of Life Support Requests.</p> <p>Direction should be provided as to under what conditions a Life Support Request can be rejected, and the mechanism for doing so.</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.4.4	<p>Life Support Request process</p> <p>The Procedure is not clear regarding where a Life Support Notification in response to Life Support Request must be sent.</p> <p>Proposed improvement: Add another clause to section 4.4.4:</p> <p><i>“Life Support Notifications in response to Life Support Requests must be sent to the email address the Life Support Request was received from.”</i></p>
TasNetworks		4.4.4	<p>Life Support Request process</p> <p>The Procedure does not detail the email subject header for the Life Support Notification in response to the Life Support Request. It is recommended an additional clause be added to allow parties to differentiate from a standard Life Support Notification to one being received in response to a Request.</p> <p>Proposed improvement: Add another clause to section 4.4.4:</p> <p><i>“The email subject heading for the Life Support Notification in response to a Life Support Request must be in the form of: ‘Life Support Notification Response # NMI’.”</i></p>
TasNetworks		4.4.4(c)	<p>Formatting error:</p> <p><i>[Guidance Note 1] The Recipient of the Life Support Request must provide a Life Support Notification and sent within 5 business days.</i></p> <p>Proposed improvement: Delete “and sent”;</p> <p><i>[Guidance Note 1] The Recipient of the Life Support Request must provide a Life Support Notification and sent within 5 business days</i></p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
TasNetworks		4.5(e)	Formatting error: Table reference should be Table 11, not Table 12.

2. Option and commentary for long term solution

TasNetworks preference for a long term solution is Option 1, the creation of a new B2B Transaction(s) to support Life Support communications.

TasNetworks considers option 1 is more tenable for the following reasons:

- The existing B2B Customer And Site Details Notification Process required to support Option 1 could be modified to support this option without having to implement a new process and/or modification to other AEMO procedures and processes to support the central repository model.
- There would not be any requirement for AEMO to build a technical solution to implement a central repository.
- The notifications between participants would emulate current B2B procedures for delivery and receipt directly between participants and would not rely on any intermediary functionality.
- The central repository option may need to be subject to strict access and confidentiality/privacy principles, particularly for prospective parties who may not have a need to the information held in the central repository.
- The central repository will still require the development of new transaction types to enable parties to send data to, and receive data from the repository, and as such may require increased implementation costs from participants than transactions which could emulate existing B2B processes.
- The introduction of a central repository model may have a greater impact of change on existing business processes for participants than the introduction of B2B transactions which would be aligned to the processes modified for the use of the interim email solution.

TasNetworks also considers that whatever option is adopted, the Life Support value within the SensitiveLoad field in the existing CustomerDetailsNotification should be removed to avoid duplication and misinterpretation of information. This will have downstream impacts on the existing Reconciliation Process and will need to be modified accordingly.