B2B Guide

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: Brave Energy Systems*

***Completion Date**: Nov 2016*

Table of Contents

1. Guide 3

1. Guide

Clause	Heading	Comments
3.4 - general	**Business Communications Model Changes**	The model infers all participants will nominate the list of Notified Parties in the Service Order content; hub will handle routing on participant's behalf. Post recent developments via the Systems Working Group allowing Initiator to choose one of two options, Brave propose this section should be extended to mention participant's ability (initiator) to handle direct communications to notified parties.
3.4(f)	**Business Communications Model Changes** To avoid complex exception situations where (for example), the Recipient accepts a Service Order, but the Notified Party rejects the Service Order Copy causing an exception for the Initiator to deal with, it is proposed that the Hub will ensure that no message responses are sent from the Notified parties to the Initiator. The Hub alone will manage the	No longer valid post determination by B2B-WG and AEMO determination initiator is required to handle at a minimum transaction rejects from the Notified Parties (hub to handle negative message acknowledgments). Brave propose clause is phrased to refect final determination.

	message acknowledgement with the Notified Party (TBC).	
5.2.3.1(b)	**CDN with Life Support within an Embedded Network** In the diagram below, a Life Support situation is communicated to Retailer by a Customer, but if that Customer resides in an Embedded Network, then extra steps are required to ensure that the Retailer and DNSP of the Parent NMI are also informed.	The extra steps prescriped are not contained within the B2B procedure Customer and Site Details Notification Process v3.0. If the described process is obligational (not a guide), these obligations should be replicated in the procedure to become enforceable.