



B2B Procedures Version 2.1

Initial Consultation Participant Response Pack

Participant: Ausgrid

Completion Date: 19th December 2013

9. Participant Responses

This section lists the changes proposed to the B2B Procedures: Version 2.0.

Proposed changes have been categorised as Procedure changes as follows;

- Table 9.1 covers the proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Customer and Site Details Notification Process.
- Table 9.2 covers the proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Service Order Process.
- Table 9.3 covers the proposed changes to the B2B Meter Data Process.
- Table 9.4 covers the proposed changes to the B2B Procedure One Way Notification Process.
- Table 9.5 covers the proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Technical Guideline for B2B Procedures.
- Table 9.6 covers the proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Technical Delivery Specification.

9.1 Proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Customer and Site Details Notification Process

Please complete the relevant columns below in order to record your response. If you have no comments on this document please note this as a general comment in the table.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ¹)	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikeout means delete</p>		
9.1.1	002	Clause 2 Customer & Site Details Process - No Comment			
9.1.2	002	Clause 2.2.3 Customer Details Request - No Comment			
9.1.3	002	<p>Clause 2.2.5 Customer Details Reconciliation</p> <p>"2. The Retailer and DNSP must agree the timing of the Reconciliation. This agreement shall consider at least the following criteria:</p> <p>i. File limits;</p> <p>i.ii. Conflicting scheduled reconciliations with other participants;</p> <p>ii.iii. IT Support availability; and</p> <p>iii.iv. Other impacting activities.; and Proposal"</p> <p>Given the significantly reduced transaction volume resulting from the Customer Details Reconciliation being for Life Support customers, MSATS and</p>	<p>"2. The Retailer and DNSP must agree the timing of the Reconciliation. This agreement shall consider at least the following criteria:</p> <p>i. File limits;</p> <p>i.ii. Conflicting scheduled reconciliations with other participants;</p> <p>ii.iii. IT Support availability; and</p> <p>iii.iv. Other impacting activities.; and Proposal"</p>	H	

¹ L= Low: Not critical. Issues / comments are minor. They add clarity to the document. No major concern if not included in any further revisions
M= Medium: Important. Strong case that issue / comments should be considered and an update to the document is desirable, but not critical.
H= High: Critical. The issues / comments are fundamental and failure to make necessary changes has the potential to impact consensus.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ¹)	AEMO Response
		<p>LNSPs should be capable of processing a Customer Details Reconciliation at any time. As such the timing should be specified for the market to provide greater clarity and support a higher level of compliance.</p> <p>“f. The Timing Requirements for the use of the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction and its Business Signals will be initiated and processed at least quarterly or more frequently, as agreed between the Participants using the Transaction.”</p> <p>Given the significantly reduced transaction volume resulting from the Customer Details Reconciliation being for Life Support customers, MSATS and LNSPs should be capable of processing a Customer Details Reconciliation at any time. As such the timing should be specified for the market to provide greater clarity and support a higher level of compliance.</p> <p>“h. For NMIs in the DNSP system flagged with Life Support, but not provided by the Retailer in the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction, the DNSP must send a CustomerDetailsRequest using the Reason value ‘Rec – confirm no SensitiveLoad’ within 2 business days of receiving the</p>	<p>“f. The Timing Requirements for the use of the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction and its Business Signals will be initiated and processed <u>during the months of February, May, August and November</u> at least quarterly or more frequently, as agreed between the Participants using the Transaction.”</p> <p>“h. For NMIs in the DNSP system flagged with Life Support, but not provided by the Retailer in the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction, the DNSP must send a CustomerDetailsRequest using the Reason value ‘Rec – confirm no SensitiveLoad’ within 2 business days of receiving the</p>		

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ¹)	AEMO Response
		<p>CustomerDetailsReconciliation.</p> <p>This is not clear. Clause 2.2.5 a. indicates that CustomerDetailsReconciliation transactions will only be received where the customer is flagged with Life Support. Hence an LNSP would not expect to receive a CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction with Sensitive Load value of "None". What is the intended trigger for this CustomerDetailsRequest? If the LNSP is to independently check the Life Support customers in their system and verify whether or not they have received the expected CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction, when will they do this? Some flexibility should be allowed to the DNSP so they may verify the completion of the CustomerDetailsReconciliation, prior to sending the expected CustomerDetailsRequests.</p>	CustomerDetailsReconciliation.		
9.1.4	002	Clause 3 TIMING REQUIREMENTS – No Comment			
9.1.5	002	Clause 4.1 CustomerDetailsRequest Transaction Data – No Comment			
9.1.6	009	Clause 3.2.3 Timing Requirement for Providing Notifications – No Comment			
9.1.7	009	Clause 3.2.4 Timing Requirement for			

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ¹)	AEMO Response
		Sending CustomerDetailsRequests – No Comment			
9.1.8	N/A	No Comment			

Formatted: Page Number, Do not check spelling or grammar

9.2 Proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Service Order Process

Please complete the relevant columns below in order to record your response. If you have no comments on this document please note this as a general comment in the table.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ²)	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikeout means delete</p>		
9.2.1	001	No Comment			
9.2.2	001	No Comment			
9.2.3	001	No Comment			
9.2.4	001	No Comment			
9.2.5	001	No Comment			
9.2.6	001	No Comment			
9.2.7	001	No Comment			
9.2.8	001	No Comment			
9.2.9	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 0	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 1	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 2	001	No Comment			

² L= Low: Not critical. Issues / comments are minor. They add clarity to the document. No major concern if not included in any further revisions
M= Medium: Important. Strong case that issue / comments should be considered and an update to the document is desirable, but not critical.
H= High: Critical. The issues / comments are fundamental and failure to make necessary changes has the potential to impact consensus.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ²)	AEMO Response
9.2.1 3	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 4	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 5	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 6	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 7	001	No Comment			
9.2.1 8	N/A	No Comment			

9.3 Proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Meter Data Process

Please complete the relevant columns below in order to record your response. If you have no comments on this document please note this as a general comment in the table.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ³)	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikeout means delete</p>		
9.3.1	N/A	No Comment			

³ L= Low: Not critical. Issues / comments are minor. They add clarity to the document. No major concern if not included in any further revisions
M= Medium: Important. Strong case that issue / comments should be considered and an update to the document is desirable, but not critical.
H= High: Critical. The issues / comments are fundamental and failure to make necessary changes has the potential to impact consensus.

9.4 Proposed changes to the B2B Procedure One Way Notification Process

Please complete the relevant columns below in order to record your response. If you have no comments on this document please note this as a general comment in the table.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ⁴)	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikeout means delete</p>		
9.4.1	001	No Comment			

⁴ L= Low: Not critical. Issues / comments are minor. They add clarity to the document. No major concern if not included in any further revisions
M= Medium: Important. Strong case that issue / comments should be considered and an update to the document is desirable, but not critical.
H= High: Critical. The issues / comments are fundamental and failure to make necessary changes has the potential to impact consensus.

9.5 Proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Technical Guidelines for B2B Procedures

Please complete the relevant columns below in order to record your response. If you have no comments on this document please note this as a general comment in the table.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ⁵)	AEMO Response					
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikeout means delete</p>							
9.5.1	002	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Invalid data. Details provided in Explanation.</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Error</td> <td>202</td> <td>Standard aseXML Code. Not applicable for CustomerDetailsReconciliation.</td> </tr> </table> <p>It is proposed that EventCode 202 is not applicable for Customer Details Reconciliation. This EventCode is used when there are fundamental flaws with the data provided and it should continue to be applicable to Customer Details Reconciliation transactions</p>	Invalid data. Details provided in Explanation.	Yes	Error	202	Standard aseXML Code. Not applicable for CustomerDetailsReconciliation.	<p>Standard aseXML Code.</p> <p>Not applicable for CustomerDetailsReconciliation.</p>	H	
Invalid data. Details provided in Explanation.	Yes	Error	202	Standard aseXML Code. Not applicable for CustomerDetailsReconciliation.						
9.5.2	002	No Comment								
9.5.3	010	No Comment								
9.5.4	N/A	No Comment								

⁵ L= Low: Not critical. Issues / comments are minor. They add clarity to the document. No major concern if not included in any further revisions
M= Medium: Important. Strong case that issue / comments should be considered and an update to the document is desirable, but not critical.
H= High: Critical. The issues / comments are fundamental and failure to make necessary changes has the potential to impact consensus.

9.6 Proposed changes to the B2B Procedure Technical Delivery Specification

Please complete the relevant columns below in order to record your response. If you have no comments on this document please note this as a general comment in the table.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L ⁶)	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikeout means delete</p>		

⁶ L= Low: Not critical. Issues / comments are minor. They add clarity to the document. No major concern if not included in any further revisions
M= Medium: Important. Strong case that issue / comments should be considered and an update to the document is desirable, but not critical.
H= High: Critical. The issues / comments are fundamental and failure to make necessary changes has the potential to impact consensus.

Formatted: Page Number, Do not check spelling or grammar