

# B2B Procedures Version 2.1

## Initial Consultation Participant Response Pack

Participant: SP AusNet Completion Date:

19/12/2013

#### 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.

ltem	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>1</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<u>Blue underline</u> means insert Red strikeout means delete		
9.1.1	002	Add a new 2.1 Process Diagrams: Figure 4 titled "Wait until midnight" with explanatory note "DNSP will send CDRs for any missing Life Support NMIs based on reconciliation files provided up to midnight". A picture of a clock can be used here.	<complex-block></complex-block>	́н	
9.1.3	002	Clause f. the words "at least" are not required and are confusing.	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.	Μ	
9.1.3	002	Clause g. in most cases the DNSP will	g. For NMIs provided by the Retailer in	М	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

9.1.3 002 DI Pa Cu at ch by ap tra sc da 9.1.4 002 Si po to to to to to to	accept a file or files containing multiple transactions, hence the text should read transaction(s) DNSPs need to establish that the Participant has sent a complete set of CustomerDetailReconciliation transactions at a point in time, before the DNSP can check which NMIs have not been provided by the Retailer. SP AusNet considers it is appropriate to have all a Participant's transactions provided within a single day so the DNSP can have 2 clear business	the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction that are not flagged by the DNSP as having Life Support, the DNSP must accept the transaction(s) and update their records accordingly with Life Support. Between clauses g. and h. Add clause ga. "Participants must send all CustomerDetailsReconciliation transactions within a single day."	Н	
9.1.4 002 Si po to to to re	Participant has sent a complete set of CustomerDetailReconciliation transactions at a point in time, before the DNSP can check which NMIs have not been provided by the Retailer. SP AusNet considers it is appropriate to have all a Participant's transactions provided within a single day so the DNSP can have 2 clear business	ga. "Participants must send all CustomerDetailsReconciliation	н	
pc to to ci	days to respond.			
ar Tł tir	Similar to 9.1.1 and 9.1.3, add new timing point to Clause 3 TIMING REQUIREMENT to include the DNSP waiting until midnight to assume all CustomerDetailReconciliation files are received from a Retailer. The DNSP would then have 2 business days to send any CustomerDetailsRequests. Then alter the text in the second last timing Period – Definition – Usage to match.	Add Time Period, Definition, and Usage Period – "DNSP waits until midnight to receive all CustomerDetailReconciliation(s) from a Participant" Definition – "This is the period from the initiation of the first CustomerDetailReconciliation and the last CustomerDetailReconciliation received from a Participant". Usage – "Used by the DNSP to assume all CustomerDetailReconciliation files are received from a Retailer".	Η	

B2B\_Procedures\_v2\_1\_Participant\_Response\_Pack\_SP AusNet

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>1</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<b>Period</b> – "Providing a CustomerDetailsRequest as part of the Reconciliation Process"		
			Definition – "this is the period from the <u>midnight after the</u> initiation of the Reconcilation Process to the when the DNSP is expected to raise any <u>CustomerDetailsRequests</u> to the Retailer.		
			Timing Points_H- <u>NewPoint</u> and I define this period"		

#### 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.

SP AusNet has no issues or comments in relation to the changes proposed to the B2B Procedure Service Order Process.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>2</sup> )	AEMO Response
			Blue underline means insert		
			Red strikeout means delete		

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  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.

#### 9.3 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.

SP AusNet has no issues or comments in relation to the changes proposed to the B2B Procedure Meter Data Process.

ltem	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>3</sup> )	AEMO Response
			Blue underline means insert		
			Red strikeout means delete		

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  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.

SP AusNet has no issues or comments in relation to the changes proposed to the B2B Procedure One Way Notification Process.

ltem	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>4</sup> )	AEMO Response
			Blue underline means insert		
			Red strikeout means delete		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 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.

ltem	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L⁵)	AEMO Response
			Blue underline means insert		
			Red strikeout means delete		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 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.

SP AusNet has no issues or comments in relation to the changes proposed to the B2B Procedure Technical Delivery Specification.

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> 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.