



B2B Procedures Version 2.1

Draft Determination Participant Response Pack

Participant: Origin

Completion Date: 31/1/2014

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 strikethrough means delete</p>		
8.1.3	002	<p>Clause 2.2.5 Customer Details Reconciliation</p> <p>b. The Reconciliation Process provides the DNSP with a complete snapshot of all NMI's, for which the Retailer is financially responsible, where the customer is flagged with Life Support, and as at the time of the Reconciliation (as required by the CustomerDetailsNotification).</p>	<p>b. The Reconciliation Process provides the DNSP with a complete snapshot of all NMI's, for which the Retailer is financially responsible, where the customer is flagged with Life Support, and as at the time of the Reconciliation (as required by the CustomerDetailsNotification).</p>	M	
8.1.3	002	<p>4. A Retailer must send only one file for a CustomerDetailsReconciliation for each Reconciliation, unless otherwise agreed between participants.</p>	<p>4. A Retailer must send only one file for a CustomerDetailsReconciliation for each DNSP for each Reconciliation, unless otherwise agreed between participants.</p>	M	
		<p>f. g-For NMIs provided by the Retailer in the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction(s) that are not flagged by the DNSP as having Life Support, the DNSP must accept the transaction and update their records accordingly with</p>	<p>f-g. For NMIs provided by the Retailer in the CustomerDetailsReconciliation transaction(s) that which are not flagged by the DNSP as having Life Support, the DNSP must accept the transaction and update their records accordingly with Life Support.</p>	M	

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
		Life Support.			
8.1.3	002	g. h. For NMI's 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 CustomerDetailsReconciliation.	g. h. For NMI's 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 CustomerDetailsReconciliation.	M	
8.1.3	002	1. 'Transition Period' means the period commencing on the effective date of version 2.1 of this Procedure and ending on (and including) 14 November 2014. As advised at the January BMRG, Origin's expectation is the obligation to undertake the 'Full' reconciliation would be removed from v2.1 of the Customer and Site Details Notification Process. Reference would be made to allow participants to undertake current life support reconciliation processes as bilaterally agreed until all participants have moved to the life support reconciliation process detailed in v2.1 of the Customer and Site Details Notification Process.	1. 'Transition Period' means the period from commencing on the effective date of version 2.1 of this Procedure and ending on (and including) to 14 November 2014 inclusive. 2. Participants will continue to undertake life support reconciliation as per bilateral arrangements currently in place between participants until such time as participants are compliant with this version of the Customer and Site Details Notification Process but no later than 14 November 2014.	H	

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 strikethrough means delete</p>		

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.

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>		

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 strikethrough means delete</p>		

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 strikethrough means delete</p>		

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 strikethrough 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.