

## IN003/20 – Gas Life Support Supplementary Questionnaire

Responses to be emailed to [grcf@aemo.com.au](mailto:grcf@aemo.com.au) by due **COB 31 March 2020**.

Review comments submitted by: *AGL*

Date: *31 Mar 2020*

Contact Person: *Mark Riley*

Topic	Please Provide Response Here
<b>Question 1 – Benefits of change</b>	
<p>Please provide, in detail, what benefits the change will have on your organisation (in terms of efficiency, customer benefits, privacy, etc.). If any monetary benefits are provided (e.g. in terms of annual FTE savings), these will be kept confidential.</p>	<p>The current gas LSN process is one where a CSV file is generated, zipped and e-mailed to a gas DB. As well as being somewhat manual, there is no clear recorded or auditable process to ensure that the transaction is received by the gas DB or that the contents are acknowledged by the gas DB. While this poses some risk for the sending retailer, AGL would suggest that the higher risk is on the gas DB. Moving to an aseXML process provides assurance for the sending party that the initiating transaction is received by the gas DB (transaction acknowledgement), and that the content is processed by the gas DB (business acknowledgement).</p> <p>The transaction and business acknowledgements are tracked and a failure of an acknowledgement would generate an exception process which would lead to the information being re-sent to the DB.</p> <p>Further, this process would align the gas and electricity processes for sending Life Support information.</p>

Topic	Please Provide Response Here
<b>Question 2 – Costs of change</b>	
<p>Please provide what costs the change will create for your organisation as an order of magnitude (i.e. “low”, “medium”, or “high”). If any monetary values (e.g. once-off implementation costs, and any ongoing annual cost) are provided (e.g. in terms of the cost of system changes), these will be kept confidential.</p>	<p>Cost implementation is medium. However, the management of the processes and systems post implementation would be reduced as it would be a common process for both gas and electricity.</p>
<b>Question 3 – Volume of gas life support customers</b>	
<p>Please provide the volume of gas life support customers your organisation currently has registered. Please also provide the average rate of gas life support registrations and de-registrations per month for your organisation, as well as any notes you would like to provide on how AEMO should interpret these data.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Public answer – over 2500 transactions in 13 months</p>
<b>Question 4 – Alternatives to LSN and LSR</b>	
<p>If AEMO decides not to recommend the adoption of LSN and LSR, will your organisation likely make any changes to your existing implementation of the Gas Life Support Industry Guide process?. If so, provide details on the type of changes you intend to put forward.</p>	<p>AGL has already implemented the CSV process as a minimum process requirement. Nevertheless, we would remain concerned that we do not have auditable responses from gas DBs regarding the provision of Life Support Registrations / De-registrations through this process.</p>
<b>Question 5 – Value Rating (1-7)</b>	

Topic	Please Provide Response Here																	
<p>Please indicate your organisation's value rating if the proposal to adopt the LSN and LSR aseXML transactions proceeds, as compared with the status quo or the alternative(s) identified in Question 4. Please select one of the following.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="145 440 848 842"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 =</td> <td>Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 =</td> <td>Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 =</td> <td>Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 =</td> <td>No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 =</td> <td>Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 =</td> <td>Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 =</td> <td>Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rating	Description	1 =	Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds	2 =	Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds	3 =	Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds	4 =	No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds	5 =	Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds	6 =	Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds	7 =	Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds	<p>Value Rating</p>	<p>7</p>
Rating	Description																	
1 =	Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds																	
2 =	Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds																	
3 =	Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds																	
4 =	No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds																	
5 =	Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
6 =	Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
7 =	Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<b>Question 6 – Any other comments?</b>																		
<p>Does your organisation have any other comments that it wishes AEMO to consider in its formulation of the IIR?</p>	<p>AGL sees the current CSV process as a stop gap measure due to its limited application and lack of auditability. AGL believes that a more robust process is required for this activity.</p>																	