B2B Procedures Version 2.1

Initial Consultation Participant Response Pack

Participant: AGL

Completion Date: 23/12/2013

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.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L[1])	AEMO Response
			Blue underline means insert Red strikeout means delete		
9.1.1	002	Figure 4. Many process maps which are embedded in AEMO procedures and guidelines are often difficult to read as the text is blurred. AGL would like to recommend the transparency /quality of figure 4 attached in the initial consultation pack is to be fixed when inserted into the procedures.		M	
9.1.2	002	d. The use of B*usinessAcceptance/Rejections* for the CustomerDetailsReconciliation will be identical a subset to that used for the CustomerDetailsNotification. The DNSP can only reject for reasons as specified in the B2B procedure Technical Guidelines for B2B Procedures. If the DNSP finds an issue with the customer data provided in the CustomerDetailsReconciliation, the DNSP must use the CustomerDetailsRequest process.	Recommended insert in blue. d. The use of B*usinessAcceptance/Rejections* for the CustomerDetailsReconciliation will be identical a subset to that used for the CustomerDetailsNotification. The DNSP can only reject for reasons as specified in the B2B procedure Technical Guidelines for B2B Procedures. If the DNSP finds an issue with the customer data provided in the CustomerDetailsReconciliation, the DNSP must use the CustomerDetailsRequest process in accordance with Clause 2.2.3 of this procedure.	L	

---

[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
9.1.3	002	j. The Retailer must provide the DNSP with a CustomerDetailsNotification within 5 business days of receiving a CustomerDetailsRequest with *Reason* value 'Rec – confirm no SensitiveLoad'.	Recommended insert in blue. j. Where the Retailer is the current FRMP the Retailer must provide the DNSP with a CustomerDetailsNotification within 5 business days of receiving a CustomerDetailsRequest with *Reason* value 'Rec – confirm no SensitiveLoad'.	L	

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
			Blue underline means insert Red strikeout means delete		

[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
			Blue underline means insert Red strikeout means delete		

---

[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
			Blue underline means insert Red strikeout means delete		

---

[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
			Blue underline means insert Red strikeout means delete		

---

[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
			Blue underline means insert Red strikeout means delete		

---

[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.