

Insert Company Logo Here

# B2B Procedures Version 2.1

## Initial Consultation Participant Response Pack

*Participant:* Lumo Energy

*Completion Date:* **30 Nov 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 <sup>1</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p><del>Red strikeout</del> means delete</p>		
9.1.1	002	<p>Business Process</p> <p>Current process needs more development - If the process flow is to show a non-valid reconciliation file from the retailer, then the process should deal with a business rejection in a way which clearly shows how the rejection is dealt with rather than put it in the same steps as the acceptance path</p>			
9.1.2	002	Agree			
9.1.3	003	Noted			
9.1.4	002	Agree			
9.1.5	002	Agree			
9.1.6	009	Agree			
9.1.7	009	Agree			
9.1.8	N/A	Noted			

<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.

## 9.2 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 <sup>2</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p><del>Red-strikeout</del> means delete</p>		
9.2.1	001	Agree			
9.2.2	001	Agree			
9.2.3	001	Agree			
9.2.4	001	Agree			
9.2.5	001	Agree			
9.2.6	001	Agree			
9.2.7	001	Agree			
9.2.8	001	Agree			
9.2.9	001	Agree			
9.2.10	001	Agree			
9.2.11	001	Agree			
9.2.12	001	Agree			
9.2.13	001	Agree			
9.2.14	001	Suggest changes to wording to make information relating to jurisdiction clearer and easier to identify	<p>Suggest :</p> <p><u>Queensland – 10 business Days</u></p> <p><u>Victoria / SA – No jurisdictional timeframes</u></p>		

<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.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>2</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<a href="#">specified</a> <a href="#">NSW – Transaction not available</a>		
9.2.15	001	Agree			
9.2.16	001	Agree			
9.2.17	001	Noted			

**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 <sup>3</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p><del>Red-strikeout</del> means delete</p>		
9.3.1	N/A	Noted			

<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.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>4</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<u>Blue underline</u> means insert <b>Red strikethrough</b> means delete		
9.4.1	N/A	Noted			

<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.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>5</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p><del>Red strikethrough</del> means delete</p>		
9.5.1	002	Agree			
9.5.2	002	Agree			
9.5.3	010	Agree			
9.5.4	N/A	Noted			

<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.

Item	ID	Clause/Issue/Comment	Proposed revised MSATS text	Rating (H/M/L <sup>6</sup> )	AEMO Response
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p><del>Red strikethrough</del> means delete</p>		
9.6.1	001	Agree			
9.6.2	011	Agree			
9.6.3	N/A	Noted			

<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.