

B2B Procedures

- RoLR Procedures Part B

CONSULTATION – First Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Red Energy and Lumo Energy

Completion Date: 31/March/2023

Table of Contents

1. Issues Paper Questions	3
Topic	4
Question	4
Comments	4

1. Issues Paper Questions

Topic	Question	Comments
<p>2.1 Update of 'Table 102 A: Customer and Site Details to Provide to RoLR'</p>	<p>Question 1: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to RoLR Procedures table 102-A? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")</p>	<p>Although Red Energy and Lumo Energy (Red and Lumo) are supportive of some of the proposed changes from AEMO we are concerned that many are duplications of the existing MSATS Standing Data.</p> <p>The introduction of new fields BusinessABN and EmailAddress potentially add value to the report, providing detail for identification and communication with the customer. While the proposed removal of the RebateCode field may also be of value provided the new terms ConcessionCardNumber, FromDate and ToDate are clearly identifiable to customers and government bodies, there would need to be further examination of the impact of these changes.</p> <p>Red and Lumo however do not support the addition of CustomerClassification, AverageDaily Load and Solar as they are duplications of existing Standing Data obtainable by the RoLR. Furthermore the addition of the LifeSupportStatus field is redundant given the presence of the SensitiveLoad field and the fact that regardless of the Life Support status, the RoLR will need to perform a reconciliation to confirm at which sites the LNSP is 'RegistrationOwner', indicating which customers the RoLR would need to contact to confirm Life Support Status at a later date.</p> <p>Red and Lumo also do not support the addition of 'N' <i>Not required</i> as the definition of 'R' <i>Required</i> only places an obligation on the LNSP if they hold the data. If the LNSP does not hold the data, they're not required to provide it in the report.</p>

Topic	Question	Comments
2.2 Update of in-text referencing errors and obligations in section 104.4 and 104.5 of the RoLR procedure	Question 2: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to RoLR Procedures table section 104.4? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Red and Lumo support the amendment to require all service providers to identify and report on all Service Orders raised by the Suspended Retailer for which a ServiceOrderResponse transaction has yet to be provided.
2.2 Update of in-text referencing errors and obligations in section 104.4 and 104.5 of the RoLR procedure	Question 3: Do you support the proposed changes with regards to RoLR Procedures table section 104.5? (Answer should be one of “Yes” / “No – provide reason” / “Other – provide reason”)	Red and Lumo support the requirement for the RoLR to initiate a new service order should the customer still require the service.
General	Question 4: If the changes proposed were to be expedited, would your organisation have any issues in implementing the changes by 15 May 2023?	At this stage Red and Lumo will not be detrimentally impacted by the changes being implemented by 15 May 2023 however there is the potential for unnecessary costs if AEMO proceed with the potential duplication of existing Standing Data.

Topic	Question	Comments
General	Question 5: Do you have any other suggestions, comments or questions regarding this consultation? If you have any comments outside of the scope of this consultation, please reach out to your relevant B2B-WG representatives.	No.