B2B Procedures

- Service Orders
- Customer and Site Details
- Meter Data
- One Way Notification
- RoLR Part B

Retail Electricity Market Procedures – Glossary and Framework.

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: Active Stream*

***Completion Date**: 2/12/2016*

Table of Contents

1. General 3
2. Consultation Questions 4
3. Service Orders 5
4. CSDN 18
5. Meter Data 24
6. OWN 27
7. RoLR Part B 31
8. Glossary and Framework 32

1. General

Comments
1. The term MP and MPB has been utilised throughout the B2B documents suggest a consistent approach.
2. Name for Tabulated information has alternated between **Figure** and **Table**. Suggest Table to be used: a. as Figure is defined as a picture/drawing/diagram in a book or document and b. Table is defined as a set of information (data) arranged in rows and columns
3. Hard to make a determination on the context overall when a technical spec is not available to be reviewed in tandem with the B2B procs.

2. Consultation Questions

Section	Consultation Issue	Response
6.2A	Do the content and the structure of the Service Order Transactions meet industry needs?	Yes - As a first draft and with the feedback provided.
6.3D	Should the SiteAccessNotification be available for parties related to a NMI to send new or updated site hazards and access details?	For best industry practices, participants should be able to send SiteAccessNotification to update. The Recipient should have the option to manage the information as per internal process.
6.3E	Which participant(s) should be considered the 'master of record' holder for this information?	Suggest for consistency the Retailer maintain the Site details as master of record as it relates to NMIs and customers.

3. Service Orders

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
General	• The figures/diagrams need to be reviewed as poor quality. When the view is increased wording become blurred.	
	CONTENT TABLE	**Summary of the Management of Multiple Service Order and Multiple Retailer Situations** The style of this needs to be amended to align with the contents table – it appears to have its own style.
	1.1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE	As there are more than the ESC jurisdictional codes suggest to reword to jurisdictional instruments and include the NEL.
	1.2. DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATION	(c) In the event of any inconsistency between this Procedure and the B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification or the B2B Procedure Technical Guidelines for B2B Procedures (together referred to as the "B2B Technical Procedures"), unless this Procedure provides otherwise, the relevant B2B Technical Procedure shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency. • Suggest this dot point should not be a dot point of Glossary & Framework. Recommend making it a dot point of its own in the section. • The highlighted section requires updating once the documents have been confirmed. Currently incorrect references.

	1.3.1 EXCLUSIONS	This should be renumbered and included in a new section possibly 1.4 Scope. It's not clear why under a section header of *RELATED AEMO DOCUMENTS*
		(i) Suggest rewording to: processes for unmetered supplies
		(iii) automated / electronic Service Order status requests. The Retailer should contact the Service Provider if they require a status report suggest rewording as not to pre-empt an approach: automated / electronic Service Order status requests.
	1.3.2 TERMINOLGY	Suggest renumber *1.3.2 Terminology* under own section header; Does not really belong under RELATED AEMO DOCUMENTS
		Table 1 – Special Read Special Read | • Check Read • Final Read | The Initiator requires a Special Meter Reading not associated with a re-energisation or a de-energisation. If the DNSP is the MC, the Service Order must be sent to the DNSP. | Used to obtain a Special Read (rather than a scheduled read) arises where an out of cycle reading is required. Consistency with Table Contents: Suggest remove the highlighted section as it dictates a process, which has been reiterated in section 2.1.2(d).
		Table 1 – meter reconfiguration Remove last bullet point (empty) from 'Description of use'

	2.1.2 General Principles	• (e) replace 'Retailer' with 'Initiator'; for consistency. • (f) replace 'Retailer' with 'Initiator'; for consistency. • (g) replace 'Service Provider' with 'Recipient'; for consistency • (h) should this be retained in B2B procs or alternate doc? • (i) include type Type 5MRIM & Type 4A. This obligation should apply to all manually read meters. • (k) *If the Recipient issues a ServiceOrderResponse with a ServiceOrderStatus of "PartiallyCompleted" or "Not Completed", the Initiator* Add ':' after Initiator • (k) (ii) Capitalise 'I' of 'if' at the beginning of the bullet point. • (p) Suggest rewording to describe the intention without implying a solution. The details contained in the service order sent to the Recipient, should be provided to the Notified Parties.
	2.2. Acknowledging Receipt of the ServiceOrderRequest	(b) perhaps reword to exclude solution. Suggest: The Recipient must send a BusinessAcceptance/Rejection to be received by the Initiator and nominated Notified Parties. It acknowledges that the Recipient has validated, understood and accepted or rejected the ServiceOrderRequest.
		(e) Suggest the addition following…with a new ServiceOrderId, *The Service OrderID should be sent to the Recipient and any associated Notified Parties.*
		(f)suggest remove …'the failure of the delivery'

		There appears to be a gap/misalignment with the obligations of the Notified Parties accept/reject responses and the discussions/requirements determined in the SWG.
	2.3. Service Orders Requiring Customer Consultation	(a) this clause needs to be removed and included in the B2B Guide. (b)(ii) suggest removing the word 'reasonably' c) *The Recipient must use reasonable endeavours to consult with the customer …* Suggest this is removed as pre-empting a process outside the B2B Communications. Otherwise, for consistency and 'completeness' of the process in this clause, suggest clarifying the action for the recipient if the Customer Consultation has been requested in the SO. It is not clear how they proceed if the contact with the customer is not made.
	2.5. Where work will not be completed within the Required Timeframe	Recommend this section is reworded with the clauses generic to apply where applicable to all participants. Where specific to only certain participants this should also be referenced. a) Suggest this is removed as the obligations can apply to the DNSPs or contestable metering service providers. b)Suggest the following rewording: See section 3.3.3 of this procedure for timing requirements as applicable to DNSPs.

	2.6. Raising a ServiceOrderResponse	Suggest at a minimum there should be standard timeframes for close out of Service Orders which the industry can set as a baseline. This would not prevent bi lateral agreements to deliver better performances if they chose to. e) correct spelling of *Notidied to Notified*
	2.7. Use of Status, Exception and Product Codes in ServiceOrderResponses	(a)(i) suggested amend the wording “work request” to “work requested” for consistency. c) Replaces instances of Service provider with Recipient.
	2.8. Closing the Service Order Process	(b) amend spelling for *Recipient* in the last sentence.
	2.11. Resending a ServiceOrderRequest	The wording of this clause appears to be disconnected from **discussions** in the SWG – TDS not yet available. Suggest review the objective of this clause and suggest rewording to preclude solution or ensure the TDS aligns with this clause.
	2.12. Resending a ServiceOrderResponse	The wording of this clause appears to be disconnected from **discussions** in the SWG – TDS not yet available. Suggest review the objective of this clause and suggest rewording to preclude solution or ensure the TDS aligns with this clause.
	2.13. Service Paperwork	Suggest for consistency Initiator and Recipient to be used.

		2.13.3 &2.13.4 The B2B Procedures are to allow communications b/w business to business A change to the B2B Framework was undertaken to provide for parties using the advanced metering services. Yet this draft of the B2B SO only elaborates on the DNSPs and Retailers role in the activities of De-energisation and Re-energisation. Recommend the inclusion of obligations for remote re-en & de-en. Suggested approach: clause (a) of each section removed and the section reworded accordingly to reflect generic obligations on the B2B comms at a minimum. For example, the Initiator still requires to raise a B2B SO for a remote re-en or de-en or in order to avoid delay in Customer re-energisations, Recipient should re-energise upon receiving a ServiceOrderRequest irrespective of the transfer status in MSATS, etc.
	2.13.3 RE-ENERGISATION	c) this clause is applicable to all metering participants. Replace DNSP with Recipient.
		(b) Suggest to include the obligation for manually read Type 5 and Type 4a meters.
		(d) After hours re-energisation (i) - (v) applicable to all – not just DNSPs. (iii) is this a sub point of (i) with respect to Non-Business Hours? (iv) the second sentence is B2B Guide material. (v) this is B2B Guide Material

		(f) suggest rewording to: If a Retailer raises a Re-energisation ServiceOrderRequest the Recipient must ensure the site is re-energised and a read is provided for the date component of *ActualDateAndTime* (subject to 2.13.3) • the Service Order Type Re-energisation no longer has a Service Order Sub Type. • applicable to all – not just DNSPs
		(g) This clause should be removed as the Service Order Type Re-energisation no longer has a Service Order Sub Type.
		(h) applicable to all – not just DNSPs
		(i) (k) Suggest that these clauses would be also applicable to Remote re-energisations.
	2.13.4 DE-ENERGISATION	(a) remove or include it as a sub heading for DNSP requirements only.
		(b) this clause is applicable to all metering participants. Replace DNSP with Recipient.
		c) this clause is applicable to all metering participants. Replace DNSP with Recipient.

		(d) (i) this is no longer applicable as the suggested ServiceOrderSubType no longer exist. (ii)applicable to all – not only DNSPs: suggest rewording: If the Retailer receives payment before the ServiceOrderResponse is received, the Retailer must raise a cancellation ServiceOrderRequest, if the ScheduledDate is in the future. (Same day cancellations are to follow clause (d)(iv)4 below. (iii) This does not relate to B2B Communications. Perhaps B2B Guide Material (iv) applicable to all – not only DNSPs replace DNSP with Recipient. (v) applicable to all – not only DNSPs
	2.13.5 Special Read	(a) this clause is a process outcome of a B2B Special Read. Does not relate to B2B SO process. Suggest remove it as identified in the appropriate SLP or use include it as a guide to Participants. (b) Replace Service Provider with Recipient.
	2.13.6 Supply Abolishment	Clarification is sought in this clause for instances where a site has been de-energised and vacant for a while – hence no retailer. The authorised site agent approaches the DB directly for a supply abolishment.
		(b) Replace Service Provider with Recipient.

	2.13.7 Multiple Service Orders	(a) remove as the following obligations/requirements apply to all not only DNSPs and they need to be reworded as generic requirements. (e) Suggest: • replacing Site with NMI • replacing Service Provider with Recipient • the following rewording of the clause: Where there is a Re-energisation and De-energisation received for a NMI, Recipients have the discretion to undertake a single meter reading instead actioning the de-energisation and then re-energisation requests. (f) section has not been identified. Currently states section 0.
	2.13.7.1 Multiple Service Orders for Multiple Retailers	Suggest Table 4 (instead of Figure 4) Service Order Summary Suggest Table 5 (instead of Figure 5) Multiple Service Order Scenarios
	2.13.7.2 Scenario Process Description – Scenarios 1-6	(a)(ii) de-energisation can be remote or require a field visit. Suggest replace the word 'fieldwork' with 'activity'. (a)(ii) (A) + (B) re-energisation can be remote or require a field visit. Suggest replace the word 'fieldwork' with 'activity'. (iii) suggest rewording: If the de-energisation activity cannot be rationalised by the Recipient, they will: (A) Ensure the final status of the NMI is energised (B) Send a ServiceOrderResponse to both ServiceOrderRequests to indicate the respective outcome of the activity using the relevant ExceptionCodes and applicable ProductCodes. (b) suggest replacing Site with NMI
	2.13.7.3 Scenario Process Description – Scenarios 7	(b) Amend Initiator to Initiators.

	2.13.7.6. Multiple Service Orders from Same Initiator	Suggest Table 6 (instead of Figure 6) New Service Order same Retailer
	3.1. Overview of Timing Requirements	(a) suggest remove the wording 'regulated' from 'regulated timeframes'. Even in a contestable world the timing overview is generic enough to be applicable for regulated and non-regulated businesses.
		• Suggest Figure 4 (instead of Figure 7) Timing Overview • Suggest Figure 5 (instead of Figure 8) Timing for completion of work
	3.2.1 Timing Points	• Table 4 : Timing Point E: does not flow well. Suggest removing …'has beenattempted or completed. • Suggest Table 7 (instead of Table 4) Timing Point Definitions
	3.2.2 Use of Timing Periods	• Suggest Table 8 (instead of Table 5) Timing Period Definitions
	3.3. Specific Timing Requirements	
		References to specific Sections of the B2B Procedure TDS need to be updated when TDS amended.i.e. sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.5, 3.3.6.
		Suggest Table 9 (instead of Figure 9) Notice Period Table
	3.3.3. Timing Requirement for Completion of the Requested Work	Suggest Table 10 (instead of Figure 10) Timing Period for completion of work

	3.3.6. Timing Requirement for BusinessAcceptance/Rejection for Responses	• Restart numbering for bullet point.
	4.1. ServiceOrderRequest Transaction Data	Suggest Table 11 (instead of Figure 11) Transaction Table
		Table 1 identifies the Service Order Type as Miscellaneous Services and figure 11 records it as Miscellaneous. The Service Order Type name needs to be aligned in the document.
		Suggest for consistency in Transaction Table the use of Recipient in place of Service Provider

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Field</th><th>Format</th><th>Definition</th><th>Supply Service Works</th><th>Re-energisation</th><th>De-energisation</th><th>Special Read</th><th>Metering Service Works</th><th>Miscellaneous</th></tr>
<tr><td>FormReference</td><td>VARCHAR(15)</td><td>Reference to the forms associated with Supply Works Request and Meter Service Works. Refer to the Service Paperwork reference Table in the B2B guide document.
Not Required for a “Cancel” ServiceOrderRequest.</td><td>R/N</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>R/N</td><td>O</td></tr>
<tr><td>FormNumber</td><td>VARCHAR(15)</td><td>Where the form listed in FormReference is numbered, this field is populated with the number on the form.
Not Required for a “Cancel” ServiceOrderRequest.</td><td>R/N</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>R/N</td><td>O</td></tr>
</table>
With respect to section 2.13.3 clauses (i) and (k) suggest the highlighted section be R/N instead of N.

Suggest the table and the associated status: M, R, N and O needs to be reviewed.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. SERVICEORDERRESPONSE TRANSACTION DATA</td>
<td>

Suggest Table 12 (instead of Figure 12) Service Order Transaction
Suggest the De-energisation Method field to be included to confirm the method utilised in the de-energisation.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.SERVICEORDERAPPOINTMENTNOTIFICATION TRANSACTION DATA</td>
<td>Suggest Table 13 (instead of Figure 13) Service Order Appointment Notification transaction data</td>
</tr>
</table>

	4.4. BusinessAcceptance/Rejection Transaction Data	Suggest Table 14 (instead of Figure 14) Business Acceptance Rejection data
	4.4.1. Applicable Events and their EventCodes	Suggest Table 15 (instead of Figure 15) Business Event Codes

4. CSDN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	1.3. Related AEMO Documents	(a) recommend this clause to be moved in the introduction section.
	2. Customer & Site Details Process	Suggest itemising the Notifications and associated definitions so that Participants can relate each notification to the context of the document.
	2.1. Process Diagrams	Suggest rewording to define the "major case scenario' in the forefront and calling out succinctly the alternative trigger. Also the current paragraph does not include mention of the SiteDetailsNotification or SiteAccessRequest. Suggest: Figures 1-4 show the entire process for the provision of Customer and Site Details. The Initiator will provide the Recipient with the required CustomerDetailsNotification/SiteDetailsNotification to advise of customer & site details. This may be triggered by a change of customer/site details or in response to receiving a CustomerDetailsRequest/SiteAccessRequest.

		(b) & (c) contain Timing requirements information; suggest moving them to Section 3: Timing Requirements.
		Figure 2 CustomerDetailsNotification process (Notification sent by an Initiator) Suggest renaming to CustomerDetailsNotification process (Notification triggered by an Initiator) To better define, as all CustomerDetailsNotification will be sent by the Initiator.
		Figure 3 – blurry cannot be read
		As Figure 5 Pre Installation Process diagram has been included suggest some reference to the Pre-Installation Request Process prior to this point
	3.2. Other Timing Requirements	(a) the SiteDetailsNotification in response to a SiteAccessRequest has not been identified. Suggest including this in clause (a).
		(b)(ii) • The correct B2B SO names should be used instead of Supply connect or Install Meter Service Order • (A) Suggest both SO notifications; hence, replace **or** with **and/or** This will capture the scenario of NSW and the other states. The current wording of the clause only apply to NSW.
		(d) replace **;** with **:**

		(d) (ii) remove **o;**
		(d)(v) Does not read well as a bullet point. Suggest removing it and if it is intended as a condition then the opening sentence of (d) should be amended to read…for an energised NMI….
		(g) The PreInstallationRequest in the majority of cases will be utilised between an existing MPB and an incoming MPB. There may not be an agreement between the 2 MPBs or their associated MCs. The current wording implies that a particular path will be taken by all MPBs, where there may not be a requirement. Suggest the wording be amended to provide a Timeframe (suggest align with CustomerDetailsNotification response timeframes) for when agreements are not in place or allow for situations where agreements exist. Suggest rewording: Where a PreInstallationRequest is sent the recipient must provide the PreInstallationResponse within 2 business days of receiving the PreInstallationRequest or as otherwise agreed.
	4.1. Common Business Rules for Notifications	(d) replace **DNSP or the MPB** with **Recipient**
		(e) everything after the first sentence is not a business rule. Suggest it is guidance input.
		(f) suggest using **CustomerDetailsNotification/SiteAccessNotification** in place of **update**s

	4.2. Customer Details Request	Suggest we remove nominated roles and maintain consistency with **Initiator** and **Recipient** (a) • remove **they** from …when **they** it reasonably believes… • Customer and site Details Notification replace with CustomerDetailsNotification
	4.3. Customer Details Notification	Suggest clearly identifying that the current Retailer can only provide CDNs.
	4.3.1. Initiating a Customer Details Notification	(a) Capitalise '**I**' in Initiator
	4.3.2. Life Support	(a) • An MPB will also require the notification of a Life Support situation by phone in the instance that a Metering Service Works B2B SO is open for that NMI. Reword to DNSP/MPB • The fields should be the same for clauses (a) & (b)

		(b) Interpreting the objective of this clause, suggest that the MPB should have the same **B2B communication obligation** as the DNSP, post 1st Dec 2017. The MPB will have equal to or greater than opportunities in the field to identify Life Support customers.
		c) the last sentence of the clause: *to the relevant Recipient and the Recipient must update its records accordingly*. Suggest the sentence reads: 'to the relevant Recipient.' The remainder of the sentence is an internal process and should be no different to how the participant's action any other CustomerDetailsNotification or SDN.
	4.6. Site Access Notification	Suggest restart numbering from (a)…..
		(f) In the interest of better customer service and more efficient practices this should be reworded. If an MPB/DNSP have performed a field visit and discovered a Site Access issue not otherwise identified how do they communicate this information? Suggest removing the precedent condition of 'on receipt of a valid SiteAccessRequest'
		(g) font alignment.

		The last sentence of 4.6… *The DNSP and MPB can only use this transaction to obtain mass updates of information once the timing has been agreed with the relevant Retailer.* • This is a SiteAccessRequest point not a SiteAccessNotification point • It should also include MC. • Seeking clarification on 'mass updates of information' on Site details.
	4.7. Pre-Installation Data Request	The content of 4.7.1 provides information on how and when to use a PreInstallationDataRequest. Suggest it belongs in 4.7.
	4.7.1. PreInstallation Process	*An Initiator may commence a PreInstallationRequest process if they:* Replace: 'PreInstallationRequest' with 'PreInstallationDataRequest' for consistent terminology.
	5.7. BusinessAcceptance/Rejection	

5. Meter Data

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	1.1. Purpose and Scope	*This B2B Procedure: Data Request Process (Procedure) is published* Reword: This B2B Procedure: Meter Data Process is published….. Suggest the below is also removed as not completely correct. Not only MDFF Data
	2.1. Overview	Provide Meter Data 'Description' Column – align left;
	2.2.1. General	(a) remove PreInstallationRequest from this paragraph; not part of the Meter Data Process
	2.2.5 Meter Installation Inquiry Process	Seeking clarification if a Recipient cannot fully satisfy the request. I.e. a Contractual agreement does not allow for the delivery of all data. This would be a rejection or is a Partial option required?

	2.2.6. Remote On Demand Meter Read Process	There is no clear definition on what this process enables and how it differs from a PMD. Suggest a clarification for when a request has been received just after a meter has been read. Table 1 contains the differentiation of contract for service… Assuming it is to satisfy, **Table S7.5.1.1 Minimum Services Specification – services and access parties for (NER)** c) remote on-demand *meter* read service then the definition should also pick up the requirements to request it.
		2.2.6 Remote on Demand Meter Read Process b(i) If the Recipient is able to fully satisfy… (ii) If the Recipient is unable to satisfy Point (ii) does this include partially satisfy or fully satisfy… suggest a clarification or expectation when the request is deemed satisfied or the removal of the word 'Fully' from point (i)
	3.5.MeteringInstallationInquiryDataResponse Data	Clarification is sought what data format is used to send voltage and current data. The MeterInstallationDataResponse Data format does not appear to support the delivery of all data aspects.

	3.6. RemoteOnDemandMeterRead Request	Clarification and detail in defining the RemoteODR is required especially the objective. Nothing has been captured for the response except an MDN. How does this differ from a PMD?
		If this is to satisfy minimum services spec which reads; *The remote retrieval of metering data including quality flags for a specified point or points in time and the provision of such data to the requesting party.* Table 10 does not achieve this. It is missing fields to enable the specified point or points in time requests.

6. OWN

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	1. Introduction	Contents need to be updated as the doc reads 1.4 Related AEMO Documents but contents table reads: 1.3. Related AEMO Documents.
	1.1. Purpose and Scope	This B2B Procedure: One Way Notification Process (Procedure) is published Remove (Procedure) as redundant
	1.2. Definitions and Interpretation	Remove bullet point 1.3 under this section and hence the remainder of sub headings of Section 1 will update.
	1.4. Related AEMO Documents	Amend to 1.3 instead of 1.4
	1.5 Terminology	Amend to 1.4 instead 1.5
	2.1. Message Types	A tabulated format as in the Meter Data Process document for consistency.
		(b) (iii) …to supply at a single or at multiple End User sites) Suggest rewording:

		…to supply at a single or multiple End User site/s.
		(b) (iv) MFN – this message with allow….replace 'with' with 'will'.
		(b)(v) NMW- replace 'Customers' with 'End Users' for consistent terminology. Suggest removing the 'Customers' reference all together to read: ….Meter Works at a site.
	3.1. All Transactions	For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 2 is Table 1
	4. Transaction Data	For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 3 is Table 2
	4.1.2. Meter Exchange Notification	For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 4 is Table 3
	4.1.3. Network Tariff Notification	• In Figure 5 the Field name is METERID and Format is CHAR(8) All other B2B documents show field name as MeterSerialNumber and format as VARCHAR(12) • Suggest that Figure 5 replace with Table 4
	4.1.4. Planned Interruption Notification	• For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables:

		Suggest Figure 6 is Table 5 • Figure 6-Column 10: Duration Remove 'Not required when start and end date is not the same day'. Irrespective the date the works will occur, the recipient should have an indicative timeframe of the interruption to supply.
	4.1.5. Meter Fault and Issue Notification Data	For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 7 is Table 6
	4.1.6. Notice of Metering Works Data	• For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 8 is Table 7 • Figure 8 – Column 10 : *Disconnection at pole top, pillar box or pitFree Text* Separation of pit and Free. Suggest a VARCHAR (50) especially as there is a free text option. • Figure 8 – Column 11: Replace METERID with MeterSerialNumber for consistency • This message appears is too hierarchical to deliver via a flat CSV. Site level data, meter level data, register level data, meter reading data, CL asset data etc. Active Stream suggest this message is better suited to either an XML payload (e.g. current SA Power Networks format) or if not a multi-level CSV file (e.g. Endeavour network current format).

	4.2. BusinessAcceptance/Rejection Transaction Data	• For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 9 is Table 8 • For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 10 is Table 9 KeyInfo – Format: NUMERIC (*8), remove * before 8
	4.3. Applicable events:	For a consistent approach with Figures and Tables: Suggest Figure 11is Table 10

7. RoLR Part B

Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	51.1. APPLICATION	Suggest replacing the word 'Role' with 'Participant' for consistency in the B2B Documents
	54.4. ROLR OBLIGATIONS	(b), (i), (ii), (iii) suggest the inclusion of an MDP
	55.2. ROLR EVENT AFFECTED MSATS PARTICIPANTS' OBLIGATIONS	Table 55A – suggest the inclusion of an MDP

8. Glossary and Framework

Clause	Heading	Comments
		Version release history: perhaps not 1.1 as 1.0 is the first issue for 1 December 2017.
	1.2.4 INTERPRETATION	(d)(ii) B2B Procedures refer to the time applicable at the Site to which a B2B Transaction relates. Suggest include the following insertion at the end …(local time)
	3. GLOSSARY	**Customer and Site Details** The data elements identified in a Notification. Suggest adding 'Customer & Site Details' prior to Notification.
		Customer and Site Details Changes A change to one or more data elements identified in a Notification. Suggest adding 'Customer & Site Details' prior to Notification.
		MP & **MPB** Color code in green

		Notification A Transaction that does not require a corresponding reply. Suggest further definition so that there is a differentiation between Transactions to Notified Parties and B2B Notifications. I.e. perhaps calling out the notifications.
		Notified Party The receiver of a B2B Transaction or B2B Acknowledgement for notification purposes only and not required to respond. The Notified Party will be required to respond but is not required by the initiator to take any action in the market. Suggest rewording ….'and not required by the Initiator to act on the B2B transaction.'
		REC Registered electrical contractor. Capitalise each word.
		Recipient The receiver of a B2B Transaction or B2B Acknowledgement. This can be either a notification or request to perform work. Suggest rewording second sentence: This can either be a B2B Notification or a Service Order request to perform work
	5.1 BASIC EXCHANGE MODEL	Spelling of Initiator… • Iniator sends a BusinessReceipt to the Recipient