



B2B Procedures Version 2.1

Draft Determination Participant Response Pack

Participant: AGL

Completion Date: 07.02.2014

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
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikethrough means delete</p>		
8.1.3	002	<p>Where it advises;</p> <p>4. A Retailer must send only one file for a CustomerDetailsReconciliation for each Reconciliation, unless otherwise agreed between participants.</p> <p>To future proof the procedures incase the size of regular 'reconciliation's should increase (e.g this could incur if there is an increase in volume of LS customers, increase in volume post a RoLR event or company acquisitions) AGL proposes the following insertion be added.</p>	<p>4. A Retailer must send only one file for a CustomerDetailsReconciliation for each Reconciliation, unless <u>the file size exceeds the allowable message size of 1MB as published under 4.8 Size of asexml Messages of the B2B Procedure Technical Delivery Specification or as</u> otherwise agreed between participants.</p>	H	
8.1.3	002	<p>Where it advises under</p> <p>2.2.5A Transitional Provision for Customer Details Reconciliations</p> <p><u>b. During the Transition Period, Participants must continue to conduct</u></p>	<p>2.2.5A Transitional Provision for Customer Details Reconciliations</p> <p>b. During the Transition Period, Participants must continue to conduct reconciliations of <u>Life Support</u> Customer Details in accordance with</p>	H	

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
		<p>reconciliations of Customer Details in accordance with Old clause 2.2.5, unless both the Retailer and the DNSP, for a relevant transaction, agree that New clause 2.2.5 will apply.</p> <p>AGL proposes the following changes to align the wording to correctly reflect the discussions held at Industry in which only reconciliation of Life Support customers will apply from May 2014 as per the procedures.</p>	<p><u>existing agreements in place between the Retailer and DNSP, this is to continue until both the Retailer and the DNSP agree that New clause 2.2.5 will apply.</u></p>		

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
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikethrough means delete</p>		

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
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red-strikeout means delete</p>		

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
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikethrough means delete</p>		

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
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikethrough means delete</p>		

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
			<p><u>Blue underline</u> means insert</p> <p>Red strikethrough means delete</p>		

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.