

B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details
- Service Orders (version change)
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification (version change)
- Technical Delivery Specification (version change)

CONSULTATION – Draft Stage

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Origin Energy

Completion Date: 18 June 2018

1. Customer and Site Details

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin	Contents		<p>Can we request that the sequence of the BUSINESS RULES and the TRANSACTIONS in the procedure be the same?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customer Details - Life Support - Site Access <p>Suggested to change to the following:</p> <p>4. BUSINESS RULES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. Common Business Rules for Notifications 4.2. Customer Details Request 4.3. Customer Details Notification 4.4. Life Support Customer Details Reconciliation 4.5. Customer Details Reconciliation Life Support (Also swap Life Support Request with Life Support Notification in document for consistency). 4.6. Life Support Reconciliation 4.7. Site Access Request 4.8. Site Access Notification <p>5. TRANSACTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1. CustomerDetailsRequest Data 5.2. CustomerDetailsNotification Data 5.3. SiteAccessRequest Data LifeSupportRequest Data 5.4. SiteAccessNotification Data LifeSupportNotification Data 5.5. LifeSupportNotification Data SiteAccessRequest Data 5.6. LifeSupportRequest Data SiteAccessNotification Data 5.7. BusinessAcceptance/Rejection

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin	4.3.1		<p><u>Clarification Required:</u></p> <p>As the Life Support Notification is now the transaction used to update Life Support at a site could the below be clarified?</p> <p>a. If you look at the main changes to the CDN process it is the removal of the 'Life Support' section, and the addition of 4.3.1 (e), but there is still the requirement to populate the <i>SensitiveLoad</i> field with LS</p> <p>i. If CDN is sent with LS and no LSN has been received by DNSP, then will the CDN be rejected?</p> <p>ii. Conversely, if a site is registered with LS and a CDN is sent with <i>SensitiveLoad</i> as 'none' and no LSN has been received by DNSP, then will the CDN be rejected?</p>
Origin	4.5		<p><u>Clarification Required:</u></p> <p>Clause (a) specifies that parties "can" adopt the following processes in clause 4.5.</p> <p>The following clause (b) then specifies that a Customer Details Reconciliation "must" use the <u>CustomerDetailsNotification</u>.</p> <p>As there is only one transaction that can be used for a Customer Details Reconciliation should clause (a) be changed from "can" to "should" or "must" or is there another method participants can adopt to undertake a reconciliation?</p>
Origin	4.5 (a)		Where it says, "can adopt the following processes described below" it should refer to the relevant clauses as it specifies "must" in subsequent clauses.

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin	4.6		<p><u>Clarification Required:</u></p> <p>Clause (a) specifies that parties “can” adopt the following processes in clause 4.6.</p> <p>The following clause (b) then specifies that a Current Retailers and DNSP’s “must” conduct a reconciliation of Life Support.</p> <p>As there is only one transaction that can be used to initiate a Life Support Reconciliation, should clause (a) be changed from “can” to “should” or “must” or is there another method participants can adopt to undertake a reconciliation?</p>
Origin	4.6 (a)		<p>Where it says, “can adopt the following processes described below” it should refer to the relevant clauses as it specifies must in subsequent clauses.</p>
Origin	4.6 (b) & (f)		<p><u>Clarification Required:</u></p> <p>As Current Retailers and DNSPs must conduct a reconciliation of Life Support Details for NMIs with Life Support customers at least four times per year and clause (f) allows for both parties to agree on the timing can it also be included that the four times per year is once per quarter?</p>

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
Origin	5.5		<p>Why can't LSN deregistration be for a future date?</p> <p>The Definition/Comments for the <i>DateRequired</i> field states that "For a registration of Life Support, this date will be either the current date or a future date", but "For a deregistration of Life Support, this will be either the current date or a retrospective date"</p> <p>If we could select a future date for deregistration, we could solve some of our CDN (now LSN?) timing issues for a LS move out, i.e. we could notify on which date LS will no longer be applicable and therefore when we could raise a De-energisation</p>
Origin	5.6		<p>The LifeSupportRequest data requirements is light on information for the receiving party. Origin propose additional reason fields be added to the LifeSupportRequest.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Confirm Life Support2. Confirm Life Support – Previous Retailer Registration -3. Confirm Life Support - Reconciliation
Origin	5.7		<p>Under Definition/Comments for Event Code "Table 10" should be changed to "Table 12".</p> <p>Under Definition/Comments for Explanations this should also refer to "Table 12".</p>