

**IMPACT & IMPLEMENTATION REPORT – SUMMARY SECTION**  
*(For AEMO to complete and administer)*

<b>Issue Number</b>	<b>IN012/11</b>		
Impacted Jurisdiction (s)	VIC, QLD, SA		
Proponent	Nandu Datar	Company	AEMO
Affected Gas Markets(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retail</li> <li>▪ Wholesale</li> <li>▪ Bulletin Board</li> <li>▪ STTM</li> </ul>	Retail	Consultation process (Ordinary or Expedited)	Ordinary
Industry Consultative forum(s) used	GRCF	Date Industry Consultative forum(s)consultation concluded	19 December 2014
Short Description of change(s)	Process to identify the previous FRO in order to correct erroneous transfers		
Procedure(s) or Documentation impacted	Retail Market Procedures (VIC) Retail Market Procedures (QLD) Retail Market Procedures (SA) Gas Interface Protocol (VIC/QLD) - Participant Build Pack 2 – Systems Interface Definitions Specification Pack (SA/WA) - Interface Control Document (ICD)		
Summary of the change(s)	<p>This change proposes amendments to the transactions that enable a customer transfer to take place. The specifics of the change relates to modifying the existing transaction known as a CATSNotification. The proposal contained within this Impact and Implementation Report (IIR) is to populate the Participant field in the transaction with the Participant id of the current Financially Responsible Organization (FRO) for those transactions sent to the Market Participant who raised the transfer request and the Participant id of the Market Participant who raised the transfer for those sent to the current FRO.</p> <p>CATSNotifications sent during the following stages will contain the details as stated before,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PEN (Pending)</li> <li>• COM (Completed)</li> </ul> <p>The proposal also includes related documentation changes to Retail Market Procedures and several technical artefacts contained in the Gas Interface Protocol (GIP) and the Specification Pack (SP).</p> <p>These same changes mentioned above are under consideration as part of the NSW ACT Retail Gas Project (NARGP) and also form part of the</p>		

	Impact and Implementation Report for IN006/14 (B2B Harmonisation) issued on 9th January 2015.		
I&IR Prepared By	Nandu Datar	Approved By	Natalie Bakas
Date I&IR published	23 January 2015	Date Consultation under 135EE or 135EF concludes	23 February 2015
Contact address for written responses	Nandu Datar, Level 22, 530 Collins Street, MELBOURNE VIC 3000 GPO Box 2008, MELBOURNE VIC 3001		
Email Address for Responses	<a href="mailto:grcf@aemo.com.au">grcf@aemo.com.au</a>		
Other key contact information	<a href="mailto:Nandu.datar@aemo.com.au">Nandu.datar@aemo.com.au</a>		

**IMPACT & IMPLEMENTATION REPORT – DETAILED REPORT SECTION**

**CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF PROPOSAL**

<p>1. Description of change(s) and reasons for change(s)</p>	<p>This proposed changes in this IIR relate to documentation changes to Retail Market Procedures and several technical artefacts contained in the Gas Interface Protocol (GIP) and the Specification Pack (SP). The changes also relate to modifying AEMO and industry participant systems.</p> <p>Using the existing CATSNotification, AEMO systems are to be modified to populate the Participant field in the transaction with the Participant id of the current FRO for those transactions sent to the Market Participant who raised the transfer request and the Participant id of the Market Participant who raised the transfer for those sent to the current FRO.</p> <p>CATSNotifications sent during the following stages will contain the details as stated before,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PEN (Pending)</li> <li>• COM (Completed)</li> </ul> <p>The CATSNotification during the REQ stage is a new transaction sent to the Market Participant who raised the transfer request.</p> <p>The detail in the CATSNotification sent to the Distributor is not changing.</p> <p>These changes will enable Retailers who either win a customer in error or has mistakenly raised the transfer request to identify the previous FRO and request them to win the customer back.</p> <p>Currently there are different processes in the way that the current FRO is required to identify the previous FRO. One of the processes involves Retailer sending “blanket email” to all possible participants to establish previous FRO. This process is costly and time consuming for all concerned. The number of blanket e-mails typically sent per annum in Victoria, Queensland and South Australia is approximately 9000. The changes proposed in this IIR will result in a more efficient and effective ways to remedy the way Retailers can resolve those transfers that have been erroneously raised.</p> <p>See Attachments A, B, C, D and E for marked-up changes to the RMP, GIP and SP documents.</p> <p>Submissions for this final stage of the consultation close on 23 February 2015 and should be emailed to <a href="mailto:grcf@aemo.com.au">grcf@aemo.com.au</a>. Please use the response template provided in Attachment G.</p>
<p>2. Reference documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Procedure Reference</li> <li>▪ GIP/Specification Pack Reference</li> <li>▪ Other Reference</li> </ul>	<p>Retail Market Procedures (VIC)</p> <p>Retail Market Procedures (QLD)</p> <p>Retail Market Procedures (SA)</p> <p>Gas Interface Protocol (VIC/QLD) - Participant Build Pack 2 – Systems Interface Definitions</p> <p>Speciation Pack (SAWA) - Interface Control Document (ICD)</p>

<p>3. The high level details of the change(s) to the existing Procedures</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A comparison of the existing operation of the Procedures to the proposed change to the operation of the Procedures</li> <li>▪ A marked up version of the Procedure change (see Attachment A)</li> </ul>	<p>Below is a summary of the proposed changes to Retail Market Procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Retail Market Procedure (VIC) to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Amend the text of clause 4.2.2(d) and remove sub clauses (i) and (ii)</li> <li>○ Amend the text of clause 4.2.2(e)</li> <li>○ Insert new sub-heading 4.8.1 Notification by AEMO</li> <li>○ Insert new sub-section 4.8.2 Registration Notice Information</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amend Retail Market Procedure (QLD) to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Amend the text of clause 4.2.2(d) and remove sub clauses (i) and (ii)</li> <li>○ Amend the text of clause 4.2.2(e)</li> <li>○ Insert new sub-heading 4.8.1 Notification by AEMO</li> <li>○ Insert new sub-section 4.8.2 Registration Notice Information</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amend Retail Market Procedure (SA) to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Insert new sub-clauses 102 (c) and 102 (d)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Below is a summary of the proposed changes to the technical artefacts contained in the GIP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend VIC &amp; QLD Participant Build Pack 2 – System Interface Definitions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Under the section 4.1.13.1 Notice of Transfer Transaction, amend the data elements table for CATSNotification to modify the text in Usage column against the data element ‘Participant’</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Below is a summary of the proposed changes to the technical artefacts contained in the SP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend SA Specification Pack – Interface Control Document to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 8.1.8.1 Physical Transaction table amend the text in Usage/Comments column against the data element Participant</li> <li>○ 8.1.11.1 Physical Transaction table amend the text in Usage/Comments column against the data element Participant</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>4. Explanation regarding the order of magnitude of the change</p> <p>(eg: material, non-material or non-substantial)</p>	<p>Based on the advice provided to AEMO by Retailers during the Proposed Procedure Change (PPC) consultations and AEMO own assessment the systems and process changes they are not overly complex and do not involve any aseXML schema changes therefore are considered minor in nature. The system change involves Victorian, Queensland and South Australian participants.</p> <p>None of the costs that were submitted during either the VAT or PPC consultation were extreme. See section 5 of this IIR for further details.</p> <p>Taking into account the above, the order of magnitude for a change of this nature is non-material.</p>

## ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY EFFECT OF PROPOSAL

5. Overall Industry Cost / benefit (tangible / intangible / risk) analysis and/or cost estimates

### **Stakeholder Consultation**

As prescribed in the 'Approved Process', registered participants and interested stakeholders were requested to complete submissions to the PPC. Submissions to the PPC closed on 19 December 2014. Four registered participants in the VIC, QLD and SA retail markets submitted a response to the PPC supporting implementation of this change.

Using the Gas Retail Consultative Forum (GRCF) participants and stakeholders were asked to complete and submit Stakeholder Assessment Forms (SAFs) to provide AEMO with cost benefit data that AEMO will use, in summarised form, to develop the IIR. Three (1 Distributor and 2 Retailers) out of the four respondents submitted the SAF. This change has no impact on Distributor's systems and processes. Comments received on the costs/benefits of the proposed change are summarised below.

#### Impact Assessment

Implementation of this change is supported by all respondents. The participants indicated minor system / training business process impacts depending on the option progressed.

#### Scale of Importance of Change

Participants were asked to rate the importance of the proposed change for their organisation taking into account the industry as a whole. A rating was given using a scale from 1 to 10 (1 less important, 10 extremely important).

The average of the two Retailer responses ranked the change 8 out of 10.

#### Estimated Costs Assessment

Based on the responses received and applying an average estimated cost for those participants that did not respond to the SAF request, the total industry cost to implement this change is estimated at \$72K. This cost includes participant's internal IT system, training and business process changes.

The AEMO estimated costs to implement this change is approximately \$68K which covers VIC, SA and QLD changes.

There were no ongoing costs identified.

#### Benefits Identified

##### *Tangible*

The total industry benefits identified are savings of approximately \$160K per annum. This amount relates to reduced labour and time in identifying the previous retailer for incorrectly transferred customers and savings related to avoided ombudsman cases.

The benefit to AEMO is saving on time spent by support hub attending to the calls to identify previous FRO. Since these calls are not categorised, AEMO is unable to accurately identify the benefits.

##### *Intangible*

	<p>The intangible benefits identified are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streamlined Industry approach to establish previous FRO details.</li> <li>• Significant reduction in the volume of bulk emails issued across all Retailers relating to transfer errors.</li> <li>• Efficient identification of previous FRO details by obtaining details from the record of source.</li> <li>• Improved communication between impacted participants</li> <li>• Reduction in delayed service response times currently experienced by customers and follow up customer queries.</li> <li>• A change will ensure direct contact with relevant party ability to follow an escalation process.</li> <li>• Financial benefits attributed as a result of reduced manual enquiry handling.</li> <li>• Better meet customer expectations and improved service information to customers.</li> <li>• AEMO contributing to improving business process efficiency for the industry participants.</li> </ul> <p><u>Payback Period</u></p> <p>In order to determine whether a procedure change is economically sound, AEMO has applied a Net Industry Value cost/benefit approach to determine whether this change should proceed on a cost-effective basis. The results are as follows.</p> <p>The total discounted benefits for industry over 5 years @ 3.44%<sup>1</sup> is \$791K compared to the discounted costs of \$150K resulting in a positive return benefit/cost ratio of 5.27. This result therefore indicates that this change passes on a cost-effective basis noting that estimates for the cost and benefit were largely deduced based on assumptions because of the lack of information supplied to AEMO from Retailers.</p> <p>It is also important to note that the intangible benefits also support the implementation of this initiative.</p>
<p>6. The likely implementation effect of the change(s) on stakeholders</p> <p>(e.g. Industry or end-users)</p>	<p>The proposed changes will require changes to AEMO systems to generate CATSNotification with relevant participant id and Retailer systems to receive and interpret a modified CATSNotification during the PEN and COM stages.</p>
<p>7. Testing requirements</p>	<p>Internal system testing by the Retailers will be required to interpret the modified CATSNotification received from AEMO.</p> <p>Internal system testing by AEMO will be required to ensure the CATSNotification generated contains the relevant participant id.</p> <p>The proposed system changes that are to be applied, interact with</p>

<sup>1</sup> Reserve Bank 5 year bond yield as at 12/01/2015 was 3.44%

	<p>a transaction that utilises the FRC HUB. Clause 1.4 of the FRC HUB Operating Terms and Conditions stipulates that when parties modify an existing system used to generate the format, structure or method of transmission of a transaction that is passed through the FRC HUB, they must first seek re-certification for that transaction impacted by the changed system, prior to placing the change in a state such that it sends transactions via the FRC Hub. Given this criteria AEMO and all participants need to recertify at least the impacted transactions, however if a participant can provide evidence that recertification from their system's change perspective is not warranted, AEMO will consider such a request.</p>
<p>8. AEMO's preliminary assessment of the proposal's compliance with section 135EB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consistency with NGL and NGR,</li> <li>- regard to national gas objective</li> <li>- regard to any applicable access arrangements</li> </ul>	<p><u>Consistency with NGL and NGR:</u></p> <p>AEMO's view is that the proposed changes are consistent with the NGL and NGR.</p> <p><u>National gas objective</u></p> <p><i>"Promote efficient investment in, and efficient operation and use of, natural gas services for the long term interests of consumers of natural gas with respect to price, quality, safety, reliability and security of supply of natural gas."</i></p> <p>It is AEMO's view that this change will streamline industry approach to establishing previous FRO. It will enable Retailers who either win a customer in error or has mistakenly raised the transfer request, identify the previous FRO and request them to win the customer back. This change will also lead to improved customer experience since it is harder for them to transfer back to the correct Retailer.</p> <p><u>Applicable access arrangements</u></p> <p>AEMO's view is that the proposed changes are not in conflict with existing Access Arrangements. No Distributor raised any concerns with the proposed amendments in relation to their Access Arrangement.</p>
<p>9. Consultation Forum Outcomes</p> <p>(e.g. the conclusions made on the change(s) whether there was unanimous approval, any dissenting views)</p>	<p>The GRCF and the RBPWG are standing forums for providing effective and efficient consultation with stakeholders on development of the Victorian, Queensland and South Australian Gas Retail Markets.</p> <p>The GRCF and the RBPWG developed elements of this proposed change (prior to the formal consultation) over the period September to October 2014. In the last week of October 2014, a Gas Market Issue (GMI) paper describing the issue and a solution to remedy the issue that also contained a detail design of the procedure changes were circulated to the RBPWG recommending that this proposal progress to the formal consultation stage (Proposed Procedure Change - PPC). No Participant opposed this recommendation.</p> <p>During the formal consultation stage at least one of the participant's response to the PPC indicated issues with the scope and implementation timeframe. Subsequent discussions came up with following options for retailers to consider.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain the current scope and change the implementation</li> </ol>

	<p>timeframe from Q3 2015 to align with NARGP, April 2016</p> <p>2. Retain the current implementation timeframe of Q3 2015 but reduce the scope and costs by removing the CATSNotification transaction that is sent to Market Participant who initiated the transfer (ie - during the 'REQ' stage).</p> <p>The retailers unanimously agreed to proceed with option 2 from above.</p> <p>Attachment F is summary of the responses that AEMO has received from participants in response to the Proposed Procedure Change (PPC) consultation.</p>
--	--

<b>RECOMMENDATION(S)</b>	
<p>10. Should the proposed Procedures be made, (with or without amendments)?</p>	<p>AEMO recommends that the proposed amendments to the procedures as described in Attachments A to E should be made with amendments as per the PPC feedback in attachment F.</p> <p>In recommending this change, AEMO requests Retailer to note that as described in section 5 of the IIR, having only a small quantity of responses to work with has meant that a larger than normal estimated assumptions were applied to the NPV. AEMO again invites those Retailers that did not provide SAF at the PPC stage to provide a SAF before this IIR submission closes or at least provide positive acknowledgement or otherwise that your organisation doesn't have any dissenting view on the positive net benefit that AEMO determined.</p>
<p>11. If applicable, a proposed effective date for the proposed change(s) to take effect and justification for that timeline.</p>	<p>The consultation timeline for the proposed changes is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IIR released: 23 January 2015</li> <li>• IIR submissions due: 23 February 2015</li> <li>• AEMO decision: 10 March 2015</li> <li>• June 2015 – Target date for AEMO publishing notice of effective date</li> <li>• Target effective date: Q3 2015</li> </ul>

## ATTACHMENT A – PROPOSED CHANGES RETAIL MARKET PROCEDURES (VIC)

Blue represents additions **Red** and ~~strikeout~~ represents deletions – Marked up changes

### 4.2 Notification of Transfer

#### 4.2.2 Transfer Request Notification Information

A *transfer request notification* in relation to a *transfer request* must include the following information:

- (a) the *MIRN* for the *supply point* to which the *transfer request* relates;
- (b) the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request*;
- (c) whether the *transfer request* contains a *customer no-change statement*;
- (d) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *retrospective transfer date*: the proposed registration end date (if any)
  - ~~(i) the name of the Market Participant who delivered the transfer request to AEMO; and~~
  - ~~(ii) the proposed registration end date (if any);~~
- (e) ~~where the proposed transfer date nominated in the transfer request is a prospective transfer date and the supply point is a distribution supply point, and only~~ in the case of the *transfer request notification* which is delivered to the FRO and Distributor ~~in whose distribution area that for a distribution supply point is located~~, the name of the *Market Participant* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO; ~~and~~
- (f) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *prospective transfer date* and the *supply point* is a *transmission supply point*, and only in the case of the *transfer request notification* which is delivered to the *transmission system Service Provider* with respect to that part of the *transmission system* on which the *transmission supply point* is located, the name of the *Market Participant* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO.

### 4.8 Registration Notification

#### 4.8.1 Notification by AEMO

Where, pursuant to clauses 4.6.1 or 4.7.1 (as the case may be), AEMO registers a *Market Participant* in the *metering register* as the *FRO* for a *supply point*, AEMO must, by midnight on the first *business day* after it registers that *Market Participant* in the *metering register* as the *FRO* for that *supply point*, deliver notice of that registration, together with the date from which that registration is deemed to take effect (*registration notice*) to:

- (a) that *Market Participant*;
- (b) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *prospective transfer date*, the person who was the *FRO* for that *supply point* immediately prior to the registration of that *Market Participant* as the *FRO* for that *supply point*;
- (c) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *retrospective transfer date*, the *retrospectively affected FRO* in relation to the *transfer request*;

- (d) if that *supply point* is a *distribution supply point* - the *Distributor* in whose *distribution area* that *distribution supply point* is located; and
- (e) if that *supply point* is a *transmission supply point* - the *transmission system Service Provider* with respect to that part of the *transmission system* on which the *transmission supply point* is located.

#### **4.8.2 Registration Notice Information**

A registration notice in relation to a transfer request must include the following information:

- (a) In relation to the *Distributor* and the *FRO* for that *supply point* immediately prior to the registration;
  - (i) *MIRN* for the *supply point* to which the *transfer request* relates; and
  - (ii) the *Market Participant* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO;
- (b) In relation to the *Market Participant* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO for that *supply point*;
  - (i) *MIRN* for the *supply point* to which the *transfer request* relates; and
  - (ii) the *FRO* for that *supply point* immediately prior to the registration.

## ATTACHMENT B – RETAIL MARKET PROCEDURES (QLD)

Blue represents additions ~~Red~~ and ~~strikeout~~ represents deletions – Marked up changes

### 4.2 Notification of Transfer

#### 4.2.2 Transfer Request Notification Information

A *transfer request notification* in relation to a *transfer request* must include the following information:

- (a) the *MIRN* for the *distribution supply point* to which the *transfer request* relates;
- (b) the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request*;
- (c) whether the *transfer request* contains a *Customer no-change statement*;
- (d) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *retrospective transfer date*: the proposed registration end date (if any)  
~~(iii) the name of the Market Participant who delivered the transfer request to AEMO; and~~  
~~(iv) the proposed registration end date (if any);~~
- (e) ~~where the proposed transfer date nominated in the transfer request is a prospective transfer date and the supply point is a distribution supply point, and only~~ in the case of the *transfer request notification* ~~which is~~ delivered to the *FRO* and *Distributor* ~~in whose distribution area that for a distribution supply point is located~~, the name of the ~~Market Participant~~ *User* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO; ~~and~~

### 4.8 Registration Notification

#### 4.8.1 Notification by AEMO

Where, pursuant to clauses 4.6.1 or 4.7.1 (as the case may be), AEMO registers a *User* in the *metering register* as the *FRO* for a *distribution supply point*, AEMO must, by midnight on the first *business day* after it registers that *User* in the *AEMO meter register* as the *FRO* for that *distribution supply point*, deliver notice of that registration, together with the date from which that registration is deemed to take effect (*registration notice*) to:

- (a) that *User*;
- (b) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *prospective transfer date*, the person who was the *FRO* for that *distribution supply point* immediately prior to the registration of that *User* as the *FRO* for that *distribution supply point*;
- (c) where the *proposed transfer date* nominated in the *transfer request* is a *retrospective transfer date*, the *retrospectively affected FRO* in relation to the *transfer request*; and
- (d) the *Distributor* in whose *distribution region* that *distribution supply point* is located.

#### 4.8.2 Registration Notice Information

A registration notice in relation to a transfer request must include the following information:

- (a) In relation to the *Distributor* and the *FRO* for that *distribution supply point* immediately prior to the registration;
  - (i) *MIRN* for the *distribution supply point* to which the *transfer request* relates; and
  - (ii) the *User* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO;
- (b) In relation to the *User* who delivered the *transfer request* to AEMO for that *distribution supply point*,
  - (i) *MIRN* for the *distribution supply point* to which the *transfer request* relates; and
  - (ii) the *FRO* for that *distribution supply point* immediately prior to the registration.

**ATTACHMENT C – PROPOSED CHANGES RETAIL MARKET PROCEDURES (SA)**

**Blue** represents additions **Red** and **strikeout** represents deletions – Marked up changes

**Division 3.3.8    *The Transfer Takes Effect***

**102.    Requirements for a transfer confirmation**

*A transfer confirmation must specify at least the following information:*

*the MIRN; and*

*the transfer day.*

*in relation to the network operator and the current user for that delivery point the GBO identification of the incoming user*

*in relation to the incoming user who delivered the transfer request to AEMO for that delivery point the GBO identification of the current user for that delivery point.*

**ATTACHMENT D – PROPOSED CHANGES PARTICIPANT BUILD PACK 2:  
SYSTEM INTERFACE DEFINITIONS**

**Blue** represents additions **Red** and **strikeout** represents deletions – Marked up changes

4.1.12.1 Transfer Request State Change Notification Transaction

<b>TRANSACTION DEFINITION TABLE CROSS-REFERENCE</b>	232 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO NEW FRO) 233 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO CURRENT FRO) 234 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO AFFECTED FRO) 235 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO DISTRIBUTOR)
<i>Trigger</i>	Internal processing at AEMO.
<i>Pre-conditions</i>	The Change Request has passed the end of its Objection Period and has no active objections against it.
<i>Post-conditions</i>	All Organisations are notified on Change Request state change.
<i>Transaction acknowledgment specific event codes</i>	3040

This transaction is realised with the aseXML CATSNotification. For the transaction details see 4.1.3.1.

4.1.13.1 Notice of Transfer Transaction

<b>TRANSACTION DEFINITION TABLE CROSS-REFERENCE</b>	226 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO NEW FRO) 227 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO CURRENT FRO) 228 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO AFFECTED FRO) 229 NOTICE OF TRANSFER (TO DISTRIBUTOR)
<i>Trigger</i>	Internal processing at AEMO.
<i>Pre-conditions</i>	The Change Request state is changed to “Completed”
<i>Post-conditions</i>	All Organisations are notified on Change Request state change.
<i>Transaction</i>	3040

<i>acknowledgment specific event codes</i>	
--	--

This transaction is realised with the aseXML CATSNotification.

The following data elements are to be supplied with the Notice of Transfer transaction.

TRANSACTION:		CATSNOTIFICATION
<b>Received From:</b>		AEMO
<b>Sent To:</b>		New FRO (226) Current FRO (227) Affected FRO (228) Distributor (229)
Data Element	Mandatory / Optional / Not Required	Usage
Role	M	The role assigned to the recipient
RoleStatus	M	"N" for a new role, "C" for a current role
Participant	M	<a href="#">(i) contains the initiator (New FRO) of the Change Request when sent to Distributor or the Current FRO or the Affected FRO, or</a> <a href="#">(ii) contains the Current FRO when sent to the New FRO.</a>  <del>else Contains the initiator of the Change Request when sent to New FRO and Distributor, and xsi:nil="true" when sent to the Current FRO.</del>
RequestID	M	The ID assigned by AEMO to the Change Request.
ChangeStatusCode	M	The current status of the change request
ChangeReasonCode	M	From change request
ActualChangeDate	M	The actual date of transfer
MeterReadTypeCode	NR	
ActualEndDate	O	From change request if present

TRANSACTION:		CATSNOTIFICATION
<b>Received From:</b>		AEMO
<b>Sent To:</b>		New FRO (226) Current FRO (227) Affected FRO (228) Distributor (229)
<b>Data Element</b>	<b>Mandatory / Optional / Not Required</b>	<b>Usage</b>
InitiatingRequestID	NR	Information already in RequestID
NMI	M	From change request
checksum	M	An attribute of NMI

**ATTACHMENT E – PROPOSED CHANGES SPECIFICATION PACK – INTERFACE CONTROL DOCUMENT**

*Blue* represents additions *Red* and *strikeout* represents deletions – *Marked up changes*

**8.1 Transfer and Change of Standing Data (Erroneous Transfer Correction)**

The Transfer section of the [RMR] deals with the transfer of customers from one user (current user) to another user (incoming user). Since the customer is assigned a delivery point this is equivalent to transferring gas deliveries at a delivery point from the current user to the incoming user.

When looking for a candidate aseXML transaction to support a required Transfer logical flow the approach will be to try and re-use a suitable transaction from the CATS (CustomerTransfer) application. Where technically feasible this will be the CATS transaction as used in the Victorian gas market for a similar data exchange.

An 'erroneous transfer correction' is a request initiated by the user that was previously associated with a delivery point. This is a request to correct a transfer that may have occurred in error. The process that follows this request is precisely the same as that for a transfer.

Throughout this section reference is made to the 'previous' user. Such a user is conceptually the same as the incoming user, as referred to in the transfer process.

**8.1.8 CATSNotification Transaction – "PENDING" Variant**

**8.1.8.1 Physical Transaction**

*CATSNotification*

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
Role	String(4) "USER" – User "NO" – Network operator	Mandatory	The role assigned to the recipient. Either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"USER" or "NO" to support TFR-PEND-MI-NOTF</li> <li>"USER" or "NO" to support TFR-PEND-NOTF</li> <li></li> </ul>	1..1	Role	xsd:string xsd:maxLength = "4"

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
RoleStatus	String(Enum) "N" = New (incoming) "C" = Current	Mandatory	For TFR-PEND-MI-NOTF, TFR-PEND-NOTF and ECNET-PEND-NOTF - "C" for the Network operator and Current User and "N" for the incoming user.	1..1	RoleStatus	Enumerated list of xsd:string "N","C"

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
Participant	String (10)	Mandatory	<p>If 'Role' = "NO" then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains the GBO Id of the incoming user that initiated the transfer when sent to the Network Operator.</li> </ul> <p>If 'Role' = "USER" or "ROLR" then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">(1) contains the GBO Id of the current user when sent to the incoming user that initiated the transfer</a>  <a href="#">(2) contains the GBO Id of the incoming user that initiated the transfer when sent to the current user</a> <del>We do not communicate the incoming users identity to the current user. Set this to xsi:nil = "true" in this case.</del></li> </ul>	1..1	ChangeRequest/Participant	xsd:string

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
RequestID	Numeric (10)	Mandatory	The unique ID assigned by the Market Operator to the Transfer Request or error correction	1..1	ChangeRequest/RequestID	xsd:positiveIntegermax Inclusive = "9999999999"
ChangeStatusCode	String (4) REQ = Requested PEN = Pending OBJ = Objection COM = Completed CAN = Cancelled [SA ONLY CODES] RCA = RoLR Cancelled RCO = RoLR Completed	Mandatory	For TFR-PEND-MI-NOTF, TFR-PEND-NOTF and ECNET-PEND-NOTF:  Current status of the Change Request. In this case, "PEN"	1..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeStatusCode	xsd:string xsd:maxLength = "4"
ChangeReasonCode	String (4) 0001 = Prospective transfer, in-situ 0002 = Prospective transfer, move in 0003 = Correction of Transfer	Mandatory	One of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "0002" (move in) to support TFR-PEND-MI-NOTF</li> <li>• "0001" to support TFR-PEND-NOTF</li> <li>• "0003" to support ECNET-PEND-NOTF</li> </ul>	1..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeData/ChangeReasonCode	xsd:string xsd:maxLength = "4"

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
ProposedDate	Date (10) Ccy-mm-dd	Mandatory	For TFR-PEND-NOTF and TFR-PEND-NOTF: The Earliest Change Date supplied in the original transfer request or error correction.  For ECNET-PEND-NOTF: The transfer date of the original transfer transaction to be corrected.	1..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeData/ProposedDate	xsd:date
NMI	String(10)	Mandatory	For TFR-PEND-NOTF and TFR-PEND-NOTF: The MIRN in the original Change Request  For ECNET-PEND-NOTF: The MIRN in the original transfer transaction to be corrected.	0..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeData/NMI	xsd:string length="10"
Checksum	Integer(1)	Mandatory	An attribute of NMI	use="optional"	@checksum	xsd:integer" minInclusive="0"maxInclusive="9"

### 8.1.11 CATSNotification Transaction – “COMPLETED” Variant

#### 8.1.11.1 Physical Transaction

##### CATSNotification

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
Role	String(4) "USER" – User "NO" - Network operator	Mandatory	The role assigned to the recipient. In this case either "USER" or "NO"	1..1	Role	xsd:string xsd:maxLength ="4"
RoleStatus	String(Enum) "N" = New (incoming) "C" = Current	Mandatory	For TFR-CONF-NOTF, "C" for the Network operator and Current User and "N" for the incoming user.  For ECNET-CONF-NOTF, "C" for the Network operator and Current User and for the Previous user "N", since this user can be considered to be the incoming user in this process.	1..1	RoleStatus	Enumerated list of xsd:string "N", "C".

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
Participant	String (10)	Mandatory	<p>For TFR-CONF-NOTF and ECNET-CONF-NOTF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contains the GBO Id of the incoming user that initiated the transfer when sent to the Network Operator.</li> </ul> <p><del>We do not communicate the incoming users identity to the current user. Set this to xsi:nil = "true".</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">(1) contains the GBO Id of the current user when sent to the incoming user that initiated the transfer</a></li> <li><a href="#">(2) contains the GBO Id of the incoming user that initiated the transfer when sent to the current user</a></li> </ul>	1..1	ChangeRequest/Participant	xsd:string
RequestID	Numeric (10)	Mandatory	The unique ID assigned by the Market Operator to the Transfer Request or error correction	1..1	ChangeRequest/RequestID	xsd:positiveIntegermaxInclusive="9999999999"

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
ChangeStatusCode	String (4) REQ = Requested PEN = Pending OBJ = Objection COM = Completed CAN = Cancelled [SA ONLY CODES] RCA = RoLR Cancelled RCO = RoLR Completed	Mandatory	Current status of the Change Request. In this case, "COM"  For accelerated transactions in a RoLR event, the allowable value is "RCO".	1..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeStatusCode	xsd:string xsd:maxLength = "4"
ChangeReasonCode	String (4) 0001 = Prospective transfer, in-situ 0002 = Prospective transfer, move in 0003 = Correction of Transfer	Mandatory	Either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"0001" or "0002" (for a move-in) to support TFR-CONF-NOTF</li> <li>"0003" to support ECNET-CONF-NOTF</li> </ul> It's value will be the same ChangeReasonCode from the original transfer request.	1..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeData/ChangeReasonCode	xsd:string xsd:maxLength = "4"

Data Element	Format	Usage	Usage/ Comments	AseXML		
				Occurs	Element Path	Data Type
ActualChangeDate	Date (10) ccyy-mm-dd	<b>Mandatory</b> for TFR- CONF- NOTF  <b>Mandatory</b> for ECNET- CONF- NOTF	For a transfer, this is the date when the transfer completes. This is the meter read date provided by the network operator.  For error correction, this is the date when the transfer which is being corrected was completed.	1..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeData/ActualChangeDate	xsd:date
NMI	String(10)	Mandatory	The MIRN in the original Change Request	0..1	ChangeRequest/ChangeData/NMI	xsd:stringlength="10"
Checksum	Integer(1)	Mandatory	An attribute of NMI	use="optional"	@checksum	xsd:integer" minInclusive="0"maxInclusive="9"

**ATTACHMENT F – Submissions Received for Change**

<b>SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE PPC 28 NOVEMBER TO 19 DECEMBER – ORIGINAL CONSULTATION PERIOD</b>				
	<b>DATE</b>	<b>PARTICIPANT</b>	<b>SUBMISSION</b>	<b>AEMO COMMENTS</b>
1	22 Dec 2014	AGN	<p><u>In relation to the proposed Spec Pack ICD amendments:</u></p> <p>Proposed following minor amendments to the ICD to improve clarity</p> <p>CATSNotification Logical Flow Short Name TFR-CNOTF-IU – typo in ‘To’ field</p> <p>Incoming User<del>r</del></p>	<p><u>In relation to the Spec Pack ICD:</u></p> <p>The suggested amendments proposed by AGN are non-contentious and adds further clarity to the ICD therefore AEMO has no issue in including these suggested changes.</p>
2	19 Dec 2014	AGL	<p><u>In relation to the proposed Spec Pack ICD amendments:</u></p> <p>Proposed following minor amendments to the Spec Pack ICD to improve clarity</p> <p><u>Clause 8.1.8.1</u></p> <p>If ‘Role’ = “USER” or “ROLR” then:</p> <p><a href="#">(1) contains the GBO Id of the current user when sent to the incoming user that initiated the transfer</a></p> <p><u>Clause 8.1.11.1</u></p> <p>If ‘Role’ = “USER” or “ROLR” then:</p> <p><a href="#">(1) contains the GBO Id of the current user when sent to the incoming user that initiated the transfer</a></p>	<p><u>In relation to the Spec Pack ICD:</u></p> <p>The suggested amendments proposed by AGL are non-contentious and adds further clarity to the ICD therefore AEMO has no issue in including these suggested changes.</p>

3	19 Dec 2014	AGL	<p><u>In relation to the proposed RMP (VIC) amendments:</u></p> <p>Proposed following minor amendments to the RMP (VIC) to improve clarity</p> <p>With the redrafting clause (e) and (f) are now the same, so we therefore suggest:</p> <p><u>the name of the Market Participant who delivered the transfer request to AEMO</u> <del>where the proposed transfer date nominated in the transfer request is a prospective transfer date and the supply point is a distribution supply point, and only</del> in the case of the transfer request notification which is delivered to the <u>FRO and the relevant Distributor or transmission system Service Provider</u> <del>in whose distribution area that distribution supply point is located</del></p> <p><del>(f) — where the proposed transfer date nominated in the transfer request is a prospective transfer date and the supply point is a transmission supply point, and only in the case of the transfer request notification which is delivered to the transmission system Service Provider with respect to that part of the transmission system on which the transmission supply point is located, the name of the Market Participant who delivered the transfer request to AEMO.</del></p>	<p><u>In relation to RMP (VIC):</u></p> <p>The suggestion to combine the two similar clauses related to distributor and transmitter may lead to a situation in the future where changes are required to only one of them. In this case the clauses may have to be split again. AEMO will not include the suggested change.</p>
4	19 Dec 2014	AGL	<p><u>In relation to the proposed Spec Pack ICD amendments:</u></p> <p>Proposed following amendments to the ICD to include the change for Error Correction transaction</p>	<p><u>In relation to Spec Pack ICD</u></p> <p>The proposed change was not included in the original scope of the work. Inclusion of this change will require doing the estimate for system change again. AEMO will not include this change and propose that a new</p>

		<p>No proposed change for error correction – however, other amendments covered retrospective transfer, so for consistency error correction should also be included</p> <p>Error correction operates from the previous user to the current user, so:</p> <p><a href="#"><u>(1) contains the GBO Id of the current (affected) user when sent to the incoming (previous) user that initiated the transfer</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>(2) contains the GBO ID of the incoming (previous) user when sent to the current (affected) user</u></a></p>	<p>GMI be created if it is deemed necessary by the industry.</p>
--	--	---	--

**ATTACHMENT G – IIR Response Template**

The IIR Response Template has been attached separately to this document.