

C1 – Bilateral Hub

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

24 September 2020

Update on wireframes

💧 Wholesale response screens have been drafted

- 📁 0. Bilats C1 User Requirements - Landing Page

- 📁 1. Bilaterals C1 User Requirements - Create a new Service Request

- 📁 2. Bilats C1 User Req - Accept or Reject

- 📁 3. Bilats C1 User Req - Site Visit Completed

- 📁 4a. Bilats C1 User Req - Retailer Review

- 📁 4b. Bilats C1 User Req - Provide info

- 📁 5. Bilats C1 User Req - CMOS update (W)

- 📁 6. Bilats C1 User Req - CMOS update (R)



OAG members: Are we still on the right track? Any obvious oversights?

C1 form content – landlord and tenant questions

- The following questions form part of the current C1 Form

<p>Please indicate if the SPID relates to a landlord property with more than one tenancy and where the tenancy units are also registered in the Supply Point Register</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>If <u>yes</u> please provide the SPIDs if available for the tenancy Supply Points</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
<p>Please indicate if the SPID to which the enquiry relates is a tenancy unit within a multi-tenancy landlord property</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If <u>yes</u> please provide the SPID for the landlord property</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>

- Subject matter expert experience on bilateral team is that these questions are routinely not completed by Retailers or do not change the process/steps for Wholesalers -> propose to remove these questions from the process in the Hub.
- **OAG members: do you agree with this approach?**

C1 process – core SPIDs with multiple TPs associated

- ◆ Approximately 1-in-5 core SPIDS in the market can have multiple trading parties associated with them (i.e. Cross-border SPIDS)
- ◆ Exploring potential solutions to accommodate this in the Bilateral Hub:
 - ◆ **Option 1** (preferred) – Notification to third party with ability to comment
 - ◆ **Option 2** – Notification to third party of a proposed correction plan – third party conversations post notification held outside of the Bilateral Hub.
 - ◆ **Option 3** – Full integration in the Bilateral Hub allowing third parties to comment/reject correction plans
- ◆ Option 1 preferred due to size of the market affected while minimising transactions for TPs to integrate with
- ◆ **OAG members: do you agree with this approach?**

Meter pit reference

- 💧 Meter Pit Reference forms part of the current form.
- 💧 This data is not held in CMOS and we don't believe is widely used as a unique identifier between TPs.
- 💧 As such, we propose to remove this data item from the form in the Bilateral Hub.
- 💧 **OAG members: Do you agree with this approach?**

