

Annexure 1: Clause by clause commentary on the Draft Code

Clause	Commentary
<p>B. Defined Terms:</p>	
<p>“Access Network Provider (ANP)” means the Party to whose network an access line is directly connected and over which services are supplied. Note that an ANP may also be an Access Service Wholesaler and/or a Retail Service Provider.</p>	<p>We recommend that the terms “access” should also be defined.</p>
<p>“Access Service Wholesaler (ASW)” means the Party who purchases access network services from the Access Network Provider.</p>	<p>We recommend that the terms “access network services” should also be defined.</p>
<p>“Bilateral Agreement” means an agreement between a Party who is obliged to comply with the terms of this Code and another party (who might or might not also be a party to this Code).</p>	<p>Should be changed to “means an agreement between a Party to this Code and another Telecommunications Service provider (whether or not the second party is a Party to this Code) The word “contractual” should be inserted after <i>bona fide</i>.</p>
<p>“Billing Relationship” means a relationship where the Service Provider has a bona fide right to charge the End Customer for any chargeable activity relating to the provision of Telecommunications Services</p>	<p>Although this is a defined term, it is be used only twice in the Draft Code. The first time is in the definition of “Validation Request” where the capitalised term is not used, and the other in clause 41 (Customer Initiated Contact), where the capitalised term is used.</p>
<p>“Communication” can be oral, in writing, and via electronic means.</p>	<p>The term “communicate” is also used once (clause 48). The issue of oral, written or electronic means of communication would be appropriate to clause 48, and an appropriate amendment should be made.</p>
	<p>In the definition of Validation Request, if appropriate, the capitalised term should be used.</p>
	<p>With reference to clause 41, the substantive element of the clause is that the service provider may engage on any subject matter with a customer who contacts it. It's not relevant whether the engagement is oral, written or electronic. The use of the defined</p>

<p>"Complex Customer" means an End Customer that has more than five Telecommunication Services supplied by their Retail Service Provider at one premise or any number of Telecommunication Services supplied by their Retail Service Provider at multiple premises.</p>	<p>term is not required or material.</p> <p>Corporate customers that have complex solutions are probably the group that is most in need of a special Complex Customer process. They are not specifically covered by this definition or the complex customer processes for notification and transfer set out in the Draft Code. The range from a five line/service customer to a five hundred line/service customer is substantial and the TCF should consider retaining the current Complex Transfer process and definitions. See further our comments in relation to complex transfers under section H.</p> <p>Furthermore, this definition could be drafted so as to make it clearer that Complex Customer is determined either with reference to the number of Telecommunications Services or the number of Sites. The problem is that 5 services may be a relatively low number if the definition triggers a complex process.</p>
--	---

<p>Clause 5 Telecommunications Services covered by this Code:</p> <p>The Code applies to Retail Service Providers, Virtual Wholesalers, Access Service Wholesalers and Access Network Providers for the Transfer of all Telecommunications Services (except as listed in clause 6) and in the Code approved by the Commerce Commission includes the following determined Telecommunications Services:</p> <p>5.1 Designated access services determined under the Commerce Commission's Decision 497 (Determination on the TelstraClear Application for Determination for Wholesale Designated Access Services);</p> <p>5.2 Designated access services determined under the Commerce Commission's Decision 525 (Determination on the TelstraClear Application for Determination for Residential Wholesale Designated Access Services);</p> <p>5.3 Other designated access services or specified services determined by the Commerce Commission in the future.</p>	<p>We should clarify that "in the future" (clause 5.3) covers the existing STD's.</p> <p>There could be an interpretation where services designated/specified after Dec 525, but before July 2009 (date of the Amended Code) are excluded?</p> <p>The current clause could be read to exclude SLES, which at this time will be provided on commercial terms by Choruz and should be included in Draft Code. SLES will be an important input</p> <p>The definition of "Telecommunication Service" needs further clarification. During internal feedback the question was raised a number of times as to what happens with steppers etc. It was felt this was not made clear in the code.</p> <p>Finally, all applicable decisions of the Commerce Commission should be included.</p> <p>To the extent that the code applies only to resale services Commission Decisions 497, 525, and 563 would be relevant; and</p> <p>To the extent that the Draft Code applies to services beyond resale services, other Commerce decisions on services such as UBS (2 decisions – TCL and then CallPlus/Ihug), UBA, UCLL, SLU (and their associated backhauls and co-locations) would also be relevant.</p>
<p>Clause 11 Notification of Default in Compliance:</p> <p>11.1 In the event where a Party has reason to believe that another Party to this Code is in default of any of its obligations of performance under this Code then that Party should contact the defaulting Party's Compliance person with the following details.</p> <p>11.1.1 Company and Contact details of Complainant</p> <p>11.1.2 TCF Code which has been allegedly breached (in this case, the Customer Transfer Code)</p>	<p>Clause 11.1 "that Party should contact..." what medium is appropriate? In writing, email, 0800, specific person's DDI, fax. We might want to refine this list down to something more manageable?</p> <p>Clause 54.2 – "All parties must raise..." Is it clear how to "raise" a potential Invalid Transfer? This goes to my comment on clause 11.1.1 regarding "contact"::</p> <p>Clause 11.2 - It might be a good idea to have the alleged</p>

<p>11.1.3 Which Code clauses were breached</p> <p>11.1.4 Date(s) the breach/breaches occurred</p> <p>11.1.5 Any other relevant information (e.g. a request to sight the customer authorisation consent as defined in clause 23.2.</p> <p>11.2 The alleged defaulting party, must acknowledge the non-compliance Communication within three (3) business days of receipt and provide a timeframe for when the non-compliance issue will be investigated</p> <p>11.3 If the issue of breach is not resolved to the satisfaction of either party then the non-compliance issue may be escalated to the Enforcement Agency. Refer to section N.</p>	<p>defaulting party acknowledge receipt? If there is no acknowledgement of receipt, when does the "clock" start on the 3 business days?</p> <p>The success of this Code rests on parties' ability to communicate clearly and expeditiously with each other and it would be helpful if the terms are explicit/specific enough for all.</p>
<p>E. END CUSTOMER SUPPLY CHAIN INFORMATION</p> <p>Clause 15: The objective of this section is to outline the information that must be provided to an End Customer by their Retail Service Provider, so that in the event of the End Customer wishing to transfer some or all of their Telecommunications Services to another Retail Service Provider, this information can be provided and a seamless transition of the End Customer's Telecommunications Services between Retail Service Providers can occur.</p>	<p>The retail service provider is the one with responsibility for providing the supply chain information. It will have ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the information collated on the bill is correct.</p>
<p>Clause 16:</p> <p>The Supply Chain Information to be provided is:</p> <p>16.1 The RSP Customer Account Number or, where the RSP does not assign account numbers to customers, the full and correct RSP Customer Account Name; and</p> <p>16.2 Either the RSP Service ID or Billing ID for each Telecommunications Service provided by the RSP (for example; phone number, broadband user ID, customer email address); and</p> <p>16.3 The RSP Access Service Configuration;</p> <p>16.3.1 Access Network Provider (ANP) ID (for example, ASID); and</p> <p>16.3.2 Access Service Wholesaler (ASW) ID (for example; phone number, Telecom's Fictitious Billing Number (FBN), TCF endorsed ASW Carrier ID).</p>	<p>Will there be any responsibilities between parties for communicating the information? How do we ensure the information is correct? Can Wholesale disclaim correctness of information? Will we check whether or not the information provided to us by Chorus is correct? Checks and balances will need to be put in place within Telecom and each organisation to ensure that these numbers are correct? Will there be a verification process?</p>

<p>Cause 17.1</p> <p>17 or a Simple Customer, Retail Service Providers must make the Supply Chain Information referred to in clause Error! Reference source not found. available to its End Customers by:</p> <p>17.1 providing the Supply Chain Information specified in Clause 16 on or with, the End Customer's regular monthly bill; or</p>	<p>Remove the wording "or with" - We consider that if the information is provided as a separate page "with" the bill it is more likely to be discarded.</p>
<p>Clause 21 Obtaining Customer Authorisation and Supply Chain Information</p> <p>21.1 The Gaining RSP bears sole responsibility for ensuring that prior to commencing a Transfer it has a valid and complete Customer Authorisation and also obtains the End Customer's Supply Chain Information to affect the Transfer.</p> <p>21.2 A Customer Authorisation must contain, at a minimum, the following:</p> <p>21.2.1 The End Customer's details, including name or business name, and contact name and the phone number of authorised representative, where applicable;</p> <p>21.2.2 List of services to be transferred;</p> <p>21.2.3 The RSP Service ID, or Billing ID, for each service to be transferred (for example; phone number, broadband user ID, customer email address supplied by RSP Acknowledgement from the person communicating that they are either the End Customer or the authorised representative and so entitled to request a Transfer in respect of the services referred to in the Customer Authorisation;</p> <p>21.2.4 The End Customer's agreement to the Transfer to the Gaining RSP;</p> <p>21.2.5 The date of the Customer Authorisation;</p> <p>21.2.6 The End Customer's acknowledgement that they have been informed by the Gaining RSP of, and accept the information</p>	<p>In terms of clause 21.2.3</p> <p>Using an email address as an identifier from a Telecom perspective is inappropriate, these are independent services for e.g. an email address can be provided with dial up or broadband, and even if, the customer does not have a line with Telecom.</p> <p>Will the Gaining RSP be responsible for making sure that the supply chain information that it receives is correct?</p>

<p>21.2.7 set out in clause 22; and, Confirmation from the End Customer that the information provided by the End Customer to the Gaining RSP is true and correct.</p> <p>21.3 Whilst Customer Authorisation is being obtained, the Gaining RSP will also obtain the End Customer's Supply Chain Information, which can be accessed by the End Customer as a result of Retail Service Providers' obligations in section E.</p>	
<p>Clause 23.1 Customer Authorisation Validity Period</p> <p>23.1 Unless agreed otherwise with an End Customer, to be valid, a Transfer Request must be made within sixty (60) days of the date of the Customer Authorisation.</p>	<p>Telecom wants to ensure the following situation is addressed where:</p> <p>A Telecom customer is transferred to another service provider. The end customer then contacts Telecom after a period of time and requests to return to Telecom.</p> <p>Telecom gains the end customer authorisation and effects the transfer.</p> <p>A few days later, the customer's services are transferred back to the alternative provider – however no new authorisation has been gained by the alternative provider, and often without the end customer's knowledge.</p> <p>We believe there needs to be a stipulation that an 'authorisation' can only be used once to successfully complete a transfer or a rule that in these circumstances the Gaining RSP must notify the customer that they are re-using the original transfer consent.</p>
<p>Clause 29 Initiation of the Transfer</p> <p>29.1 Following completion of the Customer Authorisation procedure outlined in section F and on receipt of the supply chain information for the services to be transferred, the Gaining RSP will initiate the Transfer as</p>	<p>clause 29.2, we need to be clear that "Bilateral Agreements", as defined, include standard terms determinations ("STDs") and any relevant commercial services agreements between the Gaining RSP and the ANP which provide for a service which must be transferred to support the "Transfer Request" (SLES may be an</p>

<p>follows:</p> <p>29.2 The Gaining RSP must provide to the Gaining VW, ASW, or ANP (dependent on how the End Customer's Supply Chain is structured), the necessary information to process the Transfer Request, as covered in Bilateral Agreements and in the format specified in Annexure 3.</p> <p>29.3 The Party that has been provided the information in clause 0 (the Gaining VW, ASW or ANP) has two (2) Business Days from the receipt of the Transfer Request to advise, in a verifiable format, the Gaining RSP that they believe on reasonable grounds that there is an error with the Transfer Request. A reason for the rejection as set out in Annex 1 must be provided.</p> <p>29.4 The Gaining RSP can re-submit the Transfer Request once the Gaining RSP believes the reason for the rejection is no longer applicable.</p>	<p>example). The terms and conditions of those Bilateral Agreements still continue to apply and must be followed in order to actually provision the new connection. For example, the Gaining RSP must make a MPF New Connection Order under the UCLL STD – the Transfer Request does not substitute for this.</p>
<p>Clause 30 Processing of the Transfer Request by the VW or the ASW</p> <p>30.1 If the information to initiate the Transfer in clause 29.2 above did not go directly to the ANP from the Gaining RSP, then the party that the Gaining RSP provided the information to (either the Gaining VW or the Gaining ASW, dependent on the parties present in the End Customer's Supply Chain), must provide to the next party in the Supply Chain (either the Gaining ASW or the Gaining ANP) the necessary information to process the Transfer Request, as covered in Bilateral Agreements.</p> <p>30.2 The Party that has been provided the information in clause 30.1 above (either the Gaining ASW or the Gaining ANP) has two (2) Business Days from the receipt of the Transfer Request to advise, in a verifiable format, that they believe on reasonable grounds that there is an error with the Transfer Request. A reason for the rejection as set out in Annexure 1 must be provided.</p> <p>30.3 The Gaining VW or ASW can re-submit the Transfer Request once they believe the reason for the rejection is no longer applicable.</p> <p>30.4 This clause 0 relates to transfer situations where the ANP</p>	<p>See our comments in respect of clause 29 above, which should also apply in respect of communications between the Gaining VW and Gaining ASW and the next party in the Supply Chain.</p>

<p>remains the same. For those situations where the ANP changes, see clause 0.</p>	
<p>Clause 31 Processing of the Transfer Request by the ANP where the ANP does not change</p> <p>31.1 If the information for the processing of the Transfer Request in clause 0 above went to the Gaining ASW, then the Gaining ASW must provide to the ANP the necessary information to process the Transfer Request, as covered in Bilateral Agreements.</p> <p>Clause 32 Processing of the Transfer Request by the ANP where the ANP changes</p> <p>32.1 The Gaining ASW must provide to the Gaining ANP (where the Gaining ASW is not the Gaining ANP) the necessary information to set up a new End Customer on the Gaining ANP's network, as covered in Bilateral Agreements.</p> <p>32.2 The Gaining ANP will inform the Losing ANP of the Customer's Transfer away from the Losing ANP.</p> <p>32.3 The Losing ANP must inform the Losing ASW of the Customer's Transfer away from the Losing ASW, as covered in Bilateral Agreements.</p> <p>32.4 The Losing ASW must inform the next party in the supply chain (either the Losing VW or the Losing RSP) of the Customer's Transfer away from the next party in the Supply Chain, as covered in Bilateral Agreements.</p>	<p>See our comments in respect of clause 29, which apply equally to clause 31.1 and 32.1 as between the Gaining ASW and the ANP (including in respect of setting up of new customers with the ANP).</p> <p>Likewise for clause 32.3 – where Telecom lose a line at wholesale level and Chorus advises our Losing ASW accordingly, it is then up to that Losing ASW to issue the appropriate order in terms of the relevant Bilateral Agreement(s) to actually effect the relinquishment (e.g. an MPF Relinquishment Order in terms of the UCLL STD). The information sharing does not constitute the actual order in terms of the applicable contract;</p>

<p>Clause 33 Notifications to Gaining Parties</p> <p>33.1 Each Party in the End Customer's Supply Chain will be responsible for notifying their customer upon Transfer completion within one (1) business day upon receipt of relevant information:</p> <p>33.1.1 That the Transfer was successful;</p> <p>33.1.2 Of the Effective Date of the Transfer; and</p> <p>33.1.3 The Supply Chain information for the services transferred.</p> <p>For example, dependent on the parties involved in the End Customer's Supply Chain, the ANP will notify the Gaining ASW, the Gaining ASW will notify the Gaining VW, and the Gaining VW will notify the Gaining RSP.</p>	<p>This clause should refer to the fact that reference is to gaining parties. Unless otherwise stated, usual interpretation rules state that headings don't form part of the applicable clauses. These notification sections are not entirely clear and should be clarified.</p>
<p>Clause 34 Notifications to Losing Parties</p> <p>34.1 Each Party in the End Customer's Supply Chain will be responsible for notifying their customer upon Transfer completion within one (1) business day:</p> <p>34.1.1 That the Transfer was successful;</p> <p>34.1.2 Of the Effective Date of the Transfer;</p> <p>34.1.3 The Supply Chain information for the services transferred.</p> <p>For example, dependent on the parties involved in the End Customer's Supply Chain, the Gaining ANP will notify the Losing ANP, the Losing ANP will notify the Losing ASW, the Losing ASW will notify the Losing VW, and the Losing VW will notify the Losing RSP.</p> <p>34.2 Where the ASW remains the same, the ANP will not be involved in the Transfer and therefore will have no parties to notify, and where the VW stays the same, the ASW will have no parties to notify.</p> <p>34.3 The format for how the Notifications must be provided is specified in Annexure 3.</p>	<p>Our comments on clause 33 above apply to clause 34. It is unclear why there needs to be two separate sections relating to a losing and a gaining service provider when the actual contents, except for the example appear to be the same.</p> <p>We suggest that these sections be further clarified to communicate what is actually meant.</p>

<p>Clause 35 Storage of Notifications</p> <p>All parties must keep the Notifications sent and received in clauses 33 and 34 for twelve (12) months.</p>	<p>This may require protocols regarding information storage and a determination how these are to be accessed.</p>
<p>Clause 37 Privacy and Use of Information</p> <p>37.1 Information relating to Customer Transfer will be kept confidential at all times by the parties to the Code except as set out in this clause or as required by law. Information provided as part of the Transfer process can only be used or disclosed for the purpose of Customer Transfers, in association with the delivery of Telecommunications Services, and for End Customer and network fault management and complaint handling. Information provided in the Transfer Process must not be used for any other purpose (including winback and marketing purposes).</p> <p>37.2 An RSP, ASW, VW or ANP, which receives any type of information relating to the Transfer of an End Customer, may only use or disclose such information in accordance with Privacy Act 1993, the Telecommunications Information Privacy Code 2003, and any Bilateral Agreement in place between the parties.</p> <p>37.3 If there is any inconsistency between this Code, the Privacy Act 1993, and the Telecommunications Information Privacy Code 2003, the Privacy Act and the Telecommunications Information Privacy Code prevail.</p>	<p>In the event that the information is deemed to be Customer Confidential Information, as defined in Telecom's Undertakings, specific rules apply to the way in which Telecom can deal with it.</p> <p>If it is intended that the information is not to be treated as Customer Confidential Information, specific provision should be made for this in order to avoid a potential conflict with the Undertakings.</p>

<p>Clause 41 Communication Between Service Providers</p> <p>41 The Gaining RSP can request reasonable assistance from the Losing RSP for any given Transfer where additional information is required beyond the Supply Chain information already supplied during the Customer Authorisation process. This would typically be for a Complex Customer Transfer.</p>	<p>We recommend that some thought should be given to what is meant by "reasonable assistance"? Would this be to fix any billing issue – rather than refer it to the TDR to resolve (56.1.1)? Agreement should be reached and the limits of reasonable assistance should be set out in the Draft Code or an appropriate definition inserted.</p>
<p>Clause 49.1.3.1 Fault during Transfer</p> <p>49.1.3 If the End Customer contacts the Losing RSP and:</p> <p>49.1.3.1 The ASW underlying network is not changing, the Losing RSP must log the fault and attempt to resolve it, and keep the Gaining RSP informed as to the progress being made on this fault; or,</p>	<p>The roles and responsibilities of the parties interacting with the end customer should be further clarified.</p> <p>While customer service experience is important, there is a risk that if the LRSP is required to manage a fault after the effective date, then it has an opportunity to engage with the customer on any issue (as per clause 39.1) and may seek to use the opportunity to win back the customer.</p> <p>Alternatively a further carve-out in respect of fault resolution should be inserted to clause 39.1.</p>
<p>Clause 54.2 - Identification of Invalid Transfer</p> <p>54.2 All parties must immediately raise the fact they may have detected an Invalid Transfer (regardless of their role, or even if they have no role, in the particular Transfer).</p>	<p>In a number of cases a customer may not be aware it has been invalidly transferred for an extended period of time and may only contact its perceived service provider when it experiences problems with its service – e.g. a broadband service cease. In this situation the customer has no idea who the service provider is, no account number to refer to.</p> <p>How are such situations be addressed and reversed? Who will sort out the billing? Who should the RSP whose end customers have been impacted contact to assist in these situations?</p> <p>The other matter that warrants consideration is that the RSP may not have the relevant information (i.e. which service provider has the customer been invalidly transferred to), but only WSP's or ANP's may have possible access to the information required to identify who the new (invalid) service provider is. An appropriate</p>

	<p>process will need to be developed to enable the RSP to take steps to ascertain the information from the relevant WSP or ANP, with appropriate checks and balance to avoid abuse in place.</p>
<p>56. Disputes regarding the allocation of costs incurred due to an invalid transfer</p> <p>56.1 Any dispute regarding the allocation of disconnection or reconnection costs incurred due to an invalid transfer should be referred:</p> <p>56.1.1 To the Telecommunications Dispute Resolution Service if the dispute is raised by the End Customer concerned, in accordance with the Customer Complaints Code.</p> <p>56.1.2 According to Section O if the dispute is raised by any party to this Code.</p>	<p>There may be a number of circumstances where "reasonable assistance" by the LRSP should be provided in the first instance, as contemplated in clause 41 prior to the dispute resolution process envisaged in section O. Parties should be obliged to provide such assistance in respect of allocation of costs disputes.</p> <p>If two service providers are able to reach agreement on which party is responsible for an invalid transfer, the costs incurred as the result of an invalid transferred should be met by the service provider who initiated the invalid transfer.</p>

Annexure 2: Additional matters requiring further consideration

We considered the different solutions set out in Appendix 1 to your letter dated 13 August 2009 and provide our comments on these below.

A. Commentary on Preferred Solution Considered for the Customer Transfer Code

Although we set out some specific comments on the preferred solution below, we reiterate our position that the TCF process needs to re-evaluate the process more fully prior to determining the preferred technical solution and this will impact the next iteration of the Draft Code substantially.

Feedback	Explanation
Transfer ID - should the digit length be mandated for the ANP & ASW unique identifiers?	Currently 10, but should allowance be made for longer digits? Could 00 be used as a buffer prefix?
Transfer ID - how will current non UCLL consuming services be displayed? E.g. Phone line only has the phone number as the unique identifier and it is 8 digits long. Could we put an example in annexure	Currently Wholesale & Retail will not be consuming UCLL & will therefore not have an assigned ASID. How should this be displayed on the RSP bill e.g. Phone number only. Chorus will not be retrospectively assigning ASID's for existing legacy services.
The Draft Code is not clear on whether the VW/ASW/ANP needs to provide the supply chain information on regular billing records or just needs to confirm the supply chain information at point of order/change - the latter is preferable. The Wholesale preference is for RSP to be responsible for keeping a record of the supply chain info.	Issues in providing supply chain information in bill for VW/ASW/ANP as details can change, increases the chance of errors, costly to implement, will increase the size of an already substantial bill etc
The intent of the CTC solution 1 is to provide information on the end-customers bill. Some of the carriers may want similar information to be provided on their Ebill. That is likely to be a significant issue and we are of the view that it may be completely unworkable.	
Is there a requirement for a VW/ASW/ANP to make the supply chain available on a website? Our understanding is that this only applies to the RSP where the end customer churn would occur. Is this correct?	
Clarification is required about the wording around supply chain i.e. All parties must store the full supply chain information	ANP & ASW are not going to know what services their customers (providers) apply over the services provided from a network perspective

<p><u>Transfer code business rules</u> In provisioning we have a challenge when a customer requests transfer to another service provider and does not specify all services. The provisioning rep needs to make a decision to include services that were not requested, or to remove those services. Either option can be incorrect and result in a poor customer experience. The CTC may be an opportunity to work with the industry to come up with joint rules on what should be done in those situations.</p>	<p>If change of RSP occurs at the RSP/VW level only, these details do not need to be transferred to the ASW/ANP The advice of supply chain detail & storing of supply chain information must be the responsibility of each party at the time of transfer and not an ongoing request for information up and down supply chain.</p>
--	--

Rejection codes: It appears to have been a significant increase in these codes and we would suggest that this new requirement is validated through analysis of rejected orders today to ensure the increase will add value.

In terms of code 013 name mismatch the Draft Code should define how dissimilar the account name would have to be in order for a rejection to occur. E.g. will mismatches such as Mc vs. Mac; Smith vs. Smyth; will transposed letters cause a rejection?

039 Bundled service – who decides that a service is bundled and therefore cant be broken? The end customer may not be aware a service is what the industry considers “bundled”.

The definition of a “Telecommunication Service” needs further clarification. It is unclear, for example, how steppers would be classified. This should be made clear in the Draft Code.

Finally, Sub-loop extension services (“SLES”) will have it's own ASID. In situations where a provider (ASW or RSP) consumes SLES as part of an upstream service the SLES copper will be allocated an ASID, therefore there will be a requirement for this to be included as part of the supply chain.

B. Commentary on Other Solutions Considered for the Customer Transfer Code

Proposed Solution	Submission
Telecom Wholesale USID Proposal	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
LRSP Responsible for Supply Chain Information	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
Supply Chain Information Restricted	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
Retain Status Quo	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
IPMS Type Centralised System	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
Customer has to get a 'certificate' from the LSRP	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
LSRP responsible for providing the information to the GSP.	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.
"THIN" Centralised Service Registry combined with Service Audit	We have not had the opportunity to analyse the remaining solutions in detail and recommends that the revised process framework be completed prior to such engagement.