



Information Exchange Committee
C/ - IEC Secretariat – AEMO Ltd

Level 22

530 Collins Street
Melbourne VIC 3000

Tel: (03) 9609 8000

Fax: (03) 9609 8080

B2B Procedures v3.4

Second Draft Report Change Pack

Prepared by: Information Exchange Committee

Version No: 1.0

Date: 29 April 2020

Table of Contents

1. SECOND DRAFT REPORT	3
1.1 B2B PROCEDURE CHANGES	3
1.2 CHANGES BETWEEN FIRST DRAFT REPORT AND SECOND DRAFT REPORT	4
1.2.1 <i>Submissions invited on proposed changes to the One Way Notification Process</i>	4
1.2.2 <i>Previously consulted-on items to be implemented in stages</i>	4
1.2.3 <i>Items not being consulted on at this stage</i>	5
2. BACKGROUND	7
3. SCOPE / ISSUES STATEMENT	8
4. CONSULTATION PROCESS	9
4.1 SERVICE ORDER CHANGES	11
4.1.1 Metering Service Works	11
4.1.2 Supply Abolishment	13
4.1.3 Allocate NMI	14
4.2 ONE WAY NOTIFICATION CHANGES	15
4.3 INCREASE TO TRANSACTION SIZE LIMIT FOR METER DATA	17
4.4 B2B PRINCIPLES	18
4.5 B2B FACTORS	19
4.6 BENEFITS	20
4.7 COSTS	20
4.8 MSATS PROCEDURES	21
5. OTHER MATTERS	22
5.1 CONSULTATION TIMEFRAMES	22
5.2 NEW VERIFY STANDING DATA TRANSACTION	22
6. B2B PROPOSAL	24
CONSOLIDATED PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO DRAFT REPORT	25

1. Second Draft Report

1.1 B2B Procedure changes

This Notice informs all B2B Parties, relevant B2B Change Parties, AEMO and such other persons who identify themselves to the Information Exchange Committee as interested in the B2B Procedures (**Consulted Persons**) that AEMO is conducting a consultation on B2B Procedures on behalf of the Information Exchange Committee (IEC).

This consultation is conducted under clause 7.17.4 of the National Electricity Rules (**NER**), in accordance with the Rules consultation requirements detailed in Rule 8.9 of the NER. The table below outlines the consultation steps the IEC has undertaken during the consultation.

Process Stage	Date
Publication of Initial Report and Determination	29 November 2019
Closing date for submissions in response to the Initial Report	13 January 2020
Publication of First Draft Report and Determination	12 February 2020
Closing date for submissions in response to the First Draft Report	11 March 2020
Publication of Second Draft Report*	29 April 2020
Closing date for submissions in response to the Second Draft Report	27 May 2020
Publication of Final Report and Determination	8 July 2020
B2B Procedure v3.4 effective date	1 July 2021
B2B Procedure v3.5 effective date	10 November 2021

** The 22nd of April 2020 was originally the date of the publication of the Final Report and Determination. However, the consultation as a whole has had an additional round added due to the need to consult more thoroughly on the One Way Notification Process.*

The IEC developed the changes in this determination in the interests of improving existing B2B Procedures. The changes consulted on require AEMO B2B e-Hub system changes. These changes were recommended to the IEC by the Business-to-Business Working Group (B2B-WG) on behalf of industry and include:

- Amend the Service Order Process to:
 - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of Service Order transactions. Currently this information is being communicated using special instructions in the service order (SO).
 - Add a new enumeration to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a non-contestable unmetered load (NCONUML) can be communicated.
 - Clarify that the Supply Abolishment SO can be used in New South Wales.
- Increase the maximum file size and introduce a transaction number limit for the Meter Data (MTRD) transaction group.
- Enhance the One Way Notification Process. The original intent of this consultation was to create an optional field in the Meter Exchange Notification (MXN) and the Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFIN) transaction to link this transaction with the initiating SO. However, a

majority of respondents in the previous round of consultation indicated a preference for the retirement of the MXN and use of the Planned Interruption Notice (PIN) over the MFIN to replace it. As such the consultation is to have an additional round to fully consult with industry on the One Way Notification Process and consider the proposed changes to the PIN.

1.2 Changes between first draft report and second draft report

AEMO received 13 submissions in response to the First Draft report. Copies of all written submissions (excluding any confidential information) have been published on AEMO's website at: <https://aemo.com.au/en/consultations/current-and-closed-consultations/b2b-procedures-v3-4-consultation>.

Submissions were received from the following organisations:

- AGL
- Alinta
- AusNet Services
- CitiPower PowerCor
- Endeavour
- Energy Queensland
- intelliHUB
- Origin Energy
- PLUS ES
- Red and Lumo Energy
- South Australia Power Networks
- TasNetworks
- Vector

1.2.1 Submissions invited on proposed changes to the One Way Notification Process

The IEC invites submissions on proposed changes to the One Way Notification Process. The PIN changes as now proposed were not fully consulted on in the earlier stages of consultation. These proposed changes are detailed in Section 4.2.1.3.

As part of the second draft report, the IEC has determined that changes will be made to the OWN Procedures at this stage. Submissions made to the initial consultation made it clear that the MXN should be retired due to it being redundant. Further enhancements must be made to another transaction to ensure this change can be made. The draft report proposed that those changes be made to the MFIN to cater for additional fields that would be used between the Retailer and the MP, however, feedback during the draft determination indicated that change may be better placed within the PIN rather than the MFIN. Given this feedback, the IEC requested the B2BWG complete further work to determine the best solution as part of an additional round of consultation with industry.

1.2.2 Previously consulted-on items to be implemented in stages

Instead of implementing the changes listed in Section 1.1 together, they now will be separated into two stages as outlined below, to align with the implementation of 5 Minute Settlement (5MS). This is to allow the B2B Procedures required for 5MS to be aligned and also to fully consult on the MXN transaction. The tables below summarise the proposed Procedure changes and the effective dates.

B2B Procedures v3.4 - effective date 1 July 2021

Instrument	New / Amended
------------	---------------

Customer Site Details Notification	Amended (Version control only)
Service Order	Amended (Version control only)
Meter Data Process	Amended (Version control only)
One Way Notification	Amended (Version control only)
Technical Delivery Specification	Amended (Procedure changes)

B2B Procedures v3.5 - effective date 10 November 2021

Instrument	New / Amended
Customer Site Details Notification	Amended (Version control only)
Service Order	Amended (Procedure changes)
Meter Data Process	Amended (Procedure changes)
One Way Notification	Amended (Procedure changes)
Technical Delivery Specification	Amended (Procedure changes)

The IEC recognises the proposal to delay the implementation date for Five Minute Settlement and Global Settlement by 12 months to 1 July 2022 in recognition of the current pressures on industry. If an effective date change is required for non-contestable unmetered loads (NCONUML), the IEC will assess the change once more information on the effective date of Global Settlement is known.

1.2.3 **Items not being consulted on at this stage**

The IEC is not inviting submissions at this stage on proposed changes to the Service Order Procedures or Technical Specifications.

Extensive changes were proposed to the Service Order Procedures (detailed in section 4.1.1.3):

- Regarding the recently enhanced transactions: when “Other” is selected in the recently enhanced transactions, “Special Instructions” is to become Mandatory.
- Similarly, if a given contact method such as “Customer Email” is selected, the corresponding detail must be provided.
- Other minor changes have been made, including the addition and removal of some purpose subtypes.
- The ‘Normal’ enumeration will be removed from the ‘Escalation’ field.
- Several fields were made available for the following MeterServiceWorks (MSWs): Remove Meter, Install Control Load and Install Meter.

The B2B Technical Specifications are also to be updated as the definition of NCONUML will be updated from “Non-contestable Unmetered Device Market Load” to “Non-Contestable Unmetered Load”.

Additional tables have been added to the B2B Guide to create clarity around transaction and enumeration combinations.

Supporting editorial changes have been made to each technical document. These include updating references, fixing typographical errors and ensuring references to Unmetered loads are consistent. These are detailed in the change-marked versions available on AEMO's website.

This Report does not propose further changes to the Meter Data file size increase and transaction limit, with the exception of bringing implementation forward to align the B2B Procedures with the implementation of 5MS. Given the other changes to the Procedures aren't required for the 5MS effective date, these will continue to be effective 10 November 2021 as agreed upon by a majority of participants. A summary of the Procedures that are changing and implementation timeframes is provided below.

Consultation date	Procedures version number	Changes
12 February 2020 (final determination to be made 8 July 2020)	V3.4 (1 July 2021)	Technical Specifications – Meter Data file size and transaction limit
12 February 2020 (final determination to be made 8 July 2020)	V3.5 (10 November 2021)	Service Orders (MSWs, Supply Abolishment and Allocate NMI) One Way Notifications (MXN and PIN review) Meter Data Process (NCONUML)

2. Background

This document has been prepared to detail proposed amendments to the B2B Procedures, which have been developed under the IEC's power to manage the ongoing development of B2B Procedures as contemplated by National Electricity Rules (NER) clause 7.17.7(a)(2). The information provided in this consultation meets the requirements for changing the B2B Procedures as detailed in sections 7.17.4 and 8.9 of the NER.

This document also provides information considered by the IEC in determining if a prima facie case exists for amending the B2B Procedures, namely:

- An issues statement (see section 3).
- A summary of changes to the B2B Procedures, including consideration of the B2B Principles (see sections 3 and 5).
- A consideration of the B2B factors (see section 4.5).

The proposed changes have been considered and recommended by the IEC's B2B-WG.

The impacted Procedures are the:

- B2B Procedure: One Way Notification Process.
- B2B Procedure: Service Order Process.
- B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification.
- B2B Procedure: Meter Data Process.

3. Scope / Issues Statement

The IEC has developed the changes in this document to improve the functionality of existing B2B transactions and to incorporate routine communication between electricity retail market participants into B2B transactions. These changes were recommended to the IEC by the B2B-WG on behalf of industry.

The members of the B2B-WG are:

Retailers	Distributors	Metering
AGL	AusNet Services	IntelliHUB
Alinta Energy	Energy Queensland	PlusES
Origin Energy	Endeavour Energy	Metering Dynamics
Red Energy and Lumo Energy	SA Power Networks	Vector AMS
Simply Energy	TasNetworks	

This document lists the proposed changes to the B2B Procedures as developed, discussed, and primarily agreed through the IEC’s consultation with its B2B-WG. The proposed changes under this B2B consultation have staggered effective dates of 1 July 2021 (Meter Data changes) and 10 November 2021 (other changes).

In summary, the proposed changes are:

- To increase the maximum file size and introduce a transaction number limit for the MTRD transaction group.
- To amend the Service Order Process to:
 - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions. Currently this information is being communicated using special instructions in the SO.
 - Add a new enumeration to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML can be communicated.
 - Clarify that the Supply Abolishment SO can be used in New South Wales.
- To amend the One Way Notification Process to remove the MXN and enhance the PIN transaction to replace it and link this transaction with the initiating SO.

Detailed amendments are shown in the draft B2B Procedures published with this report.

4. Consultation Process

The following table details the consultation process:

Action	Start Date	End Date
IEC to issue notice of consultation for publication by AEMO	29 November 2019	
Participant submissions to be provided to AEMO	29 November 2019	13 January 2020
Submission receipt date	13 January 2020	
IEC to consider all valid submissions and prepare the Draft Determination consultation pack, which change-marked procedures	13 January 2020	12 February 2020
AEMO to publish First Draft Determination consultation (incl. change marked B2B Procedures)	12 February 2020	
Participant submissions to First Draft Determination to be provided to AEMO	12 February 2020	11 March 2020
Submission receipt date	11 March 2020	
IEC to consider all valid submissions and prepare the Second Draft Determination report. This includes the change marked procedures.	11 March 2020	22 April 2020
AEMO to publish B2B v3.4 Second Draft Stage Report*	22 April 2020*	
Participant submissions to Second Draft Report to be provided to AEMO	29 April 2020	27 May 2020
Submission receipt date	27 May 2020	
IEC to consider all valid submissions and prepare the Final Report and Determination.	27 May 2020	8 July 2020
AEMO to publish B2B v3.4 and B2B v3.5 Final Determination*	8 July 2020	
B2B Procedures v3.4 effective date	1 July 2021	
B2B Procedures v3.5 effective date**	10 November 2021*	

*This was formerly the publication date of the Final Determination

**The IEC requested feedback on this effective date and a majority of respondents indicated a preference for November 2021 implementation.

The proposed changes have an impact on the Service Order Process, the One Way Notification Process, and the Meter Data Process.

4.1 Service Order changes

4.1.1 Metering Service Works

4.1.1.1 Issue Summary and Submissions

A recent change to the NER placed obligations on Retailers to ensure that certain metering works (such as new connections, replacements due to meter fault, and customer-initiated replacements) are carried out in set (prescribed) timeframes.

Experience has shown that additional information is required to be exchanged between the Retailer (Initiator) and their contestable metering providers (Recipient) to ensure that metering work can progress in an orderly and timely fashion. Using existing B2B transactions, participants are currently required to use other ways to convey this information, such as using the special instructions fields, by repurposing other fields not designed for the conveyance of this information, or by using off-market communications methods (phone calls, emails, and spreadsheets). These approaches typically require additional resources in both Initiator and Recipient businesses to manually populate and review this additional information which is time-consuming, error-prone, and can introduce a significant delay in progressing work requests. The changes consulted on will see critical information included within formal SO fields to ensure that transactions can be managed, tracked, and audited more efficiently.

The requirement to complete fields in a SO are currently categorised as Mandatory, Required, Optional, or Not Required. As the SO is multi-purpose (i.e. the SO will be sent to both Distributors and contestable Metering Providers), the IEC proposes that the requirement to complete a field can be marked “Optional/Not Required” (O/N) — as opposed to Mandatory, Required, Optional, or Not Required — to indicate that an Initiator must obtain agreement from the Recipient before they populate an ‘O/N’ element in the SO. The B2B-WG does not expect the Retailer to populate the new information when they send a SO to the Distributor (in which instance the fields would be treated as Optional).

Participants have indicated that the following types of information are currently being communicated in the SO via alternative methods:

- **Purpose of visit** – The current SO does not contain sufficient detail to clearly articulate the reason for the visit. For example, a Meter Service Works (Exchange Meter) request can be triggered as part of a customer-initiated solar upgrade, as the result of a meter malfunction reported to the Retailer by the network, or as part of a family failure.
- **Regulatory classification** – The current SO does not clearly articulate whether a request is part of a customer-initiated request; a Retailer new deployment; or a metering malfunction. Each of these scenarios all have different timeframes under the Rules and as such have different process and reporting requirements.
- **Customer-agreed date** – The current SO does not clearly articulate whether the customer has already agreed to a fixed date or date window for the service to be performed. Understanding this impacts process and reporting requirements for metering businesses.
- **Customer notification method** – Where a formal notification of a supply interruption to the customer is required, the lead time for delivering this notice differs based on the method of delivery. This impacts a service provider’s scheduling processes — e.g. a customer who receives their notice via postal services requires scheduling in a shorter timeframe to allow for physical delivery of the letter, whereas a customer receiving notification via digital methods has a longer timeframe before scheduling must occur. An enumerated value(s) will identify the contact method.

- **Customer notification address** (postal or email) – In circumstances where the Retailer has made arrangements for the service provider to generate a Retailer PIN to the customer on the Retailer's behalf, the current SO request does not allow for a Retailer to provide the details of the customer's contact details, such as the phone number or e-mail address. Specific fields in the SO for this information will allow for better automation.
- **Escalation indicator** – The current SO does not clearly articulate that a SO is to be treated with an agreed level of priority and/or sensitivity over other SOs (e.g. ombudsman, off supply, etc). It is proposed to include a field to designate the level of escalation / urgency.
- **Malfunction exemption details** – The current SO does not allow for details related to AEMO exemptions to be conveyed from the Initiator to the service provider. Understanding the details of any exemption period informs the Metering Provider (MP) which timeframes apply and allows for appropriate scheduling. It is proposed to include fields to allow the exemption code allocated by AEMO and the end date by which the malfunction must be remedied.

To address these issues, additional fields with enumerated lists are proposed to be added to the relevant SO.

The IEC proposal was supported by a majority of participants, with some caveats. Most of the retailers and distributors that responded were in support of the proposed changes.

4.1.1.2 IEC Assessment of Initial Consultation Submissions

Ausgrid did not support the proposed changes, stating that special instructions is a mandatory field where the initiator wishes to convey to the Recipient. TasNetworks recommended utilising the existing Peer-to-Peer (P2P) transaction to send service orders without the need for a schema change.

Endeavour Energy requested future-proofing the schema change by ensuring any future changes do not compel other parties, who are not interested or impacted by the changes, from having to make costly system changes. Ausnet Services, Endeavour Energy, PLUS ES and Simply Energy proposed further fields be added to the Metering Service Works service order. PLUS ES raised a concern about lack of clarity regarding the processes by which these service orders will be used and that some fields would also deliver benefits and efficiencies to more than just the service orders identified.

CitiPower Powercor and United Energy highlighted that these changes were not applicable to Victorian distributors. SA Power Networks also noted that the proposed changes will not be used by Distributors acting as the initial Metering Coordinator (MC) and MP for Regulated metering and stated a preference for implementation post July 2021.

Several participant submissions suggested participants use special notes or P2P transactions instead of establishing new transactions or fields. However, moving standardised information from special notes as proposed provides efficiency across industry.

The IEC considers that adding potentially useful fields to transactions would improve market efficiency. To expand the v3.4 service order changes to include an expanded review of all service orders is beyond the scope of this review. An ICF being submitted separately to this review would allow the market to perform a cost/benefit analysis on the proposal.

Although various fields can be managed through special notes or P2P transactions, the IEC concludes that it is preferable to manage the additional information with specific transaction fields where possible in the interest of efficiency and standardisation within the market.

Following further discussion by the B2B-WG, several of the fields flagged by respondents were added to the proposed enumerated lists as part of the service order.

Further, the IEC recommends that PLUS ES submit an ICF for consideration of its additional suggested changes.

The IEC also acknowledges that:

- These changes are not applicable to Victorian distributors.
- Most respondents expressed a preference for November 2021 implementation.

4.1.1.3 IEC Assessment of First Draft Consultation Submissions

Several editorial changes were suggested by Endeavour Energy. These have been included in the Service Order Procedures v3.5.

AGL and PLUS ES proposed changes to several fields, including renaming “Purpose of Visit” to “Purpose of Request”, or making fields such as ‘Escalation’, ‘CustNotifAddress’ and ‘CustNotifEmail’ O/N rather than N for MSW Remove Meter, MSW Install Control Load, and MSW Install Meter. These suggestions have been adopted. Similarly, the Procedures now reflect that if an ambiguous subtype is selected, detail must be provided in a related field or SpecialInstructions. For example if ‘Other’ is selected in ‘ReqClassification’, ‘SpecialInstructions’ must be detailed or if ‘CustomerNotificationMethod’ is ‘Email’, ‘CustomerNotificationEmail’ becomes Mandatory.

Several subtypes were altered, including the addition of

- ‘Communications Install’,
- ‘Revenue Protection’,
- ‘Abolishment’,
- ‘None’,
- ‘Family Failure’, and
- ‘Retailer Led’,

The following sub-types were removed:

- ‘Relocate Existing Meter’ and
- ‘Replace Existing Meter.’

The ‘Normal’ subtype of ‘Escalation’ was also removed as any request will be treated as normal unless flagged otherwise.

The fields pertinent to MSW Install Meter, MSW Remove Meter and MSW Install Control Load were largely made O/N rather than N, as requested by PLUS ES.

For clarity more information is provided regarding the use of transaction combinations in the B2B Guide. The IEC is not calling for further submissions on this Procedure.

4.1.2 Supply Abolishment

4.1.2.1 Issue Summary and Submissions

In NSW the field work to abolish supply to a connection point is performed by an Accredited Service Provider (ASP) rather than the Local Network Service Provider (LNSP). This means that a customer engages the ASP directly and the LNSP is not involved in the field work.

For the LNSP to make the NMI extinct in MSATS where a Type 1–4A meter is installed, confirmation from the MP that the metering installation is no longer installed and has been removed from site is required. MPs regularly identify supply abolishment when they investigate communications failures of metering installations. In these instances, the MP would notify the Retailer who would then request that the LNSP make the NMI extinct in MSATS.

Currently the Retailer request to make the NMI extinct is performed via email, or alternately, the MP sends a Notice of Metering Works (NOMW) - Meter Removed transaction to the LNSP (although not all MPs submit a NOMW if they did not perform the meter removal work). Over 6,000 NMI extinctions occurred in NSW in 2018; as such, participants have expressed a desire for this communication to be done via B2B transactions.

The proposed change clarifies that the Supply Abolishment SO can be used in NSW, with the difference that—unlike in other jurisdictions—the use of this SO in NSW will not result in any field work by the LNSP, as the field work will continue to be performed by an ASP. Instead, Retailers will use the Supply Abolishment SO in NSW to request only that the LNSP make the NMI extinct in MSATS.

The majority of respondents were in favour of the proposed changes. Some distributors and one retailer responded “Other” or listed caveats that highlighted differences between jurisdictions. Evoenergy requested that clarity be provided around the use of the service order across jurisdictions. SA Power Networks and United Energy noted that the service order does not apply to Victorian distributors. Red and Lumo Energy noted that the service order does not result in the need for fieldwork in NSW and should not have LNSP fees associated with it.

4.1.2.2 IEC Assessment of Initial Consultation Submissions

On consideration of these submissions, the IEC acknowledges that correct use of the service order is integral to improving market outcomes and efficiency.

The authority to determine LNSP fees is held by the Australian Energy Regulator, not the IEC, and as such the IEC is silent on whether there should be fees associated with the Supply Abolishment service order in NSW.

The Service Order Process has been updated to reflect jurisdictional differences and physical processes in order to ensure participants use the service order correctly.

The IEC acknowledges that these changes are not applicable to Victorian distributors.

4.1.2.3 IEC Assessment of First Draft Consultation Submissions

AGL and Alinta Energy both expressed support for the proposed changes. Both retailers also expressed a desire for additional clarity from Evo Energy regarding their abolishment process. Red and Lumo also expressed support for the IEC’s conclusion. No further changes are proposed to the transaction. The IEC is not calling for further submissions on this Procedure.

4.1.3 Allocate NMI

4.1.3.1 Issue Summary and Submissions

The Allocate NMI is a B2B SO that is used when a Retailer wants a site to be registered in MSATS. Usually the Initiator of the Allocate NMI is a Retailer and the Recipient is the LNSP. The LNSP would usually perform a number of validations, such as ensuring the site is not already registered in MSATS and that sufficient addressing information has been provided to identify the site in their Geographic Information System (GIS).

If the request passes validation then the LNSP must determine the appropriate value for a number of the NMI standing data items (such as distribution loss factor, transmission node identifier, NMI classification, etc), assign a NMI for the site, and assign the Retailer as the Financially Responsible Market Participant (FRMP). The NMI would then be published in MSATS.

With the change of the settlements methodology under Global Settlements, there is now a requirement for NCONUML to be registered in MSATS. However, the Allocate NMI SO does not allow an Initiator to indicate that the request is for a NCONUML, which then allows the LNSP to perform the necessary validation and meet their obligation to populate the NMI Classification as defined by the CATS Procedure.

The proposed change is to add the value of “NCONUML” to the CustomerType field so that Initiators can communicate an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML via B2B transactions.

The IEC proposal was supported by all but two respondents, with one distributor objecting to the proposal and one retailer presenting caveats. TasNetworks questioned the value of the schema change and how the hub would treat a participant remaining on a n-1 schema. AGL noted that NMI type can be managed through special notes.

4.1.3.2 IEC Assessment of Initial Consultation Submissions

As noted in section 4.1.1, moving standardised information from special notes or bespoke processes such as P2P transactions as proposed provides efficiency across industry. Additionally, AEMO IT have determined it is not possible for a participant to remain on an n-1 schema where the B2B Hub is required to validate a transaction on the basis of an n schema.

Although various fields can be managed through special notes or bespoke transactions, the IEC concludes that it is preferable to manage them through standardised transactions and fields, which improve operational efficiency across the market.

4.1.3.3 IEC Assessment of First Draft Consultation Submissions

Participant feedback from Alinta Energy and AGL noted the addition of NCONUML to the Customer Type field and Red and Lumo supported the proposed changes.

No further changes were made to this transaction. The IEC is not calling for further submissions on this Procedure.

4.2 One Way Notification changes

4.2.1.1 Issue Summary and Submissions

The one-way notifications transactions used for informing parties of pending metering works — namely, the MXN and the MFIN — do not currently allow contestable metering providers to include the SO ID when sending a transaction to Retailers. This makes it onerous for the Retailers to match the request back to the original SO. By including the original SO ID with the scheduling information contained in the MXN and MFIN, the Initiator can more efficiently link the jobs.

- The MFIN is an XML-based transaction that is defined by the aseXML schema. Adding in a new optional field to be included within this transaction will result in a schema change.
- The MXN is a pre-Power of Choice transaction that uses a CSV payload to contain one or more notifications for NMIs that are scheduled for a meter exchange. Fields within this payload are comma-separated into a file-like structure. The MXN was developed to meet the requirements of the Victorian AMI program where Distributors were required to provide notice to Retailers of a pending meter exchange.

While the ability for CSV payloads to carry multiple transactions allows for efficient transport between participants, it also introduces complexity for participant systems in dealing with errors contained within the file — e.g. partial acceptance where one notification is incorrect but the remainder are correct. This is similar to other CSV-based payloads such as MDFF where data can be partially accepted.

Given that the MFIN, which is XML-based, can be used for the same purpose as the MXN and avoids the issue related to partial acceptance of the MXN, as part of the first-round consultation the IEC asked if participants supported the continued usage of the CSV-based MXN or the retirement of the MXN (CSV) transaction.

Two options were presented to industry upon retirement of the MXN (CSV) transaction, there are two options:

1. **Retire the MXN as part of the updating of the MFIN or PIN.** This would mean that there would be no need for the proposed changes to the MXN.
2. **Give the MXN an extension past this change window.** This could mean either updating or not updating the MXN. If the MXN is to be used on an ongoing basis, the IEC considers that the proposed updates should be made to the MXN. If it is to be retired within 12 months of the MFIN change, then the benefits will be diluted owing to the shorter timeframe over which they can be realised.

4.2.1.2 IEC Assessment of Initial Consultation Submissions

As part of the first-round consultation, the IEC recommended that the MXN be retired (Option 1) and sought feedback from participants on this view. The majority of respondents supported retiring the MXN and updating the MFIN as part of this work (Option 1). Most participants also stated that a November 2021 implementation period would be preferable, given the timeframe for the schema change. PLUS ES proposed utilising the PIN and MFIN for faults and issues.

Following PLUS ES's feedback, a broader review of One Way Notifications has been proposed as an option for participants. This has been included in the second draft consultation, detailed below.

As the majority of respondents were supportive of removing the MXN, it will be removed from the One Way Notification. Respondents were asked whether they have a preference between using the PIN and/or the MFIN One Way Notifications to notify participants of meter exchange dates and if so, which is their preference and why.

4.2.1.3 IEC Assessment of First Draft Consultation Submissions

The First Draft Report included a question designed to confirm industry opinion on the retirement of the MXN in favour of upgrading the MFIN or PIN. Out of the submissions on the draft report, AGL and Origin Energy objected to the removal of the MXN. PLUS ES and Endeavour Energy were ambivalent on the issue. CitiPower Powercor expressed a preference towards using the MFIN over the PIN when replacing the MXN.

A majority of respondents were in favour of retiring the MXN, contingent on using the PIN to replace its functions. However, the specifics of the changes proposed to the PIN were not included in the drafting of the One Way Notification Procedures published with the First Draft Report. As the retirement of the MXN is dependent on changes being made to another transaction, the Second Draft is to scaffold options for industry and allow the IEC to consult with industry on this solution in order to incorporate it into the B2B Procedures v3.5.

TasNetworks also suggested two clauses be updated to reflect the removal of the MXN. These suggestions have been reflected in the drafted One Way Notification Process. The proposed enhancement of the PIN consists of an additional Required field to contain a ServiceOrderID. This will allow it to replace the MXN, which will reduce redundancy in One Way Notification transactions.

With the amendment to the PIN to include the Originating SO ID, additional enumerations have been added to the Reason for Interruption field to align to the proposed changes to the B2B Service Order. These additional enumerations proposed for Reason for Interruption field are:

- Meter Installation – Additional
- Install Controlled Load
- Remove Meter
- Move Meter

- Meter Reconfiguration

In order to reflect the proposed amendments to the MFIN in the PIN and align it with industry preference, the IEC also proposes the following changes:

- *EndDate* to be made Mandatory for an interruption window that is greater than 1 day and Optional for a single calendar day interruption window.
- *ServiceOrderID* to be a new Required field for the transaction.

For further detail, see the proposed One Way Notification Process v3.5 made available as part of this consultation.

Question 1: A majority of respondents to the First Draft Report indicated a preference for enhancement of the PIN to replace the MXN. Are there any further enhancements or changes to the PIN, as drafted, that you would suggest?

4.3 Increase to transaction size limit for Meter Data

4.3.1.1 Issue Summary & Submissions

As part of the implementation of 5 Minute Settlement (5MS), meter data files will often contain a larger number of rows—for an interval meter over a day, instead of 48 rows, there will be 288. AEMO has therefore recommended that industry increase the maximum file size of the meter data file from 1 to 10 MB.

The simplest way to do this is to increase the maximum message size for the MTRD transaction group; however, this group includes:

- Meter Data Notification (MDN).
- Provide Meter Data (PMD).
- Verify Meter Data (VMD).

The latter two transactions (PMD and VMD) are quite small, and a significant number of transactions could be sent in a 10 MB file. Initial analysis by some businesses has indicated that such a large number of transactions could impact system processing, leading to degradation of participant services.

The IEC, together with AEMO and on the recommendation of the B2B-WG, has considered the issue and proposes two changes to the B2B Technical Delivery Specification that it believes would address the issue:

1. The MTRD group maximum file size be increased from 1 MB to 10 MB.
2. A limit of 1000 transactions per file be applied to the MTRD group.

The fundamental change to the B2B Technical Specification would be to specify the file size for each transaction group, as shown below:

Transaction Group	Message Size	Transaction Volume Maximum Limit
MTRD	10 MB	1000
SORD	1 MB	N/A
CDN	1 MB	N/A
SITE	1 MB	N/A

OWNX	1 MB	N/A
NPNX	1 MB	N/A

A majority of respondents indicated that they are supportive of a file size increase to 10MB and their systems are capable of accepting this new file size for MTRD transactions. MEA Powershop and Ergon Energy and Energex stated that there may be some issue with processing the transactions but were still supportive of the change as necessary for an adaptive market. The majority of respondents were also in favour of transaction limits being placed on the MTRD group. Evoenergy and Vector Metering objected to the transaction limit. PLUS ES noted that the introduction of a file limit would not necessarily mitigate any potential problems. The latter objected on the basis that it will not mitigate the potential problems of an increased file size.

Similarly, most participants indicated support for a volume limit of 1000 transactions per file for the PMD and VMD transactions. Simply Energy suggested a 2000 transaction limit. Vector Metering objected on the basis that systems and processes should be designed and built to handle any number of transactions that come in a 10MB file.

4.3.1.2 IEC Assessment of Initial Consultation Submissions

No specific problems were identified with the MTRD file size increase and transaction volume limit. Both of these changes are in the interests of efficiency and system robustness. The optimal number of transactions a file can handle will not always be the highest technically possible number. As the majority of respondents have indicated a 1000-transaction limit for the MTRD transaction group is appropriate, it will be implemented.

A majority of respondents were in favour of increasing the file size and imposing a transaction limit on MTRD files, including PMD and VMD transactions. As such, the IEC proposes to implement these changes.

Section 1.6 in the Technical Specification were updated to clearly define one megabyte as 1024 kilobytes in order to maximise clarity within the market.

4.3.1.3 IEC Assessment of First Draft Consultation Submissions

AGL, Alinta Energy, AusNet Services expressed support for the changes to file sizes and transaction limits. Energy Queensland suggested a higher transaction limit. However, the majority of respondents are in favour of a 1000 transaction limit and the established implementation date.

Although participants largely agreed upon a 10 November 2021 implementation date for these B2B changes, the IEC investigated an appropriate effective date for this change in conjunction with AEMO's 5MS project team and determined it would be 1 July 2021. As such, 1 July 2021 is the implementation date for the first tranche of the changes proposed as part of this determination. As such, participants are expected to build their systems to be ready in time for 1 July 2021 and the v3.4 Procedure effective dates have been split. The Technical Specifications will be updated ahead of other B2B Procedures as v3.4 with version number changes for the other Procedures. The other changes outlined in this document, such as the Service Order Procedures and One Way Notification Process, are to be effective 10 November 2021 as B2B Procedures v3.5.

TasNetworks also recommended the definition of NCONUML be reworded from "Non-contestable Unmetered Device Market Load" to "Non-Contestable Unmetered Load". This has been updated.

The IEC is not calling for further submissions on this Procedure.

4.4 B2B Principles

The IEC considers that the B2B Proposal supports each of the B2B Principles as follows:

B2B Principle	Justification
<i>B2B Procedures should provide a uniform approach to B2B Communications in participating jurisdictions.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures are not jurisdiction-specific and therefore do not create any jurisdictional differences.
<i>B2B Procedures should detail operational and procedural matters and technical requirements that result in efficient, effective and reliable B2B Communications.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures improve the communications and operational processes between participants through the development of consistent information exchange.
<i>B2B Procedures should avoid unreasonable discrimination between B2B Parties.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures do not introduce changes that would discriminate between B2B Parties, as the proposed changes are either optional or apply equally across all parties.
<i>B2B Procedures should protect the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures do not introduce changes that would compromise the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information.

4.5 B2B Factors

The IEC, on recommendation from the B2B-WG, has determined that the B2B Factors have been achieved for this B2B Proposal as described below.

B2B Factors	Justification
<i>The reasonable costs of compliance by AEMO and B2B Parties with the B2B Procedures compared with the likely benefits from B2B Communications.</i>	<p>The proposed changes will require an aseXML schema version change; however, participants who do not intend to use these modified transactions can utilise the $n-1$ functionality which will convert the latest version to one prior version with the effect of insulating the change to those who want it.</p> <p>As with all schema changes, this $n-1$ will only delay the need for a participant to upgrade to the latest schema until the next schema version change is deployed.</p> <p>As such, greater information is needed from industry regarding the cost–benefit ratio of each of the proposed changes.</p>
<i>The likely impacts on innovation in and barriers to entry to the markets for services facilitated by advanced meters resulting from changing the existing B2B Procedures.</i>	The proposed B2B Procedures do not impose barriers to innovation or market entry; instead, they allow participants to streamline their operations, better meet the recently introduced regulatory metering timeframes, and allow for all relevant information to be contained within the SO structure to allow for a more efficient support process.

B2B Factors	Justification
<p><i>The implementation timeframe reasonably necessary for AEMO and B2B Parties to implement systems or other changes required to be compliant with any change to existing B2B Procedures.</i></p>	<p>These proposed changes require a new version of the aseXML schema to be generated, which will require a low level of change to participant gateways.</p> <p>AEMO will be required to update the LVI screens to allow the smaller Retailers who to take advantage of these new fields.</p> <p>The timeframe for implementation has balanced the time required for this change and the benefits gained (see below).</p>

4.6 Benefits

The B2B Proposal supports the B2B Factors in the following ways:

- **Metering Service Works SO changes:** As outlined in section 4.1.1, the proposed Metering Service Works change will minimise the need for manual population and review of the SO’s regulatory requirements. This will enable more efficient SO generation, processing, and scheduling.

This change also provides participants with a more efficient process to track and audit SOs, in particular those participants with regulatory obligations.
- **Supply Abolishment SO changes:** The proposed Supply Abolishment change create a clear and auditable process for Retailers requesting that a NMI be made extinct in NSW. This would result in customers’ having their account finalised and their final bill issued much sooner as opposed to continuing to receive estimated bills.
- **Allocate NMI SO changes:** The proposed Allocate NMI change will provide benefits by allowing the use of a B2B transaction to be used for the request of a NMI for non-contestable unmetered loads.
- **One Way Notification changes:** By allowing for the linking of a meter exchange notice to the originating SO to allow participants to link SOs and responding actions (e.g. interruption dates), it will facilitate more efficient communications between Retailers and service providers, leading to reduced costs that will ultimately be passed onto customers.
- **MTRD changes:** The proposed changes will ensure that Meter Data Notification files do not now have to be split across several files and will ensure consistency across message size limits between MSATS and B2B Procedures.

4.7 Costs

The following proposed changes will require a schema change:

- To amend the Service Order Process to:

 - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions.
 - Add a new value to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML can be communicated.
- To amend the One Way Notification Process to remove the MXN and to link the PIN transactions with the initiating SO.

The B2B e-Hub supports the current schema version. Validations of the above changes will occur with the current schema in mind. For example, service orders would be rejected if a participant were unable to accept the new NCONUML value in the Allocate NMI Service Order.

When a schema change occurs, participants are expected to update their systems to reflect this update. This is so organisations can uniformly participate in the market and receive the benefit a new schema offers. If your organisation is currently on the previously supported schema version r36, then it must upgrade to the version proposed with this change.

The following proposed changes will require changes to the Low Volume Interface (LVI):

- To amend the Service Order Process to:
 - Introduce seven new optional fields to support better communication between Initiators and Recipients of transactions.
 - Add a new value to the CustomerType field so that an Allocate NMI request for a NCONUML can be communicated.
- To amend the One Way Notification Process to remove the MXN and to link either the PIN transactions with the initiating SO.

Participants should consider the impact of the proposed changes, including:

- The costs and resources required to implement the changes and the required ongoing operational cost and resources.
- Participants' ability to implement the changes on the proposed date, considering other known or upcoming industry changes as well as any internal projects.

A majority of participants had no concerns about the costs associated with the changes given the effective date will be 10 November 2021. The efficiency gains from the proposed changes are also expected to result in a cost reduction for organisations of all sizes.

4.8 MSATS Procedures

AEMO has advised that there is no assessed impact to the Market Settlements and Transfers Solution (MSATS) Procedures as a result of this B2B Proposal.

5. Other matters

5.1 Consultation timeframes

B2B schema releases are generally deployed in May or November, but AEMO is unable to deliver a schema change to B2B systems in November 2020 due to pre-existing 5MS commitments.

The IEC is conscious that this consultation is occurring in a changing external regulatory environment, with a number of known changes proposed for implementation in the next two years. While the scope and timing of some of these are well known, the timing and impact on B2B processes for other initiatives are less clear at this stage.

The below table outlines the changes that are currently in the public domain. These changes will not impact all participants equally, with variation by participant category and jurisdictions (in some cases).

Reform	Effective date
Consumer Data Right	TBC, late 2020–sometime 2021
5 Minute Settlement	1 July 2021
Global Settlement	6 February 2022
Default Market Offer 2	1 July 2020
Embedded Networks	TBC
Customer Switching	TBC
MSATS Standing Data Review	TBC, expected May and November 2022
Stand-alone Power Systems	TBC, expected mid-2021
Wholesale Demand Response	AEMC Final Determination, expected 24 November 2021

The initial report of this consultation requested participants indicate which implementation date they would prefer out of 2 December 2020 or November 2021. A majority of participants expressed preference for the latter.

Given the number of reforms with an effective date of 1 July 2021, the IEC does not believe that May 2021 will be an acceptable implementation date for B2B system changes, which therefore means that the next available opportunity to deliver a B2B schema change is November 2021. As such, the implementation date for the bulk of the proposed changes in this determination is 10 November 2021.

5.2 New Verify Standing Data Transaction

The B2B-WG have been considering the introduction of new transactions to support the verification of current MSATS standing data with a data owner (LNSP, Retailer, MDP or MP). This circumstance is usually the result of receiving alternate information from another source that may call into question the validity of the MSATS data. Currently these interactions occur outside of formal B2B transactions (generally via email exchange) and rely on manual handling within participant businesses. Initial investigations indicate that queries are at volumes to justify the development of a formal B2B transaction.

If this change was to be pursued, it is proposed that two new transactions would be created:

- Verify Standing Data Request – this transaction would be sent in order for the Recipient to verify the standing data in MSATS (and update MSATS where required). This transaction would contain details related to the nature of the request, e.g. tariff mismatch, address updates, NMI abolishment, NMI status mismatch, or meter status mismatch.
- Verify Standing Data Response – this transaction would be sent from the Recipient in response to a Verify Standing Data Request and will contain a description of the action taken.

These transactions will not be included in this release and version of B2B Procedures and require further input from industry participants to determine if there is broader levels of support and tangible benefits that would warrant further work on this initiative.

Participants should take into account the work that AEMO has completed under the MSATS Standing Data Review¹ and be aware that AEMO is about to commence further work on this project. Feedback given during the initial stage of this consultation will be incorporated into the MSATS Standing Data Review. This may therefore resolve current issues and therefore remove the need for any additional B2B transactions.

A majority of respondents did not see value in developing new Verify Standing Data transactions. The Verify Standing Data Transaction may be revisited, dependent on the outcomes of the MSATS Standing Data Review.

¹ See here for the consultation page: <https://www.aemo.com.au/Stakeholder-Consultation/Consultations/MSATS-NMI-Standing-Data-Consultation>

6. B2B Proposal

The proposed changes are detailed within the attached draft procedures published with this report.

Consolidated participant responses to Draft report

Service Order Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
AGL	Various	Various	AGL supports the general reference changes within the document.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for these changes
Alinta Energy	Various	Various	Generally Alinta Energy supports the proposed changes to the Service Order Process.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for these changes
AusNet Services	Various	Various	AusNet Services agrees with the proposed changes applied to the Service Order Process.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for these changes
Endeavour Energy	2.16.5.b	2.16.5.b	<p>For the avoidance of any confusion, this clause should be made clearer that the supply abolishment service order must only be raised when the initiator has confirmed that the service line/cable has been removed and also the distributor will not perform any site visit.</p> <p>We suggest that this clause be updated to:</p> <p>In NSW, the DNSP is requested to make the NMI extinct in MSATS as the service line / cable has been confirmed by the Initiator to be already removed. Note that the DNSP will not perform a site visit.</p>	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The clause has been updated accordingly.

Metering Service Works

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
Alinta Energy	4.1		Alinta Energy Supports the removal of “AO” and agrees that O/N will deliver the same outcome.	The IEC notes the respondent’s support for these changes
PLUS ES	General	Aligning with B2B Principles	<p>PLUS ES’ understanding of the B2B procedures is that of a mechanism which should effect an efficient, consistent and harmonised method of communication between B2B participants, as per B2B Principles.</p> <p>This is also applicable in the current POC (contestable) environment.</p> <p>Hence, PLUS ES recommends that any proposed changes which offer two different alternatives for an Initiator to communicate the same information in a B2B SO should be reviewed and the resulting outcome align with NER B2B Principles Clause (b).</p> <p>Anything additional should be a P2P agreed process.</p>	The IEC notes the respondent’s comment. PLUS ES is welcome to submit a change proposal to the IEC if two alternatives exist for an initiator to communicate the same information in a Service Order.
Red Energy and Lumo Energy (Red and Lumo)	4.1.1 Metering Service Works	4.1.1 Metering Service Works	Red Energy and Lumo Energy (Red and Lumo) agree that there is benefit in adding specific transactional fields to move away from special notes or P2P transactions. It is important though to ensure that the purpose of the additional fields is well articulated in the Service Order process so as to not create confusion (ie: Scheduled Date, Customer	The IEC notes the respondent’s support for these changes. Several fields have been updated below as suggested by other respondents.

			Preferred Date And Time, Customer Agreed Start Date, Customer Agreed End Date)	
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose of Visit classification Name AGL suggest that Purpose of Visit be renamed – Purpose of Request or SO Purpose as not all SOs will require a physical visit (eg remote configuration).	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment and has updated the field name accordingly.
PLUS ES		ReqClassification	Special Instructions should be Mandatory when ‘Other’ is selected. Refer to General SpecialInstruction field comment.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. The IEC has updated the procedures to make Special Instructions mandatory when ‘Other’ is selected.
Alinta energy	4.1		Alinta Energy supports the proposed additional fields however there is more work required to determine what sub-classifications are required and the allowed combinations of sub classifications that can be used for each “Field”.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. Other sub-classifications have been outworked in the Report and are included in the Guide.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose Sub-Types AGL believes that the New Connection enumeration may not be necessary as the requirement can be determined through other processes but does note that it is a clear requirement to the Meter Providers.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. The intent is for the Service Order to be self-

				contained and as such it has value.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL believes that the Additional Meter enumeration may not be necessary as the requirement can be determined through other processes but does note that it is a clear requirement to the Meter Providers.</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The intent is for the Service Order to be self-contained and as such it has value and will be retained.</p>
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL believes that the Part of BTS Temp to Perm enumeration is sufficiently unclear in its use, especially as it is expected that the enumeration New Connection would be used</p> <p>AGL seeks clarity on how this enumeration would be used differently to New Connection or is it a specific variation on New Connection?</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The description in the Guide has been updated to provide greater clarity.</p>
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL believes that the Part of Supply Alteration enumeration has value, as the current sub-type Supply Alteration only exists in the Supply Works SO sub-Type and not the Metering SO Sub-Type.</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent's support for this change.</p>
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL believes that the proposed Bidirectional Flow at Premises enumeration could be deleted as the Metering Required Field clearly specifies the</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The intent is for the Service</p>

			type of output required (eg import/export), however there may be some value for clarity of SO purpose.	Order to be self-contained and as such it has value.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose Sub-Types AGL believes that the proposed Relocate Existing Meter enumeration should be deleted as it replicates an existing Metering SO sub-Type.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The enumeration does not have value and can be removed.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose Sub-Types AGL believes that the proposed Replace Existing Meter enumeration should be deleted as it adds no value with a Metering SO Sub-Type Exchange.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The enumeration does not have value and can be removed.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose Sub-Types AGL believes that the proposed Bypassed Customer enumeration can add some value in ensuring clarity to the Metering SO.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's support for this change.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose Sub-Types AGL suggests that Communications Remove enumeration can add value in ensuring clarity to the Metering SO and tracking of customer requests for the removal of communications.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's support for this change.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		Purpose Sub-Types AGL suggests that as Comms Removal has been included, Communications Install now	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been updated

			needs to be included, to reverse the removal process.	accordingly and replaces 'Communications Add'.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL suggests that a new Purpose type – Revenue Protection be added as an associated purpose for Meter Test / Investigate to clearly identify requests which may require care and consideration taken by the Metering business when attending the site.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been updated accordingly.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL suggests that None (or blank) be included as a valid purpose type as the sub-type and Regulatory Classification can be sufficient information for a process.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been updated accordingly.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL suggests that Abolishment be added as a purpose type to clearly differentiate between a single meter abolishment versus a metering installation abolishment identified by this enumeration.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been updated accordingly.
AGL	4.1 Table 13		<p>Purpose Sub-Types</p> <p>AGL suggest that Family Failure and Retailer Led be an additional Purpose of Visit to clearly separate the meter malfunction (which would assume a customer impact) versus Family Failure which has different regulatory requirements.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been updated accordingly.

PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	This field should be renamed as the enumerations do not always reflect a site visit. PLUS ES suggests an alternative; perhaps: 'Purpose of Request'	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	The following enumerations can be communicated with existing B2B SO fields: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidirectional Flows at premise – this can be communicated via the MeteringRequired field Communications Remove – the remove and add can be communicated via MeterInstallCode. PLUS ES suggests this field is renamed 'Alter meter communications'	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. In the interest of completeness, these fields will be maintained.
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected. Refer to General SpecialInstruction field comment.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The field has been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	PLUS ES proposes for the following enumerations to be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue Protection • Site Abolishment • Family Failure Fault	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The field has been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		Purpose for visit	'Replace existing metering' : PLUS ES recommends removing as it is superfluous. The meter exchange MSW – Exchange meter caters for this.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. A majority

			It would require additional cost to implement – for no perceivable value.	of respondents did not object to the field’s inclusion and as such it will remain in place.
AGL	4.1 Table 13	Customer Start / End Date	AGL notes the inclusion of these fields but with the new rules designating regulatory periods, AGL suggest that the SO date would be the start date for any works or the scheduled date field would be used, which would also provide the work date. As such, AGL suggests that these fields be removed.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. The SO will capture the 5-day window within which it can be actioned. These fields will be retained as-is.
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedStartDate	PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as it would add value (O/N instead of N in the matrix): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter MSW Install Controlled Load 	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. The fields have been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedEndDate	PLUS ES supports the customer agreed start and end date combination to be used for a deployment timeframe; other than an appointment. There is a current gap for participants to indicate a Timeframe in a B2B SO, especially with the introduction of the Metering Installation Timeframes. Existing fields in the B2B SO and processes cater for the appointment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ScheduledDate ○ AppointmentReference 	The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. The SO will capture the 5-day window within which it can be actioned. The highlighted sentence has been removed.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CustomerPreferredDateAndTime <p>Introducing an additional method of communicating an appointment will add additional costs and make the process less efficient.</p> <p>Hence PLUS ES recommends the currently proposed wording to be amended in the definition to reflect a timeframe other than a fixed date/appointment. i.e. Remove the sentence: <i>'Where the Initiator.....will be the same date.'</i></p> <p>Refer to General B2B Principle comments</p>	
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedEndDate	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as it would add value (O/N instead of N in the matrix):</p> <p>MSW Remove Meter</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The field has been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerAgreedEndDate	<p>PLUS ES proposes all date or schedule date reference fields relating to the delivery date of the service works should be located together in the B2 SO table. i.e. This field should be located near or adjacent the ScheduledDate field etc.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The table has been rearranged accordingly.
AGL	4.1 Table 13	Customer Notification	<p>AGL notes that based on the Customer Notification Method there are fields for Address and e-mail but no field for Phone/SMS. For consistency, use of this field should require the CustomerContactTelephoneNumber field to be populated.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The field has been updated accordingly.

PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as they also may incur an outage (O/N instead of N in the matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSW Remove Meter MSW Install Control Load <p>MSW Install Meter</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The fields have been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	<p>PLUS ES proposes the addition of "as per bilateral agreements" so the paragraph should read:</p> <p>This is the method by which the notice of interruption to the customer is to be delivered. This is used when the Recipient is to issue the notice on behalf of the Initiator, as per bilateral agreements.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. A general statement has been made regarding optional fields broadly rather than making this proposed change.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	<p>Formatting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undo bullet point from the paragraph in the definition column <p>Add bullet point to 'Post'</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The Procedures have been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	<p>PLUS ES recommends including comments to state that if 'waiver' is selected then either of the two must be populated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CustomerAgreed Start & End date or CustomerPreferredDate 	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The Procedures have been updated accordingly.

PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationMethod	PLUS ES recommends including comments to state that if 'sms' or 'phone' is selected then the CustomerContactNumber must be populated.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The Procedures have been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationAddress	Spelling error in the Definition field – purposes amend to purposes.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has been amended accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationAddress	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as they also may occur an outage (O/N instead of N in the matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter • MSW Install Control Load <p>MSW Install Meter</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The field has been made available.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationAddress	<p>PLUS ES recommends that the wording is amended to make the population of this field mandatory when Post is selected:</p> <p><i>Customer postal address must be provided for the purpose of a retailer planned interruption notice when the CustomerNotificationMethod is 'Post'</i></p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This can be reflected in the Procedures but not the system.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationEmail	Spelling error in the Definition field – purposes amend to purposes.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This has

				been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationEmail	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs as they also may occur an outage (O/N instead of N in the matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSW Remove Meter MSW Install Control Load <p>MSW Install Meter</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. These fields have been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		CustomerNotificationEmail	<p>PLUS ES recommends that the wording is amended to make the population of this field mandatory when Email is selected:</p> <p><i>Customer email address must be provided for the purpose of a retailer planned interruption notice when the CustomerNotificationMethod is 'Email'.</i></p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This change has been reflected in the Procedures.
TasNetworks	4.1, Table 13, CustomerNotification Email		Recommend the format of this field be VARCHAR(100) to align with EmailAddress field format in the CustomerDetailsNotification	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This change has been made accordingly.
PLUS ES		Escalation	<p>Formatting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undo bullet point from the paragraph in the definition column <p>Add bullet point to 'Normal'</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. The table has been updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		Escalation	<p>PLUS ES proposes:</p> <p>Remove 'Normal' enumeration. The escalation field should only be populated</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's

			<p>when required and the absence of any enumeration implies normal status. i.e. Only include a tag in this field when escalation truly exists.</p> <p>The recipient should not be imposed to build system logic for a 'normal' status when it adds no value or an initiator to incur additional costs to populate the field when not required.</p> <p>PLUS ES has interpreted 'normal' as no escalation.</p>	<p>comment. It should be assumed that if the field is unpopulated, the escalation level if 'Normal'. Removal of the 'Normal' enumeration will improve the application of system logic. The Procedures have been updated to reflect this.</p>
PLUS ES		Escalation	<p>PLUS ES proposes: 'VIP' enumeration –remove this enumeration. There is no way of verifying if a VIP SO is an escalation.</p> <p>Agents could potentially escalate non-VIP SOs incorrectly, impacting the metering providers scheduling and timeframes unnecessarily.</p> <p>PLUS ES questions the value-add of this enumeration, since they have not received any B2B SOs from any retailers with such a requirement. This could be handled via a P2P process rather than including an enumeration that every participant would have to build if they intend to use the Escalation field.</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This field is to remain as a majority of respondents indicated support for it.</p>
PLUS ES		Escalation	<p>Special Instructions should be Mandatory when 'Other' is selected.</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent's</p>

			Refer to General SpecialInstruction field comment.	comment. This can be reflected in the Procedures but not the system.
PLUS ES		Escalation	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field should also be available for the following MSWs (O/N instead of N in the matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSW Remove Meter • MSW Install Control Load <p>MSW Install Meter</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. As these SOs can be escalated, the field will be updated accordingly.
PLUS ES		Exemption	<p>PLUS ES recommends that this field is removed. Communication of this code is best achieved and more efficient via making this field available in MSATS.</p> <p>The MSDR is currently consulting and this field has been raised to be included in the review. MSATS is the more appropriate repository for this field as it would communicate the exemption to all the participants associated with the NMI.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. However, the MSATS Standing Data Review Draft Report is yet to be released, so B2B changes should not be contingent on that. The field can be revisited if the Standing Data Review prompts it
AGL	4.1 Table 13	Escalation	<p>Escalation</p> <p>AGL does not support the use of VIP in the escalation types. As the field is subjective and misused.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. This field is to remain as a majority of respondents

			Compliant/Ombudsman/No Supply are categories which have specific triggers and can be clearly linked to other activities.	indicated support for it.
AGL	4.1 Table 13	Exemption Code	AGL suggest that if this field is populated by AEMO in NMI Standing data, then it is not required for the Service Order.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. At this stage, given the MSATS Standing Data Review Draft Report is yet to be released, this field continues to be preferred by a majority of respondents and as such it will remain in place.
Origin Energy	4.1 Table 13		Origin Energy reiterates that there are mechanisms in place today that can provide and support participants with a means to communicate the proposed additional fields for a Metering Service Works. If the suggested fields are to be used based off a bilateral agreement between participants then this can be achieved today by using shared market protocol as well as peer to peer transactions. While Origin acknowledges that there may be a preference to manage the additional information within specific transaction fields, as the implementation date has been moved to November 2021, there is concern given the cost to implement these changes and that they may not be fit for purpose in 21 months	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. At this stage, the majority of respondent indicated a preference to have these transactions and a later implementation date.

			time, given industry change is happening so rapidly. Origin also questions the criticality of these fields if industry is willing to wait till November 2021 for them.	
Energy Queensland	General		<p>Energy Queensland accepts the proposed changes to the Metering Service Works (MSW) service orders may assist with communication of requirements in some situations and support the changes in conjunction with the 'Optional/Not required' option in order to make the bilaterally-agreed usage of these fields clearer. In addition to required system and process changes we note that application of these new fields will require participants to review/update agreements in relation to the use of the new MSW transaction fields as well as application of the 'Optional/Not required' element.</p> <p>Energy Queensland supports the proposed approach to require all participants to take the associated aseXML schema update for this change (i.e. removing the 'n-1' approach). However, we note that the effective date of these changes is currently set to 10 November 2021, approximately 5 months after the Go Live date of the non-contestable unmetered load (NCONUML) is published to market. We also note that schema changes and related system changes / testing will be occurring during a period of significant other change activities, which places a high demand on resources required for development and testing. As such, we suggest the timing of this</p>	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change. The implementation date was supported by a majority of respondents.

			implementation is reconsidered to allow the market to use these transactions from the transition period in the 5MS Global Settlement (GS) project.	
AGL		General Suggestion	<p>During the assessment of the SO/Purpose combinations more varied outcomes were considered, such as a New Connection with a customer refusal for communications equipment.</p> <p>A possible solution is to populate the Meter Install Code with MRAM in this instance.</p> <p>This is shown diagrammatically as a footnote.²</p>	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. This is included in the Guide.
AGL		General Suggestion	<p>The consultation underway has focussed largely on the inclusion of new fields in the B2B SO, with less focus on the specific combinations of enumerations.</p> <p>Some work has been undertaken to review the various combination of SO sub-types with the new Purpose and regulatory Classification Field.</p> <p>AGL suggests that a more complete piece of work be done by the B2B WG to assess the various combinations and provide an update to the B2B SO procedure and guide on suitable combinations and unavailable combinations either as a sub-consultation or via workshop process.</p>	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. These combination tables have been included in the B2B Guide.

2

			<p>AGL suggests that once these tables are established, they be included in the SO procedures and B2B Guide to ensure clarity and consistency in their use.</p> <p>A sample of the combination table is shown below.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Supply Abolishment

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
AGL	2.1 Table 3		AGL supports the additional information relating to NSW Supply Abolishment Service Orders	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change
AGL	2.1 Table 3		AGL notes the additional information relating to the ACT jurisdiction, and suggest that as the process directs all parties to Evo Energy, Evo Energy will need to develop further processes to ensure meter abolishment is also undertake by the relevant MC.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The retailer is currently left out of the supply abolishment process and would not have visibility of an abolishment. The Procedures and Guide have been updated to reflect this.
Origin Energy	2.1 Table 3		Origin Energy supports the use of the B2B Supply Abolishment service order in NSW. Given this change would be to processes only and require no major system changes, Origin	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. It is recommended NSW distributors confirm their preferences and ability to make procedure and

			suggests the implementation of this service order does not need to wait until November 2021 and should be brought forward so industry could gain benefits sooner.	configuration changes rather than November 2021 system changes. Otherwise, the agreed-upon implementation date has been established by a majority of respondents.
Alinta Energy	2.16.5		Alinta Energy supports the proposed changes. As a result of this clarification it is unclear how EvoEnergy is going to notify MC/MPB of abolished sites so that the metering installation can also be appropriately abolished.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The retailer is currently left out of the supply abolishment process and would not have visibility of an abolishment. The Procedures and Guide have been updated to reflect this.
Red and Lumo		4.1.2 Supply Abolishment	Red and Lumo support the changes proposed in this section and as per the IEC's conclusion.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change.

Allocate NMI

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
Alinta Energy	4.1		Alinta Energy is neutral on the addition of NCONUML to the Customer Type Field.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment
AGL	4.1, Table 13		AGL notes the inclusion of NCONUML in the customer type field.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment

Origin Energy	4.1, Table 13		Origin Energy supports the addition of NCONUML to the “Customer Type” field however request clarification if this change in isolation requires a schema change? If there is no schema change required to add this customer type, Origin suggests to implement NCONUML into the “Customer Type” field earlier as it will support the introduction of NCONUML as part of 5 Minute Settlements, scheduled for 1 July 2021. Without this transaction, workarounds will need to be adopted.	The IEC notes the respondent’s comment. This change requires a schema change.
Red and Lumo		4.1.3 Allocate NMI	Red and Lumo support the changes proposed in this section and as per the IEC’s conclusion.	The IEC notes the respondent’s support for this change.

Meter Data Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
AGL	2.4.3 (a)		AGL supports the inclusion of the Unmetered Device Market Loads in the data delivery to AEMO	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change.
Alinta Energy	2.4.3.(a) (iii)		Alinta Energy is neutral on the proposed change	The IEC notes the respondent's comment
Origin Energy	2.4.3(a)(iii)		The proposed wording change to "Unmetered Device Market Loads" was driven by the introduction of NCONUML as part of 5 Minute Settlements. As this is a minor amendment of wording, Origin suggests that it does not need to wait till November 2021 and the change should align with 5 Minute Settlements, scheduled for 1 July 2021.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. This change requires a schema change and as such, bilateral arrangements can act as a stopgap between the schema change and 5 Minute Settlement implementation.
AusNet Services			AusNet Services agrees with the proposed changes applied to the Meter Data Process.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's support for these changes
CityPower Powercor	General Comment		CitiPower Powercor recommends consistent use of NCONUML, i.e. the document history calls it NCONUML and the update in section 2.4.3 calls it Unmetered Device Market Loads. We recommend using either 'NCONUML' as per and MSATS Procedures or ' <i>non-contestable unmetered load</i> ' as	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The terminology referring to "Unmetered" in the Procedures, Guide and Glossary has been be cross-referenced and made consistent on an ongoing basis.

			<p>per Metrology Part A & B and the NER.</p> <p>Additionally, NCONUML is currently not defined in the Glossary and Framework, we recommend it be included.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
TasNetworks	2.1.1(b)		Numbering of clause needs to be 2.1.1(a)	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The clause has been renumbered and circulated for consultation.
Alinta Energy	4.1.1 (a) (i)	deleted	Alinta Energy supports the removal of the MXN as long as there is sufficient changes to the Meter Fault and Issue Notification.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. A majority of respondents to Question 1 of the Draft Report supported the use of the PIN over the MFIN, but drafting for the PIN was not provided as part of the Draft report. As such, the One Way Notification Process will be reviewed in the second draft stage of consultation.
AGL	Various		At this point in time AGL does not support the removal of the MXN transaction as it has a number of processes associated with this transaction.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As in the previous stage of consultation, a majority of respondents did support the retirement of the MXN.
AGL	Various		AGL Notes That There Has Been Some Discussion About Also Modifying The PIN Transaction To Include The Service Order Number, and believes that this should also be considered more widely.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, the MXN will be reviewed in a additional round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.
AGL	Various		AGL seeks clarity on whether the MXN can continue to be used, although it would no longer be supported – eg will	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. AEMO will continue to support the most recent and current schemas.

			the AEMO hub reject a transaction containing the MXN ?	
TasNetworks	4.1.2, Table 4 CSVNotificationDetail		Given there is now only one CSV transaction type, recommend to: Delete the words 'Each transaction can only carry one CSVNotificationDetail payload type.' Delete the '&'.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The Procedures have been updated accordingly. The clause has been renumbered and circulated for consultation.
Origin Energy	4.1.3 Table 5		Origin Energy has concerns around retiring the Meter Exchange Notification (MXN) as there are no current issues with this transaction other than it is CSV and not asexml. As participants have been using this transaction for 2+ years and has been embedded into current processes, Origin does not see the benefit of using the Meter Fault Issue Notification (MFIN) for the same purpose as the MFIN was not designed to notify of an exchange rather when there is an issue with the metering at a specific site. As a result, participants would need to build their systems to distinguish between where there is a genuine fault at the meter and where it is notification of an exchange. This will add unnecessary cost, complexity and compliance risks to participants. Origin would like to reiterate that this change may not resolve any outstanding issues in the market and rather than patch these One Way Notifications, the outage scheduling process be looked at	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The proposed changes reflect the majority opinion of respondents and is intended on providing a holistic approach towards One Way Notificaitons. If further changes are prompted by the AEMC Power of Choice review, they will be consulted on separately.

			<p>holisitically. Industry should work together to develop a single process that improves the overall customer experience. Origin would like to propose that as the process is currently working participants be given the choice if they want to remain using the MXN or if they want to use the MFIN.</p> <p>Consideration also needs to be given to the current MC Outage Rule change as well as the forthcoming AEMC PoC review that will be undertaken in 2020 and industry should wait for the outcome of these reviews and then assess what is required.</p>	
AGL	4.2.3		AGL supports the inclusion of Service Order ID in MFN	The IEC notes the respondent's comment.
AGL	4.2.3		AGL supports the inclusion of an additional definition reason (Meter Exchange Notice)	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. Given the PIN will be adopted rather than the MFIN, the Meter Exchange Notice has been incorporated into the relevant transaction.
AGL	Various		Noting the proposed broader usage of the Meter Fault Notification transaction, AGL suggests that this transaction should be renamed to recognise its broader usage.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, the MXN will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation which will give respondents the chance to suggest specific names

Alinta Energy	Table 8	Table 7	Alinta Energy strongly supports the addition of ServiceOrderID field to the Meter Fault and Issue Notification SO.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change. As above, the MFIN will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.
Alinta Energy	Table 8	Table 7	Alinta Energy support the proposed addition of Meter Exchange Notice to the ReasonForNotice field.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change. As above, the MFIN will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.
Intellihub	4.1.3	4.2.3	<p>Existing fields NOTBEFORE and NOTAFTER in the MXN are used to inform retailers of installation occurring on a date range as opposed to on a specific date. There is no provision in the MFIN to make the retailer aware of the agreement with the customer.</p> <p>There should be a consideration for adding the above fields to the MFIN to maintain a consistent approach. Alternatively there should be clarity for where the MC obtains explicit consent from the customer to attend on date range and that information to be provided in the StartDate and EndDate, therefore it is assumed that where StartDate is same as EndDate installation will be done on specific date.</p>	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, the MFIN will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.
Intellihub	4.1.3	4.2.3	Please indicate which field in the MFIN will be used to provide visibility to	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, the MFIN will

			<p>retailers that explicit consent has been obtained from the customer on the specific date or date range and an outage notification has been provided as per the rules.</p> <p>This information is currently being shared via spreadsheets/emails or the NOTICEDATE which is now no longer.</p>	<p>be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.</p>
AusNet Services			<p>AusNet Services agrees with the proposed changes applied to the One Way Notification Process.</p>	<p>The IEC notes the respondent's support for the proposed changes.</p>
Endeavour		2.1.1.b (clean version document)	<p>Formatting error: this clause should be labelled as (a) instead of (b)</p>	<p>The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, these proposed changes will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.</p>
PLUS ES		MFIN	<p>PLUS ES notes that the MFIN has not been renamed given that in the draft consultations is has also been repurposed to include a 'Meter exchange Notice'.</p> <p>Also refer to PLUS ES response below, (Section 5), with respect to the question asked in the Draft Report Change Pack.</p>	<p>The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, these proposed changes will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.</p>
PLUS ES		MFIN	<p>Meter Exchange Notice</p> <p>PLUS ES do not support the addition of this enumeration in the MFIN if the PIN also remains as a OWN for meter exchange notice.</p>	<p>The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, these proposed changes will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.</p>

			Also refer to PLUS ES response below, (Section 5), with respect to the question asked in the Draft Report Change Pack.	
PLUS ES		Version Release History 3.4	There is a proposed enumeration of Meter Exchange Notice in the MFIN and this has not been identified in the Comments only the addition of the ServiceOrderID field.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. As above, these proposed changes will be reviewed in a separate round of consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out.

Question 1 - Do you have a preference between using the PIN and/or the MFIN One Way Notifications to notify participants of meter exchange dates? If so, which is your preference and why?

Participant Name	Question No	Comments	IEC Response
CityPower Powercor	1 (section 4.2.1.3)	Although CitiPower Powercor would have limited need for its use, it supports the MFIN transaction being used for update of a meter exchange.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. A majority of respondents indicated support for use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.
Red and Lumo	1 (section 4.2.1.3)	Red and Lumo support the use of PIN to replace MXN. We believe the use of PIN, which currently indicates a planned interruption, would avoid any potential confusion over the use of MFIN which currently indicates a fault/issue. In either case, the use of PIN or MFIN would need to have clearly defined subtypes to identify the purpose of the notification being sent/received, as well as a complete rewording of the definition & purpose in the One Way Notification procedures to mitigate any potential misinterpretation.	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. A majority of respondents indicated support for use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.
PLUS ES	1 (section 4.2.1.3)	PLUS ES' preference is for B2B to enable one transaction for the notification of a meter exchange schedule date. We	The IEC acknowledges the respondent's comment. A majority of respondents indicated

		<p>have no preference which transaction it is. I.e. we are supportive of changing and repurposing the MFIN to accommodate Meter exchange notices, if all participants agree to use the repurposed MFIN.</p> <p>Where agreement cannot be reached as part of the consultation, PLUS ES strongly advocates for the MFIN to remain a Fault and Issue notification and the PIN to be utilised as a meter exchange notification. Most of our Retailers (except for 5 Retailers) currently receive the PIN as their notification of meter exchange notice. The 5 Retailers who currently accept the MXN as a meter exchange notification would have to build for a new OWN when these changes are implemented.</p> <p>DBs are also stakeholders of the PIN. The current use of PIN by contestable MPs to notify Retailers of meter exchange dates has not impacted the use of the PIN by DBs.</p> <p>What we do not support is to have 2 transactions as options to deliver a meter exchange notification and incurring unnecessary costs to implement/amend system changes and logic.</p> <p>Refer also to PLUS ES General B2B Principle comments</p>	<p>support for use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.</p>
<p>Origin Energy</p>	<p>1 (section 4.2.1.3)</p>	<p>The MXN already provides this function to the industry however, if the final decision is to retire this transaction and the choice is between the MFIN/PIN, then PIN would be the preferred transaction as the fields are more relevant as it has a “Start”, “End” and “Duration”.</p> <p>Origin would like to propose that as the process is currently working participants be given the choice if they want to remain using the MXN or if they want to use the MFIN/PIN</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. A majority of respondents indicated support for the retirement of the MXN and use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.</p>

<p>Energy Queensland</p>	<p>1 (section 4.2.1.3)</p>	<p>Energy Queensland’s preference would be to utilise the ‘PIN’ One Way Notification to notify participants of meter exchange dates. This would be preferable as we currently have systems and processes in place to use this transaction to advise retail partners of changes to scheduled dates for MSW and would only require minor changes to extend the application of this transaction. Currently we do not utilise (initiate) the Meter Fault and Issue Notification (MFIN) for meter exchanges and would require more involved system and process changes to adopt usage of this transaction.</p> <p>We note the new clause 4.2.3(b) requires participants to complete the ServiceOrderID and seek clarity on which Participants and under what circumstances this is required.</p>	<p>6.1</p> <p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. A majority of respondents indicated support for use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.</p> <p>As above, the MXN will be reviewed in a separate consultation with options more comprehensively mapped out and this change does not need to be made at this time.</p>
<p>Endeavour</p>	<p>1 (section 4.2.1.3)</p>	<p>Endeavour Energy does not perform meter exchanges, therefore this is not applicable to us</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment.</p>
<p>Alinta Energy</p>	<p>1 (section 4.2.1.3)</p>	<p>Alinta Energy would have a preference to using the PIN One Way Notification to receive and provide notifications to participants of meter exchange dates. Alinta Energy believes meter exchange dates are better suited to a PIN over a MFIN and it should prevent any confusion as to the requirement of the One Way Notification moving forward.</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. A majority of respondents indicated support for use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.</p>
<p>Vector</p>	<p>1 (section 4.2.1.3)</p>	<p>We support the PIN transaction as a replacement – rather than the MFIN. It has come to our attention that other participants currently use the PIN transaction over the MXN or MFIN. We believe the use of PIN would avoid the confusion that is likely in using the MFIN for purposes other than reporting faults and issues.</p>	<p>The IEC acknowledges the respondent’s comment. A majority of respondents indicated support for use of the PIN over the MFIN to indicate meter exchange.</p>

Technical Specifications

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
TasNetworks	1.6 Terminology NCONUML		For consistency with other AEMO Procedures and National Electricity Rules, recommend rewording definition of NCONUML: From: Non-contestable Unmetered Device Market Load To: Non-Contestable Unmetered Load	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The Procedures have been updated accordingly.
Red and Lumo	4.3 Increase to transaction size limit for Meter Data		Red and Lumo support the changes proposed in this section and as per the IEC's conclusion.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change
AGL	5.8		AGL supports the changes for transaction sizes – 10MB/1000 transactions	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change
Alinta Energy	5.8		Alinta Energy Agree with the proposed increase in message sizes and the limit on transactions in each message.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for this change
Alinta Energy			Alinta Energy Agrees with the other proposed changes made to the Technical Delivery Specification	The IEC notes the respondent's support for the proposed changes
AusNet Services			AusNet Services agrees with the proposed changes applied to the Technical Delivery Specification.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for the proposed changes
Energy Queensland			Energy Queensland notes that the meter data transaction group of MTRD transactions are already being sent from 1MB files that have greater than 1000 transactions. However, we suggest that this limit is updated to a larger volume of transactions, for example, 5000, to cater for the increased file size. In addition, Energy Queensland suggests that the timing	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. However, the majority of respondents are in favour of a 1000 transaction limit and the established implementation date.

		of implementation is reviewed to bring in line with the 5 Minute Settlement (5MS) changes related to Business to Market (B2M) file size updates.	
--	--	--	--

General Comments

Participant Name	Question Number/Document	Comments	IEC Response
Alinta Energy	1.3	Alinta Energy supports that the effective start date for the proposed changes is the 10th Nov 2021.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for the proposed changes
Alinta Energy	B2B Guide	The B2B Guide will need to be reviewed to ensure it aligns with proposed changes. i.e. removal of MXN, update of PIN etc.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The Guide has been updated accordingly and will be released alongside the Final Report.
CityPower Powercor	B2B Guide	CitiPower Powercor recommends that references to the MXN transaction be removed from the Guide.	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The Guide has been updated accordingly and will be released alongside the Final Report.
TasNetworks	B2B Guide: Table 1 6.5.1.1 7.3.2	On the basis of the decision in the Draft Report to remove the MXN transaction, references to MXN should be removed from the B2B Guide (i.e. Table 1, clause 6.5.1.1, clause 7.3.2)	The IEC notes the respondent's comment. The Guide has been updated accordingly and will be released alongside the Final Report.
SAPN	General comment	SA Power Networks fully support the determination made regarding the implementation timeframe of these procedures (now November 2021), which was in line with the majority of industry feedback during the first round of consultation.	The IEC notes the respondent's support for the proposed changes.

		<p>We expect this November 2021 timeframe to be confirmed as part of the final determination of these procedures.</p> <p>SA Power Networks do not have any further comments to make with regards to the detailed changes.</p>	
--	--	---	--