



**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 v3.9 Consultation

---

**2 April 2025**

Final Report

# B2B v3.9 Final Report

Date of Notice: 2 April 2025

This Notice of Final Stage of Rules Consultation (Notice) informs all Business-to-Business (B2B) Parties, relevant B2B Change Parties, AEMO and other interested persons (Consulted Persons) that the Information Exchange Committee (IEC) has concluded its consultation (Consultation) on the proposals (Proposals) to make changes (Changes) to the B2B Procedures.

This Consultation was conducted under clause 7.17.4 of the National Electricity Rules (NER), in accordance with the Rules consultation procedures in NER 8.9.

## The consultation process

The IEC developed the Changes in the interests of improving the B2B Procedures. Some participants may require system changes due to the Changes. The Changes were recommended to the IEC by the members of the B2B-WG.

**Table 1** Summary of consultation stages

| Process Stage  | Date             |
|--|------------------|
| Publication of Issues Paper                                  | 29 May 2024      |
| Closing date for submissions in response to Issues Paper     | 11 July 2024     |
| Publication of Draft Report and Determination (Draft Report) | 18 December 2024 |
| Closing date for submissions in response to Draft Report     | 19 February 2025 |
| Publication of Final Report and Determination (Final Report) | 2 April 2025     |

## Executive Summary

The changes (Changes) which are proposed (Proposal) support:

- The implementation of:
  - The Accelerating Smart Meter Deployment (ASMD) Rule of the Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC)
  - The following Issues and Change Forms (ICFs):
    - B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema.
    - B004/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to the Australian Standards.
    - B006/22 - PERSONNAME definition spec correction.
    - B007/22 - Discrepancy between B2B SO Process and B2B Guide.
    - B011/23 - Amending the definition of Unknown Load Exception Code.
    - B014/23 - Define obligations for managing inflight service orders sent to metering service providers when a ROLR event is declared.

The key items noted from the draft report submissions:

- Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure:
  - Seeking to define the One In All In (OIAI) process as outlined in the NER.
  - Proposals for enhancements to the process that considers complex scenarios (including clarity around how to communicate co-ordinating contact information).
  - Guidance on the use of communicating the DNSP planned interruption notice within the MeterFaultAndIssueNotification (MFIN).
- Clarification required for some exception codes, to provide plain definitions for their use.
- More transparency on the use of 'Remediation Advised' as a Purpose of Request.
- Updates to the B2B Guide to reflect clarifications including a revised process diagram.
- A need for additional information on the ROLR procedure changes, including alignment of address structures between Part A and Part B.
- Concerns regarding inserted statements aimed to address use of street details in Technical Delivery Specification.
- Request for resolution of discrepancies in select technical specifications.
- Updates to B2B terms included in the glossary and framework.

In response (IEC Response):

The IEC has considered all responses and made the necessary changes to the documents, as they relate to the scope of the consultation.

Significant feedback was received requesting editorial amendments & changes to improve the clarity of clauses that relate to content that was not part of the draft proposal (as listed above) or related to B2M procedures. As such, the IEC considers this feedback to be out of scope.

**Table 2     Summary of Changes**

| Instrument                                       | New/Amended   |
|--|---|
| Customer Site Details Notification Process       | Amended (Procedure v3.9 changes)                                    |
| One Way Notification Process                     | Amended (Procedure v3.9 changes)                                    |
| Service Order Process                            | Amended (Procedure v3.9 changes)                                    |
| Technical Delivery Specification                 | Amended (Procedure v3.9 changes)                                    |
| B2B Guide  | Amended (Procedure v3.9 changes)                                    |
| Meter Data Process                               | Version alignment   |
| Retail Electricity Market Glossary and Framework | Amended as part of AEMO's '2024 Metering Services Review Package 1' |

## Changes between the Draft Report and Final Report

Fourteen submissions were received in response to the Draft Report from:

- AGL
- Alinta Energy
- Ausgrid
- Bluecurrent
- Citipower / Powercor
- Endeavour Energy
- Energy Australia
- Evo Energy
- Intellihub
- Origin Energy
- PlusES
- Red Energy and Lumo Energy
- SA Power Networks
- United Energy

# Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>B2B v3.9 Final Report</b>  | <b>2</b>  |
| The consultation process  | 2         |
| Executive Summary   | 3         |
| Changes between the Draft Report and Final Report   | 4         |
| <b>1. Background</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| 1.1 Issues statement and scope  | 7         |
| 1.2 Consultation plan   | 10        |
| <b>2. Changes</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| 2.1 Shared Fusing Meter Replacements  | 11        |
| 2.2 Defects Process   | 11        |
| 2.3 Usage Of RegClassification Field  | 11        |
| 2.4 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes  | 11        |
| 2.5 One Way Notification Procedure  | 12        |
| 2.6 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 – Alignment of B2B field lengths to the AS standard process | 12        |
| 2.7 B006/22 – PERSONNAME definition spec correction   | 12        |
| 2.8 B007/22 – Discrepancy between B2B SO Process and B2B Guide  | 12        |
| 2.9 ICF B011/23 – Amending the definition of Unknown Load Exception Code  | 13        |
| 2.10 B014/23 – Define obligations for managing inflight service orders sent to metering service providers when a ROLR event is declared       | 13        |
| 2.11 B2B Principles   | 13        |
| 2.12 B2B Factors  | 14        |
| 2.13 Benefits   | 14        |
| 2.14 Costs  | 14        |
| 2.15 MSATS Procedures   | 15        |
| <b>3. B2B Changes</b>   | <b>16</b> |
| <b>4. Glossary</b>  | <b>17</b> |
| <b>5. Summary of submissions in response to Draft Report</b>  | <b>18</b> |
| 5.1 Service Order Process   | 18        |
| 5.2 One Way Notification Process  | 51        |
| 5.3 Customer Site Details Notification Process  | 57        |
| 5.4 NEM RoLR Processes – Part B   | 59        |
| 5.5 Meter Data Process  | 66        |
| 5.6 Technical Delivery Specification  | 68        |

|         |   |    |
|---------|---|----|
| 5.7     | Draft Report – Appendix A- Proposed additions for the B2B Guide | 72 |
| Tables  |   |    |
| Table 1 | Summary of consultation stages                                  | 2  |
| Table 2 | Summary of Changes  | 4  |
| Table 3 | B2B-WG members by sector  | 7  |
| Table 4 | Change effective dates  | 9  |
| Table 5 | Consultation Date Plan  | 10 |

# 1. Background

This Final Report summarises the Changes. The Changes have been developed under the IEC's power to manage the ongoing development of the B2B Procedures as contemplated by NER 7.17.7(a)(2), including in respect of changes under NER 7.17.4.

This Final Report also provides the following information which the IEC has considered:

- The issues statement in respect of the Proposal (section 1.1).
- The summary of the Changes, including consideration of the B2B Principles (sections 1.1 and 2.3).
- Consideration of the B2B factors (section 2.4).
- The Changes have been considered and recommended by Distributor, Metering and Retailer representatives of the B2B-WG.

## 1.1 Issues statement and scope

The IEC has developed the Changes to:

- Implement changes to support the National Electricity Amendment (Accelerating Smart Meter Deployment) Rule and the National Energy Retail Amendment (Accelerating Smart Meter Deployment) Rule (AEMC Accelerating Smart Meter Deployment rules)
- Improve the functionality of B2B procedures by implementing Industry Change Forms raise by various participants
- Revise the ROLR procedures to include obligations on contestable metering providers and align part B with part A.

The Changes were recommended to the IEC by the members of the B2B-WG. The members of the B2B-WG are as follows:

**Table 3 B2B-WG members by sector**

| <b>Retailers</b>           | <b>Distributors</b> | <b>Metering</b> |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| AGL                        | AusNet              | Bluecurrent     |
| Alinta Energy              | Energy Queensland   | IntelliHub      |
| Energy Australia           | Essential Energy    | PlusES          |
| Origin Energy              | SA Power Networks   | Yurika          |
| Red Energy and Lumo Energy | TasNetworks         |                 |

The Changes to the relevant draft versions of B2B Procedures following participant submissions are:

- Service Order Process:
  - Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure:
    - Amended references to 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' to reflect the NER.
    - CustomersPreferredDateandTime field being labelled Mandatory.
    - Standardisation of the data to be included within the PERSONNAME field.
    - CoordinatingContactName field clarification, including references to co-ordinating party vs. Original MC, along with standardisation of data formatting.
    - Removal of Guidance Note 4 relating to Temporary Isolation Scoping Request.
    - Removal of the requirement to populate the ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired field with 'Yes' in select circumstances.
    - Clarification of CustomersPreferredDateAndTime field to be start date & time communicated in the MeterFaultAndIssueNotification (MFIN).
    - CustomersPreferredDateAndTime field to be Mandatory for select Service Orders.
    - Removal of redundant wording from FormNumber field regarding NMI volume, whilst clarifying its use for One In All In, versus other Service Orders such as Allocate NMI.
  - ExceptionCodes
    - Editorial changes relating to Values and Definitions.
    - Refinements to the Definitions of some codes to facilitate clearer understanding of their use.
    - Reformat of select guidance notes for consistency.
  - Defects
    - Amended description of 'Remediation Advised' as a Purpose of Request.
    - Rewording of the description of Business Event 'Defect Registered against NMI in MSATS'.
  - Editorial changes
    - Editorial changes have been made to improve the Service Order Procedures readability.
- Legacy Meter Replacement Plans
  - Inclusion of VIC jurisdictions for compliance to NER / NERR regarding LMRP
- One Way Notification Process:
  - Editorial changes to Table 7.
  - Inclusion of new Guidance Note pertaining to 4.2.3.
- NEM ROLR Processes – Part B:
  - Clarification of cl. 104.5 (a) regarding work undertaken in the field, but not yet updated in Service Order.
  - Alignment of address data to the Technical Delivery Specification.
  - Editorial changes to section 104.7.
- Technical Delivery Specification:



- Clarified usage of street addressing by removing references which suggest fields may be used up to two times.
    - House-Number-To updated to reflect schema support for 5 characters.
- Appendix A
  - Update of the B2B Guide regarding management of Supply Service Works Service Order, when a defect is identified prior to OIAI.
- Glossary and Framework
  - Amended references to 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' to reflect reference to the NER that describes this process.
  - Refinements to the descriptions of some fields to facilitate clearer understanding of their use.

The Consultation is built on B2B Procedures version 3.8 (effective 30 May 2023). The relevant effective dates are as follows:

**Table 4      Change effective dates**

| Procedures  | V3.9<br>(effective 1 December 2025) |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Customer and Site Details Notification Process</b> | Amended (Procedure changes)         |
| <b>One Way Notification Process</b>                   | Amended (Procedure changes)         |
| <b>Service Order Process</b>                          | Amended (Procedure changes)         |
| <b>Technical Delivery Specification</b>               | Amended (Procedure changes)         |
| <b>Meter Data Process</b>                             | Amended (version only)              |
| <b>NEM RoLR Processes Part A and Part B</b>           | Amended (Procedure changes)         |
| <b>B2B Guide</b>                                      | Amended                             |

## 1.2 Consultation plan

The Consultation plan was as follows.

**Table 5 Consultation Date Plan**

| Stage   | Start Date       | End Date         |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| Publication of Notice of Consultation and Issues Paper  | 29 May 2024      |                  |
| Participant submissions to be provided to AEMO  | 29 May 2024      | 11 July 2024     |
| Closing date for submissions in response to Issues Paper  | 11 July 2024     |                  |
| IEC consideration of all valid submissions and preparation of Draft Report and Determination (Draft Report), including change-marked Procedures | 11 July 2024     | 18 December 2024 |
| Publication of Draft Report   | 18 December 2024 |                  |
| Participant submissions to be provided to AEMO  | 18 December 2024 | 19 February 2025 |
| Closing date for submissions in response to Draft Report  | 19 February 2025 |                  |
| IEC consideration of all valid submissions and preparation of Final Report and Determination (Final Report), including change-marked Procedures | 19 February 2025 | 2 April 2025     |
| Publication of Final Report   | 2 April 2025     |                  |

# 2. Changes

## 2.1 Shared Fusing Meter Replacements

### Issue summary and submissions

In response to the Draft Report, participant feedback focussed on the reference to the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure as a process and the clarity around co-ordination responsibilities & data standardisation. Some minor editorial changes and changes to improve the clarity of clauses were also received.

### IEC assessment and conclusion

The IEC has considered the feedback received and determined that amendments were required to refer to the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure in the NER, rather than a specific process.

It was also deemed necessary to provide the clarity regarding co-ordinated parties and provide data standardisation for certain fields in relation to the Original MC.

The IEC is also agreeable to editorial changes and changes to improve the clarity of clauses.

The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in this Final Report and described in the Service Order Process and the B2B Guide.

## 2.2 Defects Process

### Issue summary and submissions

In response to the Draft Report, most respondents raised editorial / clarificatory changes only.

### IEC assessment and conclusion

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in this Final Report and described in the Service Order Process, Technical Delivery Specification and the B2B Guide.

## 2.3 Usage Of RegClassification Field

### Issue summary and submissions

In response to the Draft Report, all respondents were in favour of the proposed change, however required clarification regarding the use of LMRP as a RegClassification in VIC. This has been clarified in the affirmative.

### IEC assessment and conclusion

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to include this clarification in the B2B Guide.

## 2.4 B2B Service Order Response Exception Codes

### Issue summary and submissions

In response to the Draft Report, most respondents raised editorial / clarificatory changes only.

### **IEC assessment and conclusion**

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in this Final Report and described in the Service Order Process, Technical Delivery Specification and the B2B Guide.

## **2.5 One Way Notification Procedure**

### **Issue summary and submissions**

In response to the Draft Report, most respondents raised editorial / clarificatory changes only.

### **IEC assessment and conclusion**

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in this Final Report and described in the One-Way Notification Process, Technical Delivery Specification and the B2B Guide.

## **2.6 B002/22 - Alignment of B2B field lengths to B2M Procedures/schema and B004/22 – Alignment of B2B field lengths to the AS standard process**

### **Issue summary and submissions**

In response to the Draft Report, most respondents raised editorial / clarificatory changes only. The changes proposed were to specifically focus on field lengths and create alignment between B2B and B2M.

### **IEC assessment and conclusion**

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report.

One proponent referenced to align with B2M address usage, however the IEC has concluded to remove the comment which suggested the usage of Street Name, Street Type and Street Suffix.

The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in this Final Report and described in the One-Way Notification Process, Technical Delivery Specification and the B2B Guide.

## **2.7 B006/22 – PERSONNAME definition spec correction**

### **Issue summary and submissions**

In response to the Draft Report, all respondents were in favour of the proposed change.

### **IEC assessment and conclusion**

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in the draft report.

## **2.8 B007/22 – Discrepancy between B2B SO Process and B2B Guide**

### **Issue summary and submissions**

In response to the Draft Report, the majority of respondents were in favour of the proposed change.

### IEC assessment and conclusion

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in the draft report.

## 2.9 ICF B011/23 – Amending the definition of Unknown Load Exception Code

### Issue summary and submissions

In response to the Draft Report, all respondents were in favour of the proposed change.

### IEC assessment and conclusion

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in the draft report.

## 2.10 B014/23 – Define obligations for managing inflight service orders sent to metering service providers when a ROLR event is declared

### Issue summary and submissions

In response to the Draft Report, most respondents were in favour of the proposed change. One proponent sought additional clarification regarding the scenario whereby work is completed in the field before the SO is updated, but after a ROLR is declared. It was also highlighted that the address data format was not aligned to the Technical Delivery Specification.

### IEC assessment and conclusion

The IEC received majority support to the Change as outlined in the Draft Report. The IEC's conclusion is to make the Change as summarised in this Final Report and described in the NEM ROLR Procedures (Parts A & B).

## 2.11 B2B Principles

The IEC considers that the B2B Final Report supports each of the B2B Principles, as follows:

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

B2B Procedures should protect the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information.

The B2B Procedures do not introduce changes that would compromise the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information.

## 2.12 B2B Factors

The IEC has determined that the B2B Factors have been achieved as follows:

| B2B Factors   | Justification  |
|---|--|
| The reasonable costs of compliance by AEMO and B2B Parties with the B2B Procedures compared with the likely benefits from B2B Communications.   | The Changes will ensure continued compliance by AEMO and B2B Parties with the NER in addition to consistency between B2B Communications and business practices.  |
| 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.             | The B2B Procedures do not impose barriers to innovation or market entry. They allow participants to streamline their operations, better meet regulatory requirements and allow for all relevant information to be contained within the Communications structure to allow for more efficient processes. |
| 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. | The IEC has undertaken significant work to allow industry sufficient time to implement the proposed changes to support the rule commencement date.   |

## 2.13 Benefits

The Change supports the B2B principles by establishing consistent and reliable processes and information, with key benefits including:

- A uniform approach to B2B Communications in participating jurisdictions.
- A range of detailed operational and procedural matters and technical requirements that result in efficient, effective, and reliable B2B communications; and
- The lowest identified incremental overall costs, which leads to the lowest future implementation costs for consumers NEM-wide.

## 2.14 Costs

AEMO expects the proposed changes will require changes to the schema, the Low Volume Interface (MSATS Browser) and the B2B Electricity Validation Module (EVM).

Participants should consider the costs, as well as risks, associated with the Change, including:

- The costs and resources they require to implement the Change, as well as their ongoing operational cost and resources.
- Their ability to implement the Change by the proposed dates, considering other known or upcoming industry changes, as well as internal projects.

## 2.15 MSATS Procedures

AEMO has considered the recommendations of the IEC. AEMO does not consider that the recommendations conflict with the MSATS Procedures.

# 3. B2B Changes

The Changes are detailed in the attached final procedures, which are published with this Final Report.



# 4. Glossary

This Final Report uses many terms that have meanings defined in NER. The NER meanings are adopted, unless otherwise specified.

| Term   | Definition                                 |
|--------|--|
| AEMC   | Australian Energy Market Commission        |
| ASMD   | Accelerating Smart Meter Deployment        |
| AEMO   | Australian Energy Market Operator          |
| B2B    | Business-to-Business                       |
| B2B-WG | Business-to-Business Working Group         |
| CSDN   | Customer and Site Details Notification     |
| CSV    | Comma Separated Value                      |
| DNSP   | Distribution Network Service Provider      |
| FRMP   | Financially Responsible Market Participant |
| IEC    | Information Exchange Committee             |
| LNSP   | Local Network Service Provider             |
| LMRP   | Legacy Meter Replacement Plan              |
| MC     | Metering Coordinator                       |
| MFIN   | Meter Fault and Issues Notification        |
| MP     | Metering Provider                          |
| MPB    | Metering Provider – Category B             |
| MSATS  | Market Settlements and Transfers Solution  |
| NEM    | National Electricity Market                |
| NER    | National Electricity Rules                 |
| NERL   | National Energy Retail Law                 |
| NMI    | National Metering Identifier               |
| NSW    | New South Wales                            |
| OWN    | One Way Notification                       |
| SO     | Service Order                              |

# 5. Summary of submissions in response to Draft Report

## 5.1 Service Order Process

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-1  | Alinta Energy    |               |               | Alinta has no feedback on this content, at this time.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-2  | Bluecurrent      | 2.1 (Table 3) | 2.1 (Table 3) | Agree – we would like notified parties to be made mandatory for SSW service order types 'Temporary Isolation – One In All In' as this will allow for early notification to the metering provider of a DNSP cancellation. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.<br><br>The Procedures allow for bilateral agreements related to the use of the NP. |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-3  | AGL              | 2.1 Table 3   |               | <p>Definition Supply Service Works – Temp Isolation Scoping Request –</p> <p>A TISR is intended to allow interruption for the purposes of working on the Original NMI and identify NMIs associated with that Original NMI. It's not clear where an end boundary exists for a scoping request – eg 1 board, 1 building, 1 city.</p> <p>The DNSP is requested to determine identify all NMIs requiring interruption of supply at a shared .....planned interruption to allow works on the meters associated with the Original NMI which include legacy meters within the interruption.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |
| SOR-4  | AGL              | 2.1 Table 3   |               | <p>Supply Service Works – Temp Isolation Group Supply</p> <p>AGL notes the definition and suggests that since there is no discrete 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' (as this is an aspect of the NER) that is would be more appropriate to define this as</p> <p>DNSP is requested to temporarily isolate (disconnect) supply where multiple NMIs are connected to a supply point, and <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is not applicable</del> <u>and there is no requirement to initiate a Temporary Isolation Scoping Request.</u></p>                   | The IEC agrees and has included reference to the NER.   |

| Item # | Participant Name   | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-5  | AGL                | 2.1 Table 3   |               | <p>Temp Isolation – One In All In</p> <p>AGL notes the definition and suggests that since there is no discrete 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' (as this is an aspect of the NER). Further, the SO indicates that a Retailer is participating in a DNSP organised outage, therefore it would be more appropriate to define this as</p> <p><del>DNSP is requested to temporarily isolate (disconnect) supply to enable the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure</del></p> <p><u>DNSP is requested to temporarily isolate (disconnect) supply to the Original NMI and associated NMIs to enable metering works to be undertaken.</u></p>       | The IEC agrees and has included reference to the NER.   |
| SOR-6  | Evo Energy         | 2.1. Table 3  |               | Agree with revised simpler wording.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-7  | Evo Energy         | 2.1. Table 3  |               | There appears to be spaces here "Isolation – Scoping, but none for any of the other sub types. Please make consistent and remove these spaces; Make it ...Isolation-Scoping...   | The IEC agrees and has amended.   |
| SOR-8  | CitiPower Powercor | 2.1.2         |               | <p>The last dot point of Section 2.1.2 Service Order Process Procedure states, "Table 7 and Table 8 have been updated to treat all Temporary Isolation Service Order Requests the same for concurrency and to add the new MSW 'Install Meter Isolation Device' subtype. Note that clause 2.17, which includes these tables, applies to regulated businesses who are not expected to receive this new subtype, but the additions are made for completeness".</p> <p>CitiPower Powercor considers that these new Service Order Sub-Types do not apply to us and requires AEMO to confirm if CitiPower Powercor will receive these Service Order Sub Types.</p> | The IEC notes that Recipients can control and bilaterally agree what Service Order types they will accept/reject. |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-9  | United Energy    | 2.1.2         |               | The last dot point of Section 2.1.2 Service Order Process Procedure states, "Table 7 and Table 8 have been updated to treat all Temporary Isolation Service Order Requests the same for concurrency and to add the new MSW 'Install Meter Isolation Device' subtype. Note that clause 2.17, which includes these tables, applies to regulated businesses who are not expected to receive this new subtype, but the additions are made for completeness". CitiPower Powercor considers that these new Service Order Sub-Types do not apply to us and requires AEMO to confirm if CitiPower Powercor will receive these Service Order Sub Types. | The IEC notes that Recipients can control and bilaterally agree what Service Order types they will accept/reject. |
| SOR-10 | Bluecurrent      | 2.15          | 2.15          | Agree  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |

|  |  |   |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|------------------|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---|--|----------------------|--|--|----------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| SOR-11   | Origin Energy  | 2.15<br>Explanation<br>of use of<br>ExceptionCodes  | 2.15<br>Explanation<br>of use of<br>ExceptionCode | Errata changes: <table><tr><td>Customer On-Site</td><td>There is a <del>Customer at Site</del> customer at site...</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Demolished</td><td>For use when the <del>Premises</del> premises or metering installation has been demolished</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Inadequate <del>infrastructure</del><br/>Infrastructure</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Meter Not Retrieved</td><td></td><td>Partially Completed<br/>Limited to a Service Order Abolishment <del>with the status of Partially Completed</del> to indicate <del>Supply</del> supply was abolished, but the meter was unable to be recovered.</td></tr><tr><td>Mismatch with Standing Data</td><td>Standing Data in MSATS does not align with assets found at site</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>New Customer On-Site</td><td>Customer at <del>Site</del> site who claims to be a new customer</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Site Not Ready</td><td>Site not ready for work requested.</td><td>Not Completed.<br/>Need to add examples</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>De-energisation Not Completed Due To A <del>Reenergisation</del></td><td></td><td>Not Completed<br/>Limited to a De-energisation <del>ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'</del></td></tr></table> | Customer On-Site | There is a <del>Customer at Site</del> customer at site... |  | Demolished | For use when the <del>Premises</del> premises or metering installation has been demolished |  | Inadequate <del>infrastructure</del><br>Infrastructure |  |  | Meter Not Retrieved |  | Partially Completed<br>Limited to a Service Order Abolishment <del>with the status of Partially Completed</del> to indicate <del>Supply</del> supply was abolished, but the meter was unable to be recovered. | Mismatch with Standing Data | Standing Data in MSATS does not align with assets found at site |  | New Customer On-Site | Customer at <del>Site</del> site who claims to be a new customer |  | Site Not Ready | Site not ready for work requested. | Not Completed.<br>Need to add examples | De-energisation Not Completed Due To A <del>Reenergisation</del> |  | Not Completed<br>Limited to a De-energisation <del>ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'</del> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.</p> <p>Inadequate Infrastructure is an existing code and will not be updated.</p> <p>Site not ready – Self-explanatory, further detail not required.</p> |
| Customer On-Site   | There is a <del>Customer at Site</del> customer at site...                                 |   |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| Demolished   | For use when the <del>Premises</del> premises or metering installation has been demolished |   |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| Inadequate <del>infrastructure</del><br>Infrastructure           |  |   |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| Meter Not Retrieved  |  | Partially Completed<br>Limited to a Service Order Abolishment <del>with the status of Partially Completed</del> to indicate <del>Supply</del> supply was abolished, but the meter was unable to be recovered. |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| Mismatch with Standing Data                                      | Standing Data in MSATS does not align with assets found at site                            |   |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| New Customer On-Site   | Customer at <del>Site</del> site who claims to be a new customer                           |   |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| Site Not Ready   | Site not ready for work requested.   | Not Completed.<br>Need to add examples  |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |
| De-energisation Not Completed Due To A <del>Reenergisation</del> |  | Not Completed<br>Limited to a De-energisation <del>ServiceOrderRequests with the status of 'Not Completed'</del>  |   |   |                  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |                     |  |   |                             |   |  |                      |  |  |                |                                    |  |  |  |  |   |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                        | New Clause No                        | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| SOR-12 | Ausgrid          | 2.15<br>Table 5                      | 2.15<br>Table 5                      | <p>Add a new Exception Code.</p> <p>Shared Fuse Scoping Required – LNSP Required for Isolation.</p> <p>Description – Unable to perform the requested work because the isolation point is common with other customers and the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable. MC cannot conduct network planned outage, LNSP required.</p> <p>Justification – Where LNSPs have agreements with MCs to conduct a network planned outage on behalf of the network (ie. the LNSP notifies (cards) the customers informing them of the outage date and the LNSP does not turn up on outage date as Original MC will be conducting the network outage), this supports the process where the MC has identified that they cannot conduct the outage on behalf of the network.</p> <p>For example, if a small block of 4 units is connected to a barge board fuse or fuse in network pillar or pole and no isolation on the meter panel, the MC cannot disconnect at the barge board, therefore the network is required to attend to perform isolation.</p> <p>This would allow for the MC to communicate to the retailer raising the SSW – Scoping, to include comments that the LNSP is required to conduct isolation. See comment in 2.16.9.</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>Noting that the NER obligates LNSP to determine all NMI requiring interruption of supply.</p> <p>The IEC supports there are sufficient exception codes to facilitate notifications of network Temporary isolation requirements.</p> |
| SOR-13 | PLUS ES          | 2.15 – Table 5<br>exception<br>Codes | 2.15 – Table 5<br>exception<br>Codes | <p>Comms Refused – PLUS ES proposes that the definition is reworded for clarity. For example,</p> <p>The customer refused communications, and the metering installation did not proceed.</p> <p>We also have a concern that the differentiation of this exception code with that of 'Customer Prevented' is not clear.</p>  | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.</p>   |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                  | New Clause No                  | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| SOR-14 | PLUS ES          | 2.15 – Table 5 exception Codes | 2.15 – Table 5 exception Codes | Customer prevented – PLUS ES notes that Comms refused was introduced to identify that the customer refused the meter installation due to the remote communications. However, one can argue 'Customer Prevented' exception code is equally appropriate. We propose that the wording for this exception code delineates its usage and excludes scenarios of remote communication refusals, providing a clear standalone pathway for 'Comms Refused'. Otherwise the benefit realisation of introducing the 'Comms Refused' exception code could be significantly reduced. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| SOR-15 | PLUS ES          | 2.15 – Table 5 exception Codes | 2.15 – Table 5 exception Codes | Unable to Isolate – PLUS ES seeks clarification of when to use this exception code and when to use the exception code defect as the definition does not provide a clear delineation to promote a consistent response from Participants. Unable to Isolate is a Defect Type for metering installations. PLUS ES proposes that the definitions of this exception code and that of Defect are revised to provide the clarity.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| SOR-16 | Evo Energy       | 2.15 Table 5                   |                                | Add full stops to the sentence in the Definitions.<br>Remove full stops in the Used with ServiceOrderStatus where "Not Completed", "Completed" and "Partially Completed" as these refer to the actual ServiceOrderStatus   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |



| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No           | New Clause No   | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| SOR-17 | Intellihub       | 2.15, table 5           | 2.15, table 5   | <p>The definition for 'Customer Prevented' could be interpreted to be overlapping with 'Unable To Access'.</p> <p>We suggest the definition of 'Customer Prevented' be updated to:<br/>The customer, either verbally, in writing or by conduct, has prevented the work from being undertaken</p> <p>We also suggest the definition of 'Unable To Access' be updated to:<br/>Customer is required to provide access – e.g indoors, locked environment, etc and there is no indication the customer is intentionally trying to prevent the work from being undertaken</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>Customer Prevented has been updated accordingly.</p> |
| SOR-18 | Intellihub       | 2.15, table 5           | 2.15, table 5   | <p>The definition for 'No Access – Network Support Required' could be interpreted that the Network could help provide access to switchboards with a network lock, however customers are responsible for this scenario. To avoid confusion we suggest the definition be reworded to:</p> <p>Network access issue - network is required to provide access – e.g network substation area.</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-19 | Bluecurrent      | 2.16.7 (a) (ii)         | 2.16.7 (a) (ii) | Agree   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-20 | AGL              | 2.16.7 (vii) and (viii) |                 | Suggest that the last two Guidance notes be swapped so that 'Other' is the last guidance note for consistency with the usage of 'Other'.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                   |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No  | New Clause No   | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|--|---|--|---|
| SOR-21 | Origin Energy    | 2.16.7. Install Meter, and Exchange Meter and Install Meter Isolation Device | 2.16.7. Install Meter, and Exchange Meter and Install Meter Isolation Device  | <p>Insert a new subclause</p> <p>The Recipient must not reject Install Meter, and Exchange Meter and Install Meter Isolation Device ServiceOrderRequest if the site is de-energised in MSATS, however the <i>RegClassification</i> provided in the ServiceOrderRequest is 'One In All In'.</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>This needs to be bilaterally agreed and assessed between participants.</p> |
| SOR-22 | EnergyAustralia  | 2.16.7. Install Meter, and Exchange Meter and Install Meter Isolation Device | <i>When a participant raises a Metering Service Works ServiceOrderRequest, with a ServiceOrderSubTypeSubType of 'Install Meter' or 'Exchange Meter', the RegClassification is mandatory and must be populated....</i> | This is acceptable to EA   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.   |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---|--|
| SOR-23 | Intellihub       | 2.16.7.a      | 2.16.7.a      | <p>We believe the guidance notes for each of the RegClassification enumeration is applicable for all service orders and would be more appropriate to place this part in Table 13.</p> <p>Therefore we suggest the guidance notes in clause 2.16.7.a be moved to Table 13 under the RegClassification field and placed under the table of allowable enumerations. This would leave clause 2.16.7.a with a statement on when RegClassification is mandatory, however this is already defined in Table 13A therefore to avoid duplication we suggest the whole of clause 2.16.7.a be deleted.</p> <p>Note, we understand that RegClassification is mandatory for the SubType of 'Install Meter Isolation Device' as suggested by Table 13A (ServiceOrderRequest Field Usage). Therefore if clause 2.16.7.a is maintained then to avoid confusion this clause should also mention Install Meter Isolation Device.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and has agreed to retain clause 2.16.7(a) and included Meter Install Isolation Device. |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No   | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|---|---------------|---|--|
| SOR-24 | EnergyAustralia  | 2.16.8. Meter Exchange after being advised of defect resolution |               | <p>(a) Where an Initiator has been informed that an identified defect preventing a meter exchange has been resolved and wishes to arrange for a meter exchange, the Initiator must: (i) Raise a Metering Service Works ServiceOrderRequest with a ServiceOrderSubTypeSubType of 'Exchange Meter' containing all mandatory and required fields (ii) [Guidance Note 1] Populate the RegClassification field with a value of 'Customer Initiated'. (iii) [Guidance Note 1] Populate the PurposeOfRequest field with 'Remediation Advised'.</p> <p>When a site defect has been corrected and the customer has notified the retailer a new meter replacement SO is raised. The <i>ServiceOrderSubTypeSubType</i>, in these instances should have an 'LMRP' value. As the defect is identified under the LMRP and is now fixed and ready for the meter replacement. Without the use of the LMRP it will be difficult to have the replacement attributed to the LMRP work.</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>However, the NER requires the meter exchange to be undertaken within the customer-initiated meter installation timeframes and the draft clauses will be retained.</p> |
| SOR-25 | Intellihub       | 2.16.8.a.i  | 2.16.8.a.i    | <p>The SubType may not be 'Exchange Meter', therefore to avoid confusion we suggest this clause be updated to:</p> <p>Raise a Metering Service Works ServiceOrderRequest containing all mandatory and required fields</p>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No   | New Clause No   | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|
| SOR-26 | Ausgrid                    | 2.16.9          | 2.16.9          | <p>LNSPs and MCs want to support the MC conducting the outage eg. supply points with less than 7 NMIs, the LNSP will notify the customers of the outage, and the MC conducts the network planned outage. The MC will need to identify if the MC cannot do the outage (eg. isolation at barge board) and inform the retailer to ensure that this is included in the SSW Scoping SO.</p> <p>If the MC requires the network to attend to conduct outage due to the point of isolation eg. no isolation at MSB and has to be isolated at the barge board, the retailer must include a comment in the scoping SO, so the LNSP know they need to attend site.</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>Noting that the NER obligates LNSP to determine all NMI requiring interruption of supply.</p> <p>The IEC supports there are sufficient exception codes to facilitate notifications of network Temporary isolation requirements.</p> |
| SOR-27 | CitiPower Powercor         | 2.16.9          |                 | In relation to the new SSW Sub Type - "Temporary Isolation - Scoping Request", CitiPower Powercor would expect that all sites will require initial scoping unless the FRMP/MC provide drawings and photographs.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| SOR-28 | United Energy              | 2.16.9          |                 | In relation to the new SSW Sub Type - "Temporary Isolation - Scoping Request", CitiPower Powercor would expect that all sites will require initial scoping unless the FRMP/MC provide drawings and photographs.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| SOR-29 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | 2.16.9 (a) (ii) | 2.16.9 (a) (ii) | <p>Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe the situation?</p> <p>[Guidance Note 4] Temporary Isolation-Group Supply must only be used where a planned outage is required at a site with a shared isolation point and the outage will affect multiple customers and <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable</del> <u>no Legacy Meter is impacted.</u></p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules.  |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No           | New Clause No    | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| SOR-30 | AGL                        | 2.16.9 (a) (ii) - (iii) |                  | <p>AGL notes the definition and suggests that since there is no discrete 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' (as this is an aspect of the NER). Further, the SO indicates that a Retailer is participating in a DNSP organised outage, therefore it would be more appropriate to define this as</p> <p>[Guidance Note 4] Temporary Isolation-Group Supply must only be used where a planned outage is required at a site with a shard isolation point and the outage will affect multiple customers <u>but only the Original NMI requires metering works to be undertaken</u> <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is not applicable.</del></p> <p>Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request must only be used where a planned outage is required at a site with a shared isolation point, <u>and</u> the outage will affect multiple customers <u>requiring metering works</u> <del>and the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable.</del></p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules.                          |
| SOR-31 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | 2.16.9 (a) (iii)        | 2.16.9 (a) (iii) | <p>Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe the situation?</p> <p>[Guidance Note 4] Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request must only be used where a planned outage is required at a site with a shared isolation point, the outage will affect multiple customers and <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable</del> <u>a Legacy Meter is impacted.</u></p>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules.                          |
| SOR-32 | Bluecurrent                | 2.16.9 (c) (i)          | 2.16.9 (c) (i)   | <p>A new clause should be added under 2.16.9 C (i) (C) that requires the retailer to make the MP a notified party for these transactions. This will provide some early notification of DNSP cancellation to the metering provider.</p>  | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>The Procedures allow for bilateral agreements related to the use of the NP.</p> |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No     | New Clause No     | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| SOR-33 | PLUS ES                    | 2.16.9 (c)(ii)(D) | 2.16.9 (c)(ii)(D) | <p>PLUS ES recommends that OIAI in front of the word Duration# is not required, since we expect the <i>RegsClassification</i> to be populated as OIAI. We also query the value of this new requirement and commensurate costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It appears that DNSPs will be guided by MSPs as to the duration of the outage which is dependent on the volume of impacted NMIs; and</li> <li>DNSP discussions and current trials seek for the metering parties to be onsite prior to the isolation being actioned.</li> </ul>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have agreed to retain this value. |
| SOR-34 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | 2.16.9 (c)(ii)(D) | 2.16.9 (c)(ii)(D) | <p>Building this into the requirements for the OIAI is an unnecessary complication.</p> <p><i>(D) SpecialInstructions starting with OIAI Duration#.</i></p> <p>Duration is expected to be provided as either half or full day value and in the majority of cases it will be full day. Combined with the provision of Start Time, this should provide clear guidance on the opportunity at the site.</p> <p>Metering parties will need to attend and assess a site to confirm the LNSP assessment of the timeframe for work to be completed, consequently there is little practical value in providing this detail.</p> <p>All of which means that this requirement provides a piece of data that will be rarely used, for a small set of instances.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have agreed to retain this value. |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No                                | New Clause No                                | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| SOR-35 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | 2.16.9 (d)                                   | 2.16.9 (d)                                   | <p>What if the Special Instructions do not indicate that a reschedule is to occur?</p> <p><i>(d) Where the DNSP needs to reschedule a One In All In planned outage, the DNSP must provide a ServiceOrderResponse of 'Not Complete' for each affected 'Temporary Isolation-One In All In' ServiceOrderRequest, with an ExceptionCode of 'Recipient Cancellation' and a message advising a reschedule is to occur in SpecialNotes.</i></p>            | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>This is dependent on individual participant's follow up processes.</p>     |
| SOR-36 | Endeavour Energy           | 2.16.9 (f)                                   | 2.16.9 (f)                                   | <p>According to the clause, we will be sending the service order response as "Not completed" with an exception code of "Not FRMP" for the Temporary Isolation One In All In service order request received from the retailer who is not the FRMP. Will there be a provision for notifying the new FRMP about the open Temporary Isolation One In All In raised by the previous retailer?</p>  | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission and agrees.</p> <p>A guidance note has been added to the OWN MFIN section.</p>     |
| SOR-37 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | 2.16.9(c)                                    | 2.16.9(c)                                    | <p>Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe the situation?</p> <p>[Guidance Note 1] On receipt of a MeterFaultAndIssueNotification with ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In' the Recipient is expected to promptly submit the following associated ServiceOrderRequests to facilitate the <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure</del> <u>replacement of Legacy Meters</u>.</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules.</p>              |
| SOR-38 | Origin Energy              | 2.16.9. DNSP coordinated temporary isolation | 2.16.9. DNSP coordinated temporary isolation | <p>Insert a new subclause</p> <p>The Recipient must not reject ServiceOrderRequest with a ServiceOrderSubType with one of the following: 'Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request' or 'Temporary Isolation-One In All In' if the site is de-energised in MSATS.</p>   | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>This needs to be bilaterally agreed and assessed between participants.</p> |



| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                                | New Clause No  | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|--|--|---|---|
| SOR-39 | EnergyAustralia  | 2.16.9. DNSP coordinated temporary isolation | Where an Initiator requires an outage coordinated by the DNSP, they should raise a ServiceOrder Request with a ServiceOrder SubType with one of the following: | This is acceptable to EA  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| SOR-40 | Evo Energy       | 2.16.9.(b)<br><br>2.16.9(c)                  |  | These sentences need a comma in it to make easier reading.<br>...raises a 'Temporary Isolation Scoping Request', they must...<br>...with ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In', the Recipient... | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---|---|
| SOR-41 | Intellihub       | 2.16.9.b      | 2.16.9.b      | <p>It should be made clear that despite the use of the CoordinatingContactName field the Original MC is not the coordinating party. In addition, 'Temporary Isolation Scoping Request' should be 'Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request', it is missing the hyphen. We suggest clause 2.16.9.b be updated to:</p> <p>[Guidance Note 1] Where an Initiator raises a 'Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request' they must populate the CoordinatingContactName field with the Original MC. Note, despite the intent of the CoordinatingContactName field the Original MC is not the coordinating party and there is no requirement for the Original MC to coordinate any work.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Clarity has been added to the CoordinatingContactName field. |
| SOR-42 | Intellihub       | 2.16.9.c.ii.A | 2.16.9.c.ii.A | <p>It should be made clear that despite the use of the CoordinatingContactName field the Original MC is not the coordinating party. We suggest clause 2.16.9.c.ii.A be updated to:</p> <p>Co-ordinatingContactName to be populated with the Original MC. Note, despite the intent of the CoordinatingContactName field the Original MC is not the coordinating party and there is no requirement for the Original MC to coordinate any work.</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Clarity has been added to the CoordinatingContactName field. |
| SOR-43 | Intellihub       | 2.16.9.c.ii.B | 2.16.9.c.ii.B | <p>For consistency, this should be described in a similar manner as per Table 13 for the FormNumber field.</p> <p>We suggest this clause be reworded to:</p> <p>FormNumber to be populated with the Coordinated Interruption ID and NMLs Impacted separated by # as the delimiter.</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-44 | Intellihub       | 2.16.9.c.ii.D | 2.16.9.c.ii.D | <p>For consistency, this should be described in a similar manner as per Table 13 for the SpecialInstructions field.</p> <p>We suggest this clause be reworded to:<br/>SpecialInstructions starting with OIAI Duration with an end delimiter of #</p>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-45 | Intellihub       | 2.16.9.f      | 2.16.9.f      | <p>We suggest clause 2.16.9.f also stipulate that the DNSP is to send a MFIN to the new FRMP. We suggest this clause be reworded to:</p> <p>Where a FRMP churn occurs following the issuing of the Meter Fault and Issue Notification for a One In All In temporary isolation and the interruption has not occurred, the DNSP must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Not Complete' the 'Supply Service Works – Temporary Isolation - One In All In' from the previous FRMP with an exception code of 'Not FRMP' and</li> </ul> <p>Issue a Meter Fault and Issue Notification to the current FRMP.</p>                   | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission and agrees.</p> <p>A guidance note has been added to the OWN MFIN section.</p> |
| SOR-46 | AGL              | 2.6.19 (c)    |               | <p>AGL notes the definition and suggests that since there is no discrete 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' (as this is an aspect of the NER). Further, the SO indicates that a Retailer is participating in a DNSP organised outage, therefore it would be more appropriate to define this as</p> <p>On receipt of a MeterFaultAndIssueNotification with ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In' the Recipient is expected to promptly submit the following associated ServiceOrderRequests to facilitate <u>metering works associated with multiple customers</u> <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure</del></p> | The IEC agrees and has included reference to the NER.   |

| Item # | Participant Name  | Old Clause No         | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-47 | AGL               | 2.6.19 (c)<br>(ii)(A) |               | More information for clarity<br><br>(A) Co-ordinatingContactName to be populated with the Original MC <a href="#">ParticipantID in the PersonNameFamily field with the PersonNameTitle and PersonNameGiven fields populated with empty strings.</a>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Clarity has been added to the CoordinatingContactName field. |
| SOR-48 | AGL               | 4(a)                  |               | Cross reference error  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-49 | SA Power Networks | 4.1<br>Table 13       |               | Field - Co-ordinatingContactName.<br><br>We believe that current definition could be improved to provide better clarity of when "YES" in the "ServiceOrderCo-ordinationRequired" is applicable.<br><br>Our suggested wording for the definition:<br><br>It is mandatory to populate this field with the Original MC when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ServiceOrderSubType is Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request; or</li> <li>• ServiceOrderType is Metering Service Works and the RegClassification is One In All In</li> </ul> For any other ServiceOrderRequest this field is Mandatory when ServiceOrderCo-ordinationRequired is YES and must be populated with the contact name of the coordinating party the Recipient may contact. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                 |
| SOR-50 | Bluecurrent       | 4.1                   | 4.1           | CustomersPreferredDateandTime field needs to have mandatory in definition for OIAI   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                 |
| SOR-51 | Bluecurrent       | 4.1                   | 4.1           | CoordinatingContactName – direction needs to be given on how this field will be populated as the format is PERSONNAME. (eg. MR ####) for OIAI  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                 |

| Item # | Participant Name   | Old Clause No                          | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|--------------------|--|---------------|---|--|
| SOR-52 | CitiPower Powercor | 4.3 – Table 14                         |               | The SORESPONSE RecipientReference of 'NOFUSE' that is struck out here has not been included in Table 34 of the AEMO Standing Data for MSATS document. CitiPower Powercor seeks clarification that NOFUSE is a valid value for the Standing Data document. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.<br>This item is outside the IEC's remit as it is a B2M consultation item. |
| SOR-53 | United Energy      | 4.3 – Table 14                         |               | The SORESPONSE RecipientReference of 'NOFUSE' that is struck out here has not been included in Table 34 of the AEMO Standing Data for MSATS document. CitiPower Powercor seeks clarification that NOFUSE is a valid value for the Standing Data document. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.<br>This item is outside the IEC's remit as it is a B2M consultation item. |
| SOR-54 | EnergyAustralia    | Added exception codes                  |               | Exception Codes are acceptable to EA  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| SOR-55 | EnergyAustralia    | Applicable Events and their EventCodes |               | The addition of the defect listed against the NMI is supported as it allows defect information to flow to a Retailer and ease of LMRP reporting   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                  | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-56 | Intellihub       | General                        | General       | <p>We believe the One In All In (OIAI) process would benefit from having a party being the coordinating party to ensure the work undertaken by multiple parties at the work site is done safely and effectively. Unfortunately, the Rules do not define or obligate a coordinating party for the OIAI process therefore we are concerned that the B2B Service Order Procedure may be misleading or cause confusion by defining the Original MC be communicated in the field called Co-ordinatingContactName.</p> <p>We understand that to minimise the impact to industry new fields were not defined and instead existing fields were repurposed for the OIAI process. To avoid confusion we suggest it is made clear in the procedure that although the Co-ordinatingContactName field is used to communicate the Original MC, the Original MC is not the coordinating party and there is no requirement for the Original MC to coordinate any work.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Clarity has been added to the CoordinatingContactName field. |
| SOR-57 | EnergyAustralia  | Install Meter Isolation Device |               | The Initiator requires the installation of a meter isolation device only.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-58 | Evo Energy       | Minor edits                    |               | <p>Nice work!, but</p> <p>Please update the four references where a slash / is that has a space before and after e.g. 1.4.(a)(ii)</p> <p>The rest of the document has no space before or after the slash.</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission / comment.  |
| SOR-59 | EnergyAustralia  | Product Coded & Charges        |               | Clarification on the meaning of the codes is acceptable to EA.   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.   |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No   | New Clause No   | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---|---|---|---|
| SOR-60 | Origin Energy    | Section 4.1<br>Table 13<br>ServiceOrder<br>Request Field<br>Description<br>and Format | Section 4.1<br>Table 13<br>ServiceOrder<br>Request Field<br>Description<br>and Format | Co-ordinatingContactName<br>As agreed in the B2BWG Feb 2025 meeting, Origin suggests a consistent approach across the market in populating this field, i.e., MC Participant ID should be provided in the family name field (as the only mandatory field) in the Co-ordinatingContactName.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                 |
| SOR-61 | AGL              | Tab13-<br><i>ServiceOrderC<br/>o-<br/>ordinationReq<br/>uired</i>                     |   | Consistent use of ' around YES and No in definition<br><br>Should be No for cancel  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                 |
| SOR-62 | PLUS ES          | Table 12<br>Timing Period<br>for<br>completion of<br>work                             | Table 12<br>Timing Period<br>for<br>completion of<br>work                             | Guidance Note 4 with respect to the Temp Isolation Scoping Request is not required in the B2B SO procedures as it is included in the Rules and applicable only for the NECF jurisdictions.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.                                 |
| SOR-63 | AGL              | Table 13 –<br>Coordinating<br>ContactName   |   | Clarity<br><br>It is mandatory to populate the <a href="#">PersonNameFamily component of</a> this field with the Original MC <a href="#">Participant ID</a> when:<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ServiceOrderSubType is Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request; or</li> <li>• Service order type is Metering Service Works and RegClassification is One In All In.</li> </ul> <a href="#">The PersonNameTitle and PersonNameGiven fields must be populated with empty strings</a> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Clarity has been added to the CoordinatingContactName field. |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No   | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|---|---------------|---|---|
| SOR-64 | AGL                        | Table 13 – De-energisation Reason   |               | Regulated reasons not clearly identified;<br><br>Suggest * against Non-Payment, Unauthorised Usage, Breach of Contract, Illegal Usage, No Access to identify these as regulated activities<br><br>and a note<br><br><a href="#">Guidance Note[?]: These Reasons have regulatory protections on when the action can be undertaken.</a>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-65 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 13 ServiceOrder Request Field Description and Format PurposeOfRequest         |               | This note needs to more clearly explain that the usage relates to the NER refined term: <i>defect at the metering installation</i><br><del>'Remediation Advised' must be populated and used to inform the Recipient that the customer has advised the defect has been remediated.</del><br><br>'Remediation Advised' must be populated and used to inform the Recipient that the customer has advised that a <i>defect at the metering installation</i> has been remediated.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.   |
| SOR-66 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 13 ServiceOrder Request Field Description and Format Co-ordinatingContactName |               | It is unclear (without referring to the process flow Figure 1 provided in the consultation) if <i>ServiceOrderCo-ordinationRequired</i> should be Y when this field is populated with <i>Original MC</i><br><br>The Procedure needs to clarify that <i>ServiceOrderCo-ordinationRequired</i> is YES when populating this field for a meter exchange in a One In All In scenario and if Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request is required.<br><br>It is mandatory to populate this field with the Original MC when:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ServiceOrderSubType is Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request; or</li> <li>• <del>Service Order type</del> <a href="#">ServiceOrderType</a> is Metering Service Works and RegClassification is One In All In</li> </ul> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly by removing the requirement to populate the ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired field with 'Yes' as this is deemed less prescriptive. |



| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No   | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|---|---------------|---|---|
| SOR-67 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 13<br>ServiceOrder Request Field Description and Format<br><br>Co-ordinatingContact TelephoneNumber |               | <p>The Procedure needs to clarify that <i>ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired</i> is YES when populating this field for a meter exchange in a One In All In scenario.</p> <p>It is also unclear which telephone number should be provided by a retailer when populating this field for a meter exchange in a One In All In scenario and if Temporary Isolation Scoping Request is required.</p> <p>LNSP have known contact numbers for metering parties which retailers may not be privy to. Should a generic, a specific (nonsense), or an accurate value be provided here?</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly by removing the requirement to populate the ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired field with 'Yes' as this is deemed less prescriptive. |
| SOR-68 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 13<br>ServiceOrder Request Field Description and Format<br><br>ServiceOrder Coordination Required   |               | <p>The Procedure needs to clarify that <i>ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired</i> is YES when populating Co-ordinatingContactName field for a meter exchange in a One In All In scenario and if Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request is required.</p>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly by removing the requirement to populate the ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired field with Yes as this is deemed less prescriptive.   |

|        |            |  |  |  |   |
|--------|------------|--|--|--|---|
| SOR-69 | Intellihub | Table 13, Co-ordinatingContactName Field | Table 13, Co-ordinatingContactName Field | <p>The definition for Co-ordinatingContactName has scenarios that could be interpreted to be overlapping which can cause confusion. Also, it should be made clear that despite the use of the CoordinatingContactName field the Original MC is not the coordinating party. In addition, for market consistency the definition would benefit with a description on how the Original MC is to be communicated in this field. We suggest the definition for Co-ordinatingContactName be updated to:</p> <p>Mandatory as per below:</p> <p>a) If ServiceOrderSubType is Temporary Isolation-Scoping Request then this field must be populated with the Original MC. Note, despite the intent of this field the Original MC is not the coordinating party and there is no requirement for the Original MC to coordinate any work.</p> <p>b) If Service order type is Metering Service Works and RegClassification is 'One In All In' then this field must be populated with the Original MC. Note, despite the intent of this field the Original MC is not the coordinating party and there is no requirement for the Original MC to coordinate any work.</p> <p>c) If a) and b) are not applicable and ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired is 'YES' then this field must be populated with the contact name of the coordinating party the Recipient may contact</p> <p>For a) and b) this field must be populated as per below for the mandatory elements:</p> <p>PersonNameFamily Element: Original MC<br/> PersonNameType Element: default to 'AKA'<br/> PersonNameTitle Element: provide an empty string<br/> PersonNameGiven Element: provide an empty string</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly and removed the requirement to populate the ServiceOrderCoordinationRequired field with Yes as this is deemed less prescriptive. |
|--------|------------|--|--|--|---|

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                                 | New Clause No                                 | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|---|---|---|--|
| SOR-70 | Intellihub       | Table 13, CustomersPreferredDateAndTime Field | Table 13, CustomersPreferredDateAndTime Field | <p>For consistency, the CustomersPreferredDateAndTime field should describe what must be populated when it is related to a One In All In scenario. We suggest the following be added to the definition of the CustomersPreferredDateAndTime field:</p> <p>If ServiceOrderSubType is 'Temporary Isolation-One In All In' then this field must be populated with the StartDate and StartTime from the MeterFaultAndIssueNotification with ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In'</p> <p>If Service order type is Metering Service Works and RegClassification is 'One In All In' then this field must be populated with the StartDate and StartTime from the MeterFaultAndIssueNotification with ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In'</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.  |
| SOR-71 | Intellihub       | Table 13, FormNumber Field                    | Table 13, FormNumber Field                    | <p>NMIs Impacted is already defined therefore having 'number of' in the last sentence is superfluous. We also suggest an example be provided that is aligned with the example provided in the MFIN procedure. We suggest the last two sentences be worded to:</p> <p>Must be populated for the ServiceOrderSubType of 'Temporary Isolation-One In All In' with the Coordinated Interruption ID. For example: TS123~1</p> <p>Must be populated for ServiceOrderType of 'Metering Service Works' with RegClassification of 'One In All In' with the Coordinated Interruption ID and NMIs Impacted separated by # as the delimiter. For example: TS123~1#06</p>  | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>Have updated with the removal of the redundant wording.</p> |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No              | New Clause No              | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| SOR-72 | Intellihub       | Table 13, FormNumber Field | Table 13, FormNumber Field | <p>The definition for FormNumber has scenarios that could be interpreted to be overlapping which can cause confusion. In addition, we suggest providing some examples that aligns with the examples provided in the MFIN would be helpful. We suggest the definition for FormNumber be updated to:</p> <p>Mandatory as per below:</p> <p>a) If ServiceOrderSubType is 'Temporary Isolation-One In All In' then this field must be populated with the Coordinated Interruption ID, for example: TS123~1</p> <p>b) If Service order type is Metering Service Works and RegClassification is 'One In All In' then this field must be populated with the Coordinated Interruption ID and NMIs Impacted separated by # as the delimiter, for example: TS123~1#06</p> <p>c) If ServiceOrderSubType is "Allocate NMI" and the jurisdiction is NSW or ACT then this field must be populated with the Section Number</p> <p>d) If a), b) and c) are not applicable and the form listed in FormReference is numbered then this field must be populated with the number on the form</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |

| Item #              | Participant Name | Old Clause No   | New Clause No                                  | Comments   | IEC response  |        |            |   |                     |              |   |  |   |
|---------------------|------------------|---|--|--|---|--------|------------|---|---------------------|--------------|---|--|---|
| SOR-73              | Intellihub       | Table 13, SpecialInstructions Field   | Table 13, SpecialInstructions Field            | <div>The second last bullet point should be presented as a marked change – see screen print below:</div> <table><tr><th>Field</th><th>Format</th><th>Definition</th><th>Required for a "Cancel" ServiceOrderRequest</th></tr><tr><td>SpecialInstructions</td><td>VARCHAR(240)</td><td><div>Any special instructions the Initiator wishes to convey to the Recipient.<br/>Mandatory where:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A value of "Yes" is used in CustomerConsultationRequired.</li><li>A value of "Other Multi-phase" is used in SupplyPhases.</li><li>A value of "Other" is used in MeteringRequired.</li><li>If ActionType = "Replace".</li><li>Necessary to support exceptional arrangements for urgent (high priority) ServiceOrderRequests.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Supply Service Works" and any tariff or metering requirements are not already provided.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Metering Service Works" and any tariff, metering requirements or any other special requirements need to be advised.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Metering Service Works" and RegClassification = "One In All In" and must, as the first characters of this field, be populated with the OIA Duration with an end delimiter of #</li><li>ServiceTime = "Non-Business Hours".</li></ul></div></td><td></td></tr></table> <div>This information does not replace information previously provided in a <a href="#">SiteAccessNotification</a>.</div> | Field   | Format | Definition | Required for a "Cancel" ServiceOrderRequest | SpecialInstructions | VARCHAR(240) | <div>Any special instructions the Initiator wishes to convey to the Recipient.<br/>Mandatory where:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A value of "Yes" is used in CustomerConsultationRequired.</li><li>A value of "Other Multi-phase" is used in SupplyPhases.</li><li>A value of "Other" is used in MeteringRequired.</li><li>If ActionType = "Replace".</li><li>Necessary to support exceptional arrangements for urgent (high priority) ServiceOrderRequests.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Supply Service Works" and any tariff or metering requirements are not already provided.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Metering Service Works" and any tariff, metering requirements or any other special requirements need to be advised.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Metering Service Works" and RegClassification = "One In All In" and must, as the first characters of this field, be populated with the OIA Duration with an end delimiter of #</li><li>ServiceTime = "Non-Business Hours".</li></ul></div> |  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| Field               | Format           | Definition  | Required for a "Cancel" ServiceOrderRequest    |  |   |        |            |   |                     |              |   |  |   |
| SpecialInstructions | VARCHAR(240)     | <div>Any special instructions the Initiator wishes to convey to the Recipient.<br/>Mandatory where:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A value of "Yes" is used in CustomerConsultationRequired.</li><li>A value of "Other Multi-phase" is used in SupplyPhases.</li><li>A value of "Other" is used in MeteringRequired.</li><li>If ActionType = "Replace".</li><li>Necessary to support exceptional arrangements for urgent (high priority) ServiceOrderRequests.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Supply Service Works" and any tariff or metering requirements are not already provided.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Metering Service Works" and any tariff, metering requirements or any other special requirements need to be advised.</li><li>ServiceOrderType = "Metering Service Works" and RegClassification = "One In All In" and must, as the first characters of this field, be populated with the OIA Duration with an end delimiter of #</li><li>ServiceTime = "Non-Business Hours".</li></ul></div> |  |  |   |        |            |   |                     |              |   |  |   |
| SOR-74              | Intellihub       | Table 13A, CustomersPreferredDateAndTime Field  | Table 13A, CustomersPreferredDateAndTime Field | <div>For consistency, the status of 'M' should be added for the following:</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Supply Service Works Temporary Isolation - All</li><li>Metering Service Works Install Meter</li><li>Metering Service Works Install Meter Isolation Device</li><li>Metering Service Works Exchange Meter</li></ul>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |        |            |   |                     |              |   |  |   |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No  | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|--|---------------|---|---|
| SOR-75 | AGL              | Table 13-<br>Form number                             |               | <p>Confirm definition - is number of NMIs in the form 1-9 then 10-99 or 01-99 ?</p> <p><i>SO description is</i><br/>Must be populated for <i>ServiceOrderType</i> of 'Metering Service Works' with <i>RegClassification</i> of 'One In All In' with the <i>Coordinated Interruption ID</i> and number of <i>NMIs Impacted</i> separated by # as the delimiter.</p> <p><i>One Way Procedure Description</i><br/>When ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In' is used then the initiator must, as the first characters within this field, provide the Coordinated Interruption ID, NMIs Impacted and the Original MC separated by # as the delimiter and ending with #. For example: TS123~1#06#ACMEMC#</p> <p>Therefore requires Retailer to strip Original MC ID and then paste to FormNumber.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| SOR-76 | AGL              | Table 16 -<br>Defect registered against NMI in MSATS |               | <p>Suggest redrafting:</p> <p>Used to indicate when a ServiceOrderRequest is received to exchange a meter at a defective metering installation <del>without clearly indicating that the defect has been remediated and</del> <u>PurposeofRequest is not 'DefectRectified'.</u></p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No  | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|--|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-77 | CitiPower Powercor         | Table 3  |               | CitiPower Powercor would expect that all sites will require initial scoping unless the FRMP/MC provide drawings and photographs. CitiPower Powercor believes the number of shared fuses and/or common isolation situations that exist or will occur in the >160 metering market in Victoria is very small. Noting that nothing in this rule changes the Victorian AMI mandate, or removes the Victorian distributors from remaining the initial Metering Coordinator for the <160 metering market in Victoria. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-78 | United Energy              | Table 3  |               | CitiPower Powercor would expect that all sites will require initial scoping unless the FRMP/MC provide drawings and photographs. CitiPower Powercor believes the number of shared fuses and/or common isolation situations that exist or will occur in the >160 metering market in Victoria is very small. Noting that nothing in this rule changes the Victorian AMI mandate, or removes the Victorian distributors from remaining the initial Metering Coordinator for the <160 metering market in Victoria. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-79 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 3<br>Service Order Types and Subtypes<br>Supply Service Works<br>Temporary Isolation<br>Group Supply |               | Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe what the purpose of the SO is in terms of impact to a Legacy Meter?<br>'DNSP is requested to temporarily isolate (disconnect) supply where multiple NMIs are connected to a supply point and <a href="#">no Legacy Meter is impacted</a> .'   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No  | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|--|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-80 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 3<br>Service Order Types and Subtypes<br>Supply Service Works<br>Temporary Isolation One In All In |               | Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe what the purpose of the SO is in terms of impact to a Legacy Meter?<br><br>'DNSP is requested to temporarily isolate (disconnect) supply where multiple NMIs are connected to a supply point and <a href="#">at least one is a Legacy Meter.</a> '  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |
| SOR-81 | AGL                        | Table 5  |               | Appointment Required – grammar<br><br>Customer has requested <del>for</del> an appointment to be made.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-82 | AGL                        | Table 5  |               | Customer on Site<br><br>Given the other enumerations, it may be better to define this enumeration as<br><br>There is a Customer at Site resulting in the work requested not being completed <a href="#">at this time. Work can be rescheduled.</a>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-83 | AGL                        | Table 5  |               | Shared Fuse - Scoping Required<br><br>AGL notes the definition and suggests that since there is no discrete 'Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure' (as this is an aspect of the NER). Further, the SO indicates that a Retailer is participating in a DNSP organised outage, therefore it would be more appropriate to define this as<br><br>Unable to perform the requested work because the isolation point is common with other customers and <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable.</del> <a href="#">a Temporary Isolation Scoping Request SO will be required to access this NMI</a> | The IEC agrees and has included reference to the NER.   |



| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No  | New Clause No  | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| SOR-84 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>Customer On-Site                     |  | There is ambiguity in the Value and Definition of this Exception Code as it could be used in place of Customer Prevented, 'There is a Customer at Site resulting in the work requested not being completed at this time.'<br>Should this be (re-)restricted to physical DeEn?  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| SOR-85 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>Shared Supply Point                  |  | Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe the situation?<br><br>'Unable to perform the requested work because the isolation point is common with other customers and <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable</del> <u>no Legacy Meter is impacted</u> .' | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |
| SOR-86 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>No Access – Network Support Required | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>No Access Network Support Required | Red and Lumo suggest that we remove the hyphen from this Exception Code to avoid issues with systems processing this text since non-ascii variants have caused problems in the past.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No   | New Clause No   | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| SOR-87 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>Shared Fuse -<br>Scoping Required | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>Shared Fuse<br>Scoping Required | <p>Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe the situation in terms of impact to a Legacy Meter?</p> <p>'Unable to perform the requested work because the isolation point is common with other customers and <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is applicable</del> <u>a Legacy Meter may be impacted.</u>'</p> <p>Red and Lumo also suggest that we remove the hyphen from this Exception Code to avoid issues with systems processing this text since non-ascii variants have caused problems in the past.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |
| SOR-88 | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | Table 5<br>Exception Codes<br>Unable To Access                  |   | There is ambiguity in the Value and Definition of this Exception Code as Unable To Access could be used in place of Dog, Obstruction, Customer Prevented or in some cases Appointment Required  | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>Customer Prevented has been updated accordingly.</p>   |
| SOR-89 | EnergyAustralia            | Temp Isolation<br>scoping request                               |   | This explanation is acceptable to EA.   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.   |
| SOR-90 | EnergyAustralia            | Temporary Isolation-<br>Group Supply                            |   | While this SO type is available when it is used will need further explanation so that the correct request based on the situation at the site can be raised. Eg: Temp Isolation group supply as opposed to One in All in request.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and believes no change is required.                               |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                     | New Clause No | Comments                                     | IEC response                            |
|--------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| SOR-91 | EnergyAustralia  | Temporary Isolation-One In All In |               | This service order type is acceptable to EA. | The IEC notes the respondent's support. |

## 5.2 One Way Notification Process

| Item # | Participant Name  | Old Clause No | New Clause No      | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|--|
| OWN-1  | SA Power Networks |               |                    | No comments.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| OWN-2  | Bluecurrent       |               |                    | N/A   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| OWN-3  | Alinta Energy     |               |                    | Alinta has no feedback on this content, at this time.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| OWN-4  | Endeavour Energy  |               |                    | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| OWN-5  | PLUS ES           |               | MFIN – Notes field | Typo – Initiator – the 'i' needs to be capitalised.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.  |
| OWN-6  | PLUS ES           |               | General            | PLUS ES notes there are specific obligations on the DNSP and what they need to do for open Service Orders when they become aware of a Retailer churn but no corresponding requirements to inform the incoming Retailer of a scheduled OIAI. For industry transparency we recommend the B2B WG consider the use case and action as required. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and agrees.<br>A guidance note has been added to the OWN MFIN section. |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No | New Clause No                       | Comments   | IEC response   |
|--------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| OWN-7  | EnergyAustralia            |               | MeterFaultAndIssueNotification Data | EA agrees to all the changes within this One Way Notification Process  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| OWN-8  | Ausgrid                    |               |                                     | <p><u>OIAI for multi day outages at a site.</u></p> <p>AEMOs current proposal requires 2 batches of MFNs for each outage day issued at the same time. At the time of raising these 2 batches of MFNs the LNSP is not aware of who the MCs are for the other NMLs. For efficiency of having minimal MC businesses onsite one each outage day, Ausgrid proposes another option for consideration.</p> <p>Scenario is, 40 units, 2 outages a week apart, (Day 1 and Day 2), 40 MFNs need to be raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LNSP raises one MFN for 40 NMLs with Day 1 as the outage date.</li> <li>• Retailers then have 5 days to update MSATS with new MC role. 20 x NMLs MC1, 12 x NMLs MC2, 8 x NMLs MC3.</li> <li>• LNSP can raise another MFN for 20 NMLs for Day 2.</li> <li>• 20 new MFNs raised NMLs for MC1 for Day 2 outage.</li> <li>• 20 existing MFNs still valid for MC 2 and MC3.</li> </ul> <p>Having one MC on site per outage is much more efficient than having 3 MCs on each day of the outage. This will allow the MC to be able to provide the appropriate resourcing on the day of the outage.</p> | <p>The IEC notes the respondent's submission.</p> <p>The Procedures allow for this scenario through Coordinated Interruption ID.</p> |
| OWN-9  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy |               |                                     | Nothing identified   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| OWN-10 | AGL                        |               |                                     | AGL supports the changes   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No    | Comments   | IEC response                               |
|--------|------------------|---------------|------------------|--|--|
| OWN-11 | Evoenergy        | 1.4(d)        | Guidance Note 12 | Agree with addition.                               | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |
| OWN-12 | Evoenergy        | 4.1.1(a)(i)   |                  | Missing a full stop at end of dot point.           | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| OWN-13 | Evoenergy        | 4.1.3(a)(ii)  |                  | Missing a full stop at end of dot point.           | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| OWN-14 | Evoenergy        | 4.2.2 Table 6 |                  | Agree with removal of note for Distribution Works. | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No   | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| OWN-15 | Evoenergy        | 4.2.3 Table 7 | <div>StartDate</div> <div>StartTime</div> <div>EndDate<br/>Duration</div> <div>ReasonForNotice</div> <div>Notes</div> | <p>Wording for each of these definitions need minor changes for readability, clarity and consistency with other Procedures.</p> <p>Mandatory when ReasonforNotice is 'One In All In'. This field indicates the start date for the 'One In All In' distributor scheduled interruption for all impacted NMLs.</p> <p>Mandatory when ReasonforNotice is 'One In All In'. This field indicates the start time for the 'One In All In' distributor scheduled interruption for all impacted NMLs.</p> <p>Agree with wording removal.</p> <p>Mandatory when ReasonforNotice is 'One In All In'. This field indicates the duration for the 'One In All In' distributor scheduled interruption for all impacted NMLs.</p> <p>Update definition to<br/>One In All In<br/>(Used by the distributor to advise of a 'One In All In' scheduled interruption for all impacted NMLs.)</p> <p>Update definition to read better and align to all other docs<br/>When ReasonForNotice of 'One In All In' is used, then the Initiator must, as the first characters within this field, provide the Coordinated Interruption ID, total of NMLs impacted and the Original MC, separated by # as the delimiter and ending with #. For example: TS123~1#06#ACMEMC#</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |

| Item # | Participant Name   | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| OWN-16 | Evoenergy          | 4.2.3(b)      | 4.2.3.(c)     | <p>Disagree with additional wording here. It relates to a specific Rule, this should have its own dot point.</p> <p>New suggested wording and dot point;</p> <p>(b) [Guidance Note 1] The Initiator may use this notification to inform the Recipient of a metering installation malfunction.</p> <p>(c) [Guidance Note 4] An Initiator may issue this Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Notice to the Recipient for a 'One In All In' scheduled interruption.</p>   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| OWN-17 | Evoenergy          | 4.2.4 Table 8 |               | Agree with corrections.  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| OWN-18 | CitiPower Powercor | 4.2.5         |               | <p>CitiPower Powercor would expect that all sites will require initial scoping unless the FRMP/MC provide drawings and photographs.</p> <p>CitiPower Powercor believes the number of shared fuses and/or common isolation situations that exist or will occur in the &gt;160 metering market in Victoria is very small. Noting that nothing in this rule changes the Victorian AML mandate, or removes the Victorian distributors from remaining the initial Metering Coordinator for the &lt;160 metering market in Victoria.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| OWN-19 | United Energy      | 4.2.5         |               | <p>CitiPower Powercor would expect that all sites will require initial scoping unless the FRMP/MC provide drawings and photographs.</p> <p>CitiPower Powercor believes the number of shared fuses and/or common isolation situations that exist or will occur in the &gt;160 metering market in Victoria is very small. Noting that nothing in this rule changes the Victorian AML mandate, or removes the Victorian distributors from remaining the initial Metering Coordinator for the &lt;160 metering market in Victoria.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |

| Item #       | Participant Name  | Old Clause No                     | New Clause No                               | Comments  | IEC response                                       |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|----------|--------------------|----------------|----|---|--------------|---------------------|--|
| OWN-20       | Evoenergy   | 4.2.5.1 Table 10                  | 3.  | <div>This whole table is not consistent with the structure of the other Procedures. Create a new column so looks like</div> <table><tr><td>Timing Point</td><td>Scenario</td><td>NotificationStatus</td><td>RefTranasction</td></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Recipient provides a positive BusinessReceipt for a ServiceOrderRequest</td><td>SO Requested</td><td>ServiceOrderRequest</td></tr></table> | Timing Point                                       | Scenario | NotificationStatus | RefTranasction | 1. | Recipient provides a positive BusinessReceipt for a ServiceOrderRequest | SO Requested | ServiceOrderRequest | <div>The IEC notes the respondent’s submission.</div> <div>This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF.</div> |
| Timing Point | Scenario  | NotificationStatus                | RefTranasction                              |   |  |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
| 1.           | Recipient provides a positive BusinessReceipt for a ServiceOrderRequest | SO Requested                      | ServiceOrderRequest                         |   |  |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
| OWN-21       | Evoenergy   | 5.1 Table 15                      |   | Remove a full stop from Data format is invalid for consistency in this table.   | The IEC notes the respondent’s submission.         |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
| OWN-22       | Evoenergy   | Consistency with other procedures | Procedure headings                          | <div>This procedure has a different heading structure than other B2B Procedures.</div> <div>Others have 1.1 or 2.1.1</div> <div>This one has 1.1 or 4.2.1 with no full stop at the end of each clause number.</div>   | The IEC notes the respondent’s submission.         |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
| OWN-23       | Origin Energy   | N/A                               | N/A   | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent’s submission.         |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
| OWN-24       | Evoenergy   | Procedure Title                   |   | Why is the title of this document not in the consistent format as the other B2B Procedures? Example ‘B2B PROCEDURE: SERVICE ORDER PROCESS’  | The IEC notes the respondent’s submission.         |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |
| OWN-25       | EnergyAustralia   | StartDate                         | MeterFaultAndIssueNotification field values |   | The IEC notes the respondent’s lack of submission. |          |                    |                |    |   |              |                     |  |



### 5.3 Customer Site Details Notification Process

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No | New Clause No                 | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| CDN-1  | SA Power Networks          |               |                               | No comments.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| CDN-2  | Bluecurrent                |               |                               | N/A   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| CDN-3  | Alinta Energy              |               |                               | Alinta has no feedback on this content, at this time.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| CDN-4  | Endeavour Energy           |               |                               | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| CDN-5  | Intellihub                 |               | Version Release History table | Effectively there is no change to this document except for changing the hazard field length in the SAN, therefore to avoid confusion we suggest the comments for version 3.9 be updated to:<br><br>Updated to support ICF B002/22                           | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| CDN-6  | EnergyAustralia            |               |                               | No comments on this documentation   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| CDN-7  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy |               |                               | Nothing identified  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| CDN-8  | Evoenergy                  | 1.4.(d)       | Table 2                       | Agree with update to Guidance Note 12.  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| CDN-9  | Evoenergy                  | 2.2.(a)       |                               | Paragraph appears to be out of alignment e.g. after word Support, the 'and' is not aligned to start i.e. the word Figures. See 3.1.(b) and (c) where the sentence carries over to a second line and this aligns). Same issue with 4.4.(b), 4.7, 4.9, 5.7.1. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |

| Item # | Participant Name   | Old Clause No                                 | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|--------------------|---|---------------|---|--|
| CDN-10 | Evoenergy          | 3.1.(d)                                       | 3.1.(e)       | Swap these two around to make for better understanding and reading.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission but do not agree with participant's view.  |
| CDN-11 | Evoenergy          | 3.1.(e)                                       | 3.1.(d)       | Swap these two around to make for better understanding and reading.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission but do not agree with participant's view.  |
| CDN-12 | Evoenergy          | 3.2.(f)                                       | 3.2.(f)(i)    | Remove the word following and start the dot point with The (okay if not accepted), but refer to the below.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| CDN-13 | Evoenergy          | 3.2.(f)                                       | 3.2.(f)(ii)   | Change the for to For. If not, then do not end (i) here with a full stop but a comma.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| CDN-14 | Evoenergy          | 4.4.(b)                                       | i, ii, iii    | Why are these not formatted the same as the rest of the document that has (i), (ii), etc.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| CDN-15 | Evoenergy          | 4.6.(g)                                       |               | Missing a full stop at end of dot point.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| CDN-16 | Evoenergy          | 4.8, 4.9, 5.3, 5.4                            |               | Agree with deletion of text related to first draft consultation.  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| CDN-17 | Evoenergy          | 5.1. Table 5<br>5.5. Table 9<br>5.6. Table 10 |               | Agree with formatting updates.  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| CDN-18 | CitiPower Powercor | 5.4 – Table 8                                 |               | The SAN HazardDescription of 'OBSTRUCTION' that is struck out here has not been included in Table 34 of the AEMO Standing Data for MSATS document. CitiPower Powercor seeks clarification that OBSTRUCTION is a valid value for the Standing Data document. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.<br><br>Obstruction has been added as an exception code and the Draft Report explains the codes removal. |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No   | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|--|
| CDN-19 | United Energy    | 5.4 – Table 8   |               | The SAN HazardDescription of 'OBSTRUCTION' that is struck out here has not been included in Table 34 of the AEMO Standing Data for MSATS document. CitiPower Powercor seeks clarification that OBSTRUCTION is a valid value for the Standing Data document. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.<br><br>Obstruction has been added as an exception code and the Draft Report explains the codes removal. |
| CDN-20 | Origin Energy    | N/A             | N/A           | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| CDN-21 | AGL              | Version History |               | Inaccurate description – other editorials have also been made<br>Amend to<br>Changes supporting the Accelerating <a href="#">S</a> smart <a href="#">M</a> meter <a href="#">D</a> eployment Rules <a href="#">and renaming of AEMO procedures</a>          | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.  |

## 5.4 NEM RoLR Processes – Part B

| Item # | Participant Name  | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response                               |
|--------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---|--|
| ROL-1  | SA Power Networks |               |               | No comments.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| ROL-2  | Bluecurrent       |               |               | Agree with proposed changes                           | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |
| ROL-3  | Alinta Energy     |               |               | Alinta has no feedback on this content, at this time. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| ROL-4  | Endeavour Energy  |               |               | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |

| Item # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No | New Clause No                                | Comments  | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| ROL-5  | EnergyAustralia            |               | Produce NMI list by MSATS                    | EA Agrees with the production of this report  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| ROL-6  | EnergyAustralia            |               | AEMO produce all In Progress Change Requests | EA Agrees with the production of this report  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| ROL-7  | EnergyAustralia            |               | Report of Change Requests for Change of Role | EA Agrees with the production of this report  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| ROL-8  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy |               |  | Nothing identified  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.                              |
| ROL-9  | AGL                        |               | 104.5 (a)                                    | Missing ')' after 5.1(a)  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| ROL-10 | AGL                        |               | 104.5 (a)                                    | <p>Is the criteria 'ServiceOrderResponse transaction has yet to be provided' or is it service works have not been undertaken and a ServiceOrderResponse transaction has yet to be provided ?</p> <p>AGL considers there may be service orders completed in the field, but a response has not been sent to the failed retailer. AGL therefore suggests those should be appropriately responded to the failed retailer and those not started be 'not completed' as described.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| ROL-11 | Evoenergy                  | 102           |  | New wording appears ok  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |

| Item # | Participant Name      | Old Clause No        | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|--|---|
| ROL-12 | CitiPower<br>Powercor | 102.3 Table<br>102-A |               | <p>CitiPower Powercor has identified the following fields in the NEM RoLR Process - Part B Table 102-A requires updating to match the format in the B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification v3.9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SiteFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• SiteHouseNumber2</li> <li>• SiteStreetName1</li> <li>• SiteStreetName2</li> <li>• PostalFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• PostalHouseNumber2</li> <li>• PostalStreetName1</li> </ul> <p>PostalStreetName2</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |

| Item # | Participant Name   | Old Clause No     | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response   |
|--------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|--|--|
| ROL-13 | United Energy      | 102.3 Table 102-A |               | <p>CitiPower Powercor has identified the following fields in the NEM RoLR Process - Part B Table 102-A requires updating to match the format in the B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification v3.9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SiteFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• SiteHouseNumber2</li> <li>• SiteStreetName1</li> <li>• SiteStreetName2</li> <li>• PostalFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• PostalHouseNumber2</li> <li>• PostalStreetName1</li> </ul> <p>PostalStreetName2</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly.  |
| ROL-14 | CitiPower Powercor | 102.4 (b)         | 102.4 (b)     | The reports that AEMO are obligated to provide in order to support this clause have been proposed to be removed in section 4.3.1 of <i>2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Draft Determination</i> . The removal of these reports will impact the LNSP ability to comply with the obligations under clause 102.4, clause 102.5(b), clause 103.2 (a) (ii) [MDP obligations]   | The IEC notes the Participant's concerns however they have not detailed the impacts. As such the IEC believes since we have not updated the existing LNSP Part B obligations, the remit falls into RoLR Part A (B2M consultation). |
| ROL-15 | United Energy      | 102.4 (b)         | 102.4 (b)     | The reports that AEMO are obligated to provide in order to support this clause have been proposed to be removed in section 4.3.1 of <i>2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Draft Determination</i> . The removal of these reports will impact the LNSP ability to comply with the obligations under clause 102.4, clause 102.5(b), clause 103.2 (a) (ii) [MDP obligations]   | The IEC notes the Participant's concerns however they have not detailed the impacts. As such the IEC believes since we have not updated the existing LNSP Part B obligations, the remit falls into RoLR Part A (B2M consultation). |

| Item # | Participant Name      | Old Clause No        | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|--|---|
| ROL-16 | CitiPower<br>Powercor | 102.4 Table<br>102-B |               | <p>CitiPower Powercor has identified the following fields in the NEM RoLR Process - Part B Table 102-B requires updating to match the format in the B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification v3.9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SiteFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• SiteHouseNumber2</li> <li>• SiteStreetName1</li> <li>• SiteStreetName2</li> <li>• PostalFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• PostalHouseNumber2</li> <li>• PostalStreetName1</li> </ul> <p>PostalStreetName2</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No     | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|--|---|
| ROL-17 | United Energy    | 102.4 Table 102-B |               | <p>CitiPower Powercor has identified the following fields in the NEM RoLR Process - Part B Table 102-B requires updating to match the format in the B2B Procedure: Technical Delivery Specification v3.9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SiteFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• SiteBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• SiteHouseNumber2</li> <li>• SiteStreetName1</li> <li>• SiteStreetName2</li> <li>• PostalFloorOrLevelType</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName1</li> <li>• PostalBuildingOrPropertyName2</li> <li>• PostalHouseNumber2</li> <li>• PostalStreetName1</li> </ul> <p>PostalStreetName2</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |
| ROL-18 | Evoenergy        | 103               |               | New wording appears ok   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.                                 |
| ROL-19 | Evoenergy        | 104.7.            |               | <p>The new wording and deletions appear ok, except 104.7.(e) and (i) as it is missing critical components and is not clear. Suggested to reword to:</p> <p>(e) Clause 104.4(c) must be complied with by the end of the next <i>business</i> day after receiving, or from the date and time specified in the notification in clause 104.4(a), whichever is the later.</p> <p>(i) Clause 104.5(b) must be complied with by the end of the next <i>business</i> day after receiving, or from the date and time specified in the notification in clause 104.5(a), whichever is the later.</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and have updated accordingly. |



| Item # | Participant Name      | Old Clause No    | New Clause No  | Comments   | IEC response                               |
|--------|-----------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| ROL-20 | CitiPower<br>Powercor | 4.3.1            |  | In section 4.3.1 of the Draft Determination, reports ROLR_016 and ROLR_022 refer to "Currently LNSPs only have visibility of CR1xxx when it is COM, therefore we believe this report is now redundant". CitiPower Powercor is able to view these transactions, even in a pending state. And depending on the transaction type, will also receive notifications for different status changes. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| ROL-21 | United Energy         | 4.3.1            |  | In section 4.3.1 of the Draft Determination, reports ROLR_016 and ROLR_022 refer to "Currently LNSPs only have visibility of CR1xxx when it is COM, therefore we believe this report is now redundant". CitiPower Powercor is able to view these transactions, even in a pending state. And depending on the transaction type, will also receive notifications for different status changes. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| ROL-22 | EnergyAustralia       | AEMO Obligations | AEMO NOTIFIES ROLR KEY CONTACTS FOLLOWING ROLR EVENT                                   | EA agrees with this update/change to RoLR processes.   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |
| ROL-23 | EnergyAustralia       | AEMO Obligations | AEMO PRODUCES PENDING TRANSFER REPORT AND RoC TRANSFER CONFIRMATION EMAIL FOR THE ROLR | EA Agrees with the production of this report   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |
| ROL-24 | AGL                   | Appendix I       |  | AGL supports the removal of the unneeded reports.  | The IEC notes the respondent's support     |

| Item # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                            | New Clause No                            | Comments                       | IEC response                               |
|--------|------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| ROL-25 | Origin Energy    | N/A                                      | N/A                                      | No comments                    | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| ROL-26 | EnergyAustralia  | Non-regulated MC, MP and MDP Obligations | Non-regulated MC, MP and MDP Obligations | EA agrees with this obligation | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |

## 5.5 Meter Data Process

| ITEM # | Participant Name | Old Clause No   | New Clause No  | Comments   | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| MD-1   | AGL              |                 |                | <a href="#">Support re-versioning</a>  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| MD-2   | Evoenergy        | 2.5.4.1 Table 6 |                | The following are missing a full stop on Use last sentence.<br>Verify/Missing Register<br>Require Estimate Data                                | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| MD-3   | Evoenergy        | 1.1.3. Table 1  |                | Agree with reference update.   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| MD-4   | Evoenergy        | 2.2.4.(e)       | 2.2.4.(d)(iii) | This clause is a follow-on from 2.2.4.(d)(ii). It should not be its own dot point, therefore add as (iii) as it is part of (d) response group. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |

| ITEM # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                        | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response   |
|--------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| MD-5   | Evoenergy        | 2.2.4 first Guidance Note under (e)  | 2.2.4.(e)     | This Guidance note should have its own dot point, and should be as per proposed new clause number, in the same way as (h).                         | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| MD-6   | Evoenergy        | 2.5.5.(a)                            |               | Missing full-stop at end of dot point.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| MD-7   | Evoenergy        | 3.2.(a) Table 8                      |               | The following are missing a full stop on Definition last sentence.<br>RegisterID   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| MD-8   | Evoenergy        | 3.4.(a) Table 10<br>3.5.(a) Table 11 |               | The following are missing a full stop on Definition last sentence.<br>ResponseFormat   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| MD-9   | Evoenergy        | 3.5.(a) Table 11                     |               | The following are missing a full stop on Definition sentence.<br>ResponseFormat<br>ResponsePayload<br>ErrorCode<br>ErrorDescription<br>ProductCode | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| MD-10  | Evoenergy        | 3.7.(c) Table 14                     |               | Either add a full stop to all the Business Events, or none, but please be consistent.<br><br>Same rule applies to Reference Notes.                 | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |

## 5.6 Technical Delivery Specification

| ITEM # | Participant Name  | Old Clause No   | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response   |
|--------|-------------------|---|---------------|--|--|
| TD-1   | SA Power Networks |   |               | No comments.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| TD-2   | Bluecurrent       |   |               | Agree with proposed changes  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| TD-3   | Alinta Energy     |   |               | Alinta has no feedback on this content, at this time.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| TD-4   | Endeavour Energy  |   |               | No comments  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |
| TD-5   | AGL               |   |               | AGL supports the changes   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| TD-6   | Evoenergy         | 1.4.(e)<br>6.4.1.4.(a)<br>6.5.1.(b)<br>6.5.1.3.(a)<br>8.1.<br>8.3.<br>8.6.1.<br>9.2.<br>9.11. |               | Why are the dot points following in a separate box? Separating could be interpreted as a separate statement or meaning. Why not colour it in the same way as the Guidance Notes in the other Procedures?<br><br>There should only be the one box to rule them all. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |
| TD-7   | Evoenergy         | 2.11. Table 1   |               | Either add a full stop to all the Descriptions, or none, but please be consistent.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF. |

| ITEM # | Participant Name | Old Clause No                 | New Clause No                 | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| TD-8   | Evoenergy        | 2.12. Table 2                 |                               | Either add a full stop to all the Descriptions, or none, but please be consistent.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. This is not in scope of this IEC consultation. The Participant has the option to submit an ICF.  |
| TD-9   | Evoenergy        | 3.2. Table 3                  |                               | Should the Unstructured now have (Obsolete)?   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Unstructured addresses are not obsolete e.g. Postal address.   |
| TD-10  | Intellihub       | 3.4, table 4<br>'Street Name' | 3.4, table 4<br>'Street Name' | <p>We believe making a statement saying 'The combination of Street Name, Street Type and Street Suffix may occur up to two times' is inadequate for this document. We understand this statement is meant to allow MSATS to support complex addresses (which is akin to having a primary address and a secondary address)</p> <p>We suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This table is updated to show the name of each field that comprises a complex address and clearly define which field is associated with the primary address and which field is associated with the secondary address</li> <li>• Clearly define the fields associated with the primary address must be used when communicating a non-complex address.</li> <li>• Clearly define the fields associated with the primary address must not be null if fields associated with the secondary address is used</li> </ul> <p>Providing examples to demonstrate how a complex and a non-complex address is to be communicated in relations to the fields associated with the primary address and the secondary address and from the perspective of a B2B transaction</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. To align with B2M and to clarify usage under the B2B Procedures, the IEC has removed references which suggest fields may be used up to two times, as well as removing the comment which suggested the usage of Street Name, Street Type and Street Suffix. |

| ITEM # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No           | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| TD-11  | Evoenergy                  | 3.4. (c), (d), (e)      | (c), (d), (e) | Should the Unstructured now have (Obsolete)?   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Unstructured addresses are not obsolete e.g. Postal address.   |
| TD-12  | Evoenergy                  | 5.1.(d)                 |               | No full stop at end of sentence.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. Cannot locate the referenced clause.   |
| TD-13  | Evoenergy                  | 6.4.1.4 Figure 8        |               | Sentence below Figure 8 description missing full stop.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and updates accordingly.  |
| TD-14  | Evoenergy                  | 9.1.(a)                 | (a) and (a)   | There are 2 dot points here that are both listed as (a).   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and updates accordingly.  |
| TD-15  | EnergyAustralia            | BuildingOrPropertyName  |               | EA Supports the character increase for this field and the update to Australian Standard AS4590.1:2017 5.8 Address site name  | The IEC notes the respondent's support.   |
| TD-16  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | BuildingOrPropertyName2 |               | <p>The proposed amendments to Addressing need to more clearly communicate usage in the case of a Complex Address as per AS4590.1:2017, either by reference to the schema alone, or by adding a note as is proposed in the description of StreetName as amended below.</p> <p>The Description offered should also refer to the other fields which may occur twice if it is retained and should be replicated in each of these fields:</p> <p>"The combination of HouseNumber, HouseNumberSuffix, HouseNumberTo, HouseNumberToSuffix, Street Name, Street Type and Street Suffix may occur up to two times."</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. To align with B2M and to clarify usage under the B2B Procedures, the IEC has removed references which suggest fields may be used up to two times, as well as removing the comment which suggested the usage of Street Name, Street Type and Street Suffix. |

| ITEM # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No       | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response   |
|--------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---|--|
| TD-17  | EnergyAustralia            | FloorOrLevelType    |               | EA Supports this change   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| TD-18  | CitiPower<br>Powercor      | General             |               | <p>If Address information is being standardised, CitiPower Powercor seeks to confirm if the following fields should be included in the definition of Address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GNAF PID</li> <li>• Section Number</li> </ul> <p>DP Number</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. These elements are not considered in scope of the current IEC consultation. |
| TD-19  | United Energy              | General             |               | <p>If Address information is being standardised, CitiPower Powercor seeks to confirm if the following fields should be included in the definition of Address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GNAF PID</li> <li>• Section Number</li> </ul> <p>DP Number</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. These elements are not considered in scope of the current IEC consultation. |
| TD-20  | EnergyAustralia            | House Number Name   |               | EA Supports the changes   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| TD-21  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | HouseNumberTo       |               | <p>Since HouseNumber is limited to NUMERIC(5) IN RANGE: 0-99999</p> <p>should HouseNumberTo be (5) and range 0-99999 instead of the proposed</p> <p>NUMERIC(6) IN RANGE: 0-999999?</p> <p>(This would also align to B2M)</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and updates accordingly as the schema supports 5 characters.                 |
| TD-22  | EnergyAustralia            | HouseNumberToSuffix |               | EA Supports the changes   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.  |
| TD-23  | Origin Energy              | N/A                 | N/A           | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.   |

| ITEM # | Participant Name | Old Clause No   | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response                               |
|--------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|--|
| TD-24  | Evoenergy        | Procedure Title |               | Why is the title of this document not in the consistent format as, for example, the<br>B2B PROCEDURE: SERVICE ORDER PROCESS | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| TD-25  | EnergyAustralia  | Street Name     |               | EA Supports the changes   | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |

## 5.7 Draft Report – Appendix A- Proposed additions for the B2B Guide

| ITEM # | Participant Name  | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments  | IEC response                               |
|--------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---|--|
| GD-1   | SA Power Networks |               |               | No comments.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| GD-2   | Evoenergy         |               |               | Yeah, sure.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| GD-3   | Bluecurrent       |               |               | Agree with proposed changes                           | The IEC notes the respondent's support.    |
| GD-4   | Alinta Energy     |               |               | Alinta has no feedback on this content, at this time. | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| GD-5   | Origin Energy     | N/A           | N/A           | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |
| GD-6   | Endeavour Energy  |               |               | No comments   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission. |



| ITEM # | Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| GD-7   | Intellihub       |               | Clause x      | <p>To avoid confusion we suggest this clause clarifies that the cancelation is only for the NMI with the defect. We suggest this clause be reworded to:</p> <p>If the Retailer is informed by their metering party that a Defect has been identified on a NMI prior to the scheduled One In All In temporary isolation, the Retailer should cancel the 'Supply Service Works – Temporary Isolation – One In All In' service order for the NMI with the Defect.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and will update accordingly in the B2B Guide. |
| GD-8   | PLUS ES          |               |               | OIAI process (including requirements for a Retailer churn)   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| GD-9   | PLUS ES          |               |               | Defect tracking and monitoring including raising a SO post the customer advising of defect remediation.  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |
| GD-10  | PLUS ES          |               |               | Review and explanation of the usage and priority of the various exception codes.   | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |

| ITEM # | Participant Name           | Old Clause No                                | New Clause No | Comments   | IEC response  |
|--------|----------------------------|--|---------------|--|---|
| GD-11  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy | DNSP coordinated temporary isolation process |               | <p>Since there isn't a discrete Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure, should we instead describe the situation?</p> <p>Metering party visited a site with multiple customers to carry out work on a smart meter. However, due to a shared fuse, the metering party couldn't complete the task and now requires assistance from the DNSP to isolate the supply. During the visit, the metering party confirmed that <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is not applicable</del> <u>no Legacy Meter is impacted</u>.</p> | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |
| GD-12  | Red Energy and Lumo Energy |  |               | <p>Metering party visited a site with multiple customers to carry out work on any meter type. However, due to a shared fuse, the metering party couldn't complete the task and now requires assistance from the DNSP to isolate the supply. During the visit, the metering party believes that <del>the Shared Fusing Meter Replacement Procedure is not applicable</del> <u>a Legacy Meter is impacted</u></p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission and current wording is aligned to the obligation under the Rules. |
| GD-13  | AGL                        |  | M             | <p>Suggest some additions for clarity</p> <p>The receipt of the Meter Fault and Issue Notification <u>with a Reason for Notice as 'One In All In'</u> from the DNSP advises the Retailer that they are involved in a One In All In interruption. Retailers must use information contained within the Meter Fault and Issue Notification to: .....</p>  | The IEC notes the respondent's submission.  |