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# Example Submission (Please delete this section)

## General Instructions

1. *Please keep information in the clause numbers simple - eg no titles, comments etc. – put titles and text in the comment section.*
2. *Please use a individual row for each comment on any each clauses.*
3. *Old clauses only needed if there is no equivalent clause within the revised draft procedures.*
4. *If an obligation exists in another instrument please identify the instrument and clause to assist in including guidance notes.*
5. *Please only include comments either with suggested changes, issues or support. Please do not include ‘No Comment’.*
6. *See example below (please note the “comments” are sample only, they bear no relevance to the proposed changes):*

| Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1.42(a) | 2.15(a) | Service Order response  Change response list from varchar(250) to an enumerated list |
|  | 1.42(a) | 2.15(a) | Suggest add ‘Other’ as part of enumerated list and add free text to support other |
|  |  | 2.25(a)(ii) | Table 5  “Description of use” should be reworded to “Description of typical use” |
|  |  | 3.6(a) | The MDP SLP (c 3.5.2) requires the meter serial ID to be provided.  Suggest the MeterSerialID be added to the transaction. |
|  |  | 3.6(a) | Ensure MeterserialID is the same field used in other procedures |
|  |  | 2.15 | Ensure character length for MeterSerialID matches MSATS field length |

# One Way Notification Process

| Participant Name | Old Clause No | New Clause No | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

## Second Draft Report Question

Given a majority of respondents to the First Draft Report indicated a preference towards enhancement of the PIN to replace the MXN, drafting of it has been provided. With this drafting in mind, are there any further enhancements or changes to the PIN that you would suggest? If so, what?

| Participant Name | Question No | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 |  |

# General Comments

| Participant Name | Document/Section | Clause No | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |