

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
1	ENERGYAP, TCAMP, TCAUSTM		General	<p>Ausgrid notes that a VerifyMeterData request can only be sent to an MDP. This will not resolve the current process issues where an MPB is required to update Meter Standing Data. The industry should build processes that allow MPB and MDP to be separate entities. There is a need for certain VerifyMeterData Requests to go to the MC to co-ordinate the synchronisation of data between MDFF and MSATS. VerifyMeterData Investigation Codes that should go to the MC include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verify Standing Data • Verify/Missing Registers <p>A VerifyMeterData Request to the MC should only be allowed once the timing for MPB MSATS updates has passed.</p>	<p>IEC acknowledge that this is an existing inefficiency in the existing process.</p> <p>We recommend this be raised in the ERCF after implementation.</p>
2	Endeavour Energy		General	<p>The Remote service request and response should be a different transaction group to allow participants to build in web service to achieve real/near real time timings without impacting existing meter data procedure transactions.</p>	<p>IEC Remote Services is now it's own transaction group (MRSR)</p>

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
3	VECTORAMS	Issue 2.	Issue 2.	In response to consultation issue 2 – ‘Issue for Consultation – the Remote Services Request and Response’, VectorAMS supports the current drafting. The Remote Services Request and Response can meet minimum services.	IEC Remote Services is now it’s own transaction group (MRSR)
4	Jemena		2.2.2(a)[GN1] 2.2.2(c)(ii & v)[GN1] 2.2.3(c) & (f) [GN1] 2.2.4(e) & (h) [GN1] 2.2.5(a) [GN1] 2.2.5(b)(i) [GN1] 2.4.3[GN1] 2.5.1(a) & (b) & (c) [GN1] 2.5.3(c) [GN1]	<p>Clause 7.3.1(b)(2) Places an obligation on the Metering Coordinator to perform its role in accordance with Ch7 of the Rules AND the Procedures authorised by the Rules. Therefore activities that the MC conduct on behalf of the retailers (as their contracted agent or as an active role) must conform with the provision outlined in the Procedures. This in effect gives a head of power to the [GNs] identified, as obligations that a Retailer/MC must perform under the B2B Procedures. As a consequence these Guidance notes should be translated into direct obligations.</p> <p>The formalisation of these processes is particularly important when describing the behaviours and obligations relating to the delivery and correction of meter data where it can have an impact on billing or settlement processes.</p> <p>This obligation is separate to the B2B Communications section of the new Chapter 7 and appears to have been ignored by the AEMO legal; advice to the IEC of the 2nd November</p>	IEC Refer to the IEC directive which was published as part of the draft determination.
5	ActewAGL		1.1		

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
6	ActewAGL		1.2 (a)		
7	AGL		1.4	Unnamed Table – Guidance Notes Should Guidance Note 6 be AEMO Procedures – see usage 2.2.2 (a)	IEC updated table with a heading. Added new guidance note 10 for Metrology Procedures. Updated 2.2.2 to have Guidance Note 3 & 10
8	AGL		2.1	Table 1 Two processes are named ‘Remote Service’ – Suggest one be named ‘Remote Service Request’ (RSR) and the other ‘Remote Service Response’	IEC No change wording sufficient
9	AusNet Services		2.1	For consistency, we recommend that these are not referred to as "processes" but as transactions as is the case in other B2B procedure documents. If they are "processes" a new B2B Procedure Process document would be required.	IEC no change after discussion we think the intent is clear.
10	AGL		2.2.2 (a)	Should the Guidance Note be 6 since it refers to the SLP & Metrology Procedure	IEC refer to response for item 7

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
11	Active Stream		2.2.2(a)	<p>This is depicted as Guidance Note 1 – Industry Practices</p> <p>The Guidance note should reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance Note 3 - MDP SLP • Guidance Note X – for Metrology Procedure – Assuming Part B <p>Possibly Guidance Note Y – MDFF Specifications Nem12 & NEM 13</p>	IEC refer to response for item 7
12	Active Stream		2.2.3	<p>The current version of the B2B Meter Data Process document contains a clause in section 2.9 (a) which reads:</p> <p><i>a. Participants must be aware that an MDP is only required to maintain Metering Data on-line for a period of 13 months¹. Any ProvideMeterDataRequest with a StartReadDate earlier than 13 months prior to the date of the ProvideMeterDataRequest may be rejected by the MDP.</i></p> <p>Recommend this is reinstated in the new procedure as a Guidance note 1 as it provides clarification on the process.</p>	<p>IEC</p> <p>The NER states the obligation of data retention IEC saw no value in duplicating the NER.</p>

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
13	United		2.2.3 / 2.2.4	<p>It is unclear under which circumstances a new MDP can raise a PMD / VMD request seeking the provision or verification of churn data from the old MDP.</p> <p>Clarification by the B2B Working Group would be beneficial as it will enable participants to modify their existing PMD/VMD validation logic appropriately to handle these requests (e.g. determine whether the recipient is the MDP for the requested period).</p>	IEC Believe this is covered in the MDP SLP don't believe it needs to be stated here as it's out of scope for B2B communications
14	Momentum Energy		2.2.3 (a) & 2.2.5 (b) (iii)	Can you please advise the main difference between these 2 clauses, as both are used to get the meter data?	IEC agree they are both used to obtain meter data. The difference being is one caters for the Remote on Demand provision of meter data (as per Min Spec) and the other is the provision of historical meter data.

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
15	Active Stream		2.2.4	<p>The current version of the B2B Meter Data Process document contains a clause in section 2.10 (a) which reads:</p> <p><i>Participants must be aware that an MDP is only required to maintain Metering Data on-line for a period of 13 months¹. Any VerifyMeterDataRequest with a StartReadDate earlier than 13 months prior to the date of the VerifyMeterDataRequest may be rejected by the MDP.</i></p> <p>Recommend this is reinstated in the new procedure as a Guidance note 1 as it provides clarification on the process.</p>	IEC refer to response for item 12
16	Endeavour Energy		2.2.4(e)	<p>Only the last sentence should be a guidance note as the rest of the clause is specific to the B2B communication and how it is to be used.</p> <p>(e) If the Recipient is unable to satisfy the VerifyMeterDataRequest, the Recipient must send a BusinessAcceptance/Rejection with a Status of "Reject" and must not send a MeterDataNotification in response to the VerifyMeterDataRequest. The Recipient must provide appropriate EventCodes and associated details in the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection to explain why the VerifyMeterDataRequest cannot be satisfied. The EventCodes in the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection must have a Severity of "Error". [Guidance Note 1] If the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection transaction indicates a problem (using an appropriate EventCode) with the VerifyMeterDataRequest, the Initiator must use reasonable endeavours to resolve the problem which may include providing a new VerifyMeterDataRequest, if appropriate.</p>	IEC agree corrected

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
17	Aurora Energy		2.2.4 (e)	<p>If the Recipient is unable to satisfy the VerifyMeterDataRequest, the Recipient must send a BusinessAcceptance/Rejection with a Status of “Reject” and must not send a MeterDataNotification in response to the VerifyMeterDataRequest. The Recipient must provide appropriate EventCodes and associated details in the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection to explain why the VerifyMeterDataRequest cannot be satisfied. The EventCodes in the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection must have a Severity of “Error”.[Guidance Note 1] If the BusinessAcceptance/Rejection transaction indicates a problem (using an appropriate EventCode) with the VerifyMeterDataRequest, the Initiator must use reasonable endeavours to resolve the problem which may include providing a new VerifyMeterDataRequest, if appropriate.</p> <p>Aurora Energy comment: Highlighted section should be 2.2.4(d)(iii) and guidance Note 1 should be (e)</p>	IEC agree refer to response for item 16
18	ActewAGL		2.2.5		
19	ActewAGL		2.2.5 (b)(i)		
20	ActewAGL		2.2.5 (b)(ii)		
21	ActewAGL		2.2.5 (b)(iii)		

22	AusNet Services		2.2.5	<p>AusNet Services notes that the previous RemoteOnDemandMeterRead transaction has been replaced by the RemoteServiceRequest transaction. As RemoteServiceRequest includes subtypes of OnDemandRead, Meter Inquiry, and other new Service Types. The provision of these services can be facilitated through commercially negotiated means and adding a RemoteServiceRequest B2B Transaction creates additional implementation costs for B2B parties. The cost of the industry of all B2B parties implementing this unnecessary change is imprudent.</p> <p>We would only support the introduction of the RemoteServiceRequest transaction, if B2B Parties had the capability to configure the e-Hub to automatically reject transaction groups on their behalf based on the Transaction group. That way B2B parties not interested in providing certain service would not have build the capability to process and reject new transactions or to only use eHub for services they offer. This may help small B2B parties operate in areas of the market where they have capabilities to do so and reduce their setup costs.</p> <hr/> <p>We consider the concept of a RemoteOnDemandRead does not align with the existing meter data processes in the market and the Metrology Procedures. Only validated data can be provided to Registered Participants so initiators would have to wait until the next day before receiving the metering data in any case, or send partly estimated metering data.</p>	<p>IEC This is a contestable service, regardless of what transaction type it is you would only build this transaction if you were going to request these services or provide these services. If a provider was to receive this type of request and they do not provide this service then they would reject it with the appropriate code.</p> <p>There is a clear obligaton for the B2B Procedures to cover the communication of minimum services as per the rules.</p> <p>A new transaction group has been</p>
----	-----------------	--	-------	--	--

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
					<p>created for Remote Services (MRSR). And you can reject at transaction level.</p> <p>We agree that it does not align with the existing meter data processes, as it's a contestable service the requirements would be by agreement.</p>
23	Endeavour Energy		2.2.5(b)(ii) and (iii)	<p>Delete the unnecessary punctuation as highlighted below</p> <p>2.2.5. Remote Service Process</p> <p>(a) [Guidance Note 1] Prior to commencing the use of the Remote Service Process the Initiator and Recipient must agree the scope of the service(s) and the format of the response to the service request.</p> <p>(b) An Initiator may commence a <u>RemoteServiceRequest</u> process if they:</p> <p>(i) [Guidance Note 4] are authorised to receive the requested information and</p> <p>(ii) Require remote retrieval of information from a specified metering installation, or</p> <p>(iii) require a reading on demand, or</p>	IEC agree updated
24	TasNetworks		2.3	<p>Diagrams</p> <p>There are only 4 diagrams but there is reference to “five” and to Figures “1-5”</p>	IEC agree corrected

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
25	AusNet Services		2.3	Figure 2 - logically there shouldn't be a connector in Initiator swim lane between receive receipt and receive accept/reject	IEC agree connected
26	ActewAGL		2.3	States "illustrated in Figures 1-5, but no figure 5	IEC agree corrected

27	Simply		Figure 4	<p><u>Remote Service Process</u></p> <p>Considering the above comment, this figure needs to be amended for completeness as it stops at the receipt of RemoteServiceResponse whereas it should result in valid Meter Data in an agreed format. Unless otherwise agreed, this process should trigger a “Meter Data Notification” as a default option, to keep it consistent with PMDR and VM DR Processes.</p> <p><i>Payload should be sent as a standard MDN file (MDFF) in the response, unless otherwise specified in the request.</i></p>	<p>IEC the response could be meter data in an agreed format. As this is a contestable service and agreement is made between two parties. Do not believe the B2B procedures can mandate that a MDN should be sent.</p> <p>IEC agreed to add MDN as an allowed value to provide the option.</p> <p>Response format field has been made mandatory</p> <p>Where MDN is used the response will follow existing meter data delivery mechanisms.</p> <p>Otherwise the return data will be in the response payload.</p>
----	--------	--	----------	---	---

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
					Response payload has been made optional
28	ActewAGL		2.4.1	Is the reference to 2.4.2 correct, or should this statement also reference 2.4.3?	IEC agree updated
29	ActewAGL		2.4.3 (a)(iii)		
30	AGL		2.4.3	Why is this a Guidance Note a 4 (NER) – this is more likely to be a 1 (industry practice)	IEC agree updated
31	Active Stream		2.4.3	Understand these timings were determined as best practice in the industry and were not supported by any regulatory or jurisdictional document. Should this be Guidance Note 1?	IEC refer to response for item 30
32	Active Stream		2.5	Recommend that the content of 2.5 and 2.2 are revised and the sections more closely aligned both content wise and physically in the document. Some Business Rules are process requirements and should be in section 2.2 against the relative process.	IEC no change believe at this late stage they don't think changes should be made. Agree could be structured better

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
33	Aurora Energy		2.5.1 (b)	<p>[Guidance Note 4] Prior to rejecting a MeterDataNotification, ProvideMeterDataRequest or VerifyMeterDataRequest on the basis that the Initiator does not have the correct Role for the connection point, Recipients must confirm that this is correct on the basis of information held in MSATS.</p> <p>Aurora Energy comment: While the correct role refers to the NER confirming in MSATS is not a NER requirement so would refer to Guidance Note 1.</p>	IEC agree updated
34	AGL		2.5.1(b)	Why is this a Guidance Note 4 (NER) – would expect it to refer to AEMO MSATS Procedures (6)	IEC refer to response for item 33
35	AGL		2.5.1(c)	Why is this a Guidance Note 1 (Industry Practice) – would expect it to refer to AEMO MSATS Procedures (6) relating to provision of metering data	IEC no change Guidance Note is around the practice of raising a new PMD/VMD not around the provision of data.
36	Active Stream		2.5.1 (d)	Suggest this is removed and added in section 2.2 as per previous comments for section 2.2.3 and 2.2.4. They describe an outcome of a process rather than a rule.	IEC refer to response for item 32
37	ActewAGL		2.5.3 (a)(i)		

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
38	AusNet Services		2.5.4.1	While AusNet Services observes that the first round consultation drafting remains in place, we maintain our position that the new drafting contains excessive and unnecessary changes to the InvestigationCodes that are not related to the Metering Contestability, Embedded Network or Meter Exchange Process Rule changes, hence additional to the scope of the current review. At the earlier metering services working group that developed these changes there was no cost benefit analysis completed. These changes will result in costly system changes to Meter Data Management Systems that otherwise would not be impacted by Power of Choice. Therefore we continue to recommend not making this imprudent decision to change the InvestigationCodes as proposed.	IEC still believe these codes provide specific and valid reasons for requesting the verification of meter data. New codes to remain in procedures.
39	Endeavour Energy		2.5.4.1	<p>Table 4</p> <p>The MDP and MPB are different entities.</p> <p>When the investigation codes Invalid Standing Data and Verify/Missing Register are required to be used, PMD and VMD transactions need to be made available to be sent to the MC in order for them to fulfil their obligations (NER 7.3 Role and Responsibility of the Metering Co-ordinator). It is not the obligation of the MDP to verify/correct standing data.</p> <p>Suggest adding a guidance note to make this evident as historically PMD and VMD transactions have only ever been sent to an MDP.</p>	<p>IEC acknowledge that this is an existing inefficiency in the existing process.</p> <p>We recommend this be raised in the ERCF after implementation.</p>

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
40	CitiPower Powercor	2.5.4.1 3.2	2.5.4.1 3.2	<p>Table 4 Investigation Code Explanations: new investigation code listed as 'Verify/Missing Register'</p> <p>Table 6 <u>VerifyMeterDataRequest</u> Data: new Investigation Code listed as 'Verify/Missing Registers'</p> <p>CitiPower Powercor recommends this code be applied consistently in the Procedure and the Guide as 'Verify Missing Register'.</p>	IEC agree updated
41	CitiPower Powercor	2.5.4.1 3.2	2.5.4.1 3.2	<p>Table 4 Investigation Code Explanations: new investigation code listed as 'Require Estimate Data'</p> <p>Table 6 <u>VerifyMeterDataRequest</u> Data: new Investigation Code listed as 'Require Estimate Read'</p> <p>CitiPower Powercor recommends this code be applied consistently in the Procedure and the Guide as 'Require Estimate Data'.</p>	IEC agree updated

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
42	AusNet Services		2.5.5	There is insufficient information here to explain to participants how the <u>RemoteServiceRequest</u> transaction will operate. While the drafted content points the reader to the B2B Guide (presumably sections 5.4.3 and 6.7.3) there is little information provided there either. Suggest that worked usage scenarios are written for some of the service types.	IEC This transaction is provided for the foundation of services that may be required for remotes services. Use of this transaction will be by agreement between the parties. It refelects the MinimumServices in Chapter 7 of the NER.
43	Red Energy & Lumo Energy		2.5.5(d)	(d) Please refer to the B2B guide for further explanation of the use of this transaction. This should not be an obligation. Remove.	IEC Agree removed
44	Aurora Energy		3	<i>Aurora Energy comment: TRANSACTIONS needs to come left to align</i>	IEC agree corrected
45	ActewAGL		3		

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
46	ActewAGL		3	Insert new sentence above Key Where the Definition states otherwise, usage key value no longer applies.	IEC no change wording is sufficient
47	Endeavour Energy		3	Left align the heading 3. TRANSACTION	IEC agree corrected
48	ActewAGL		3.1	Table 5 – InitiatorID Remove full stop after “ParticipantID”, and insert space before “requesting”	IEC agree updated
49	ActewAGL		3.2	Table 6 – CurrentRead Change Use from M/N to M Reword definition Only Mandatory...	IEC no change wording is sufficient
50	ActewAGL		3.2	Table 6 – CurrentReadDate Change Use from M/N to M Reword definition Not Required when CurrentRead is not provided.	IEC no change wording is sufficient
51	ActewAGL		3.2	Table 6 – CurrentConsumption Change Use from M/N to M Reword definition Not Required when CurrentRead is not provided.	IEC no change wording is sufficient

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
52	Simply		3.3	<div><div><div><div>RequestID</div><div>VarChar(15)</div><div>N/M</div><div>The RequestID provided in the initiating Request. Not required when transaction sent as part of the normal Meter Data Notification Process. Mandatory when the transaction is sent to the requesting Initiator as a response to a ProvideMeterDataRequest, VerifyMeterDataRequest or RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest</div></div></div></div> <div>There’s no such transaction named as “RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest” as highlighted above and hence should be replaced by “RemoteServiceRequest” in the above RequestID field.</div>	IEC agree updated.
53	ActewAGL		3.3	<div>Table 7 – RequestID</div> <div>Change Use from M/N to M</div> <div>Reword definition (RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest not valid)</div> <div>Not required when transaction sent as part of the normal Meter Data Notification Process, otherwise Mandatory for all other requests.</div> <div>Mandatory when the transaction is sent to the requesting Initiator as a response to a ProvideMeterDataRequest, VerifyMeterDataRequest or RemoteOnDemandMeterReadRequest.</div>	IEC no change wording is sufficient Refer to 52 response as well.
54	EA		3.4	EA is satisfied with the drafting of Remote Service transaction.	IEC thank you for your comment
55	AGL		3.4	<div>Table 8 - Datetime</div> <div>In OWN Datetime is shown as Datetime (12) – Suggest fieldnames be reviewed for consistency</div>	IEC agree updated

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
56	AGL		3.4	Table 9 - Datetime In OWN Datetime is shown as Datetime (12) – Suggest fieldnames be reviewed for consistency	IEC agree updated
57	AGL		3.4	Table 9 – Product Code Note – Product Code in Service Order Procedure is VARCHAR (10) not (12) Also suggest use same requirements for product code as in Service Order Procedure	IEC agree updated
58	AGL		3.4	MeterSerialNumber should be an optional field. When left blank it indicates the service applies to all meters under the NMI	IEC Agree. Updated
59	AGL		3.4	Table 9 – Product Code Note – Product Code in Service Order Procedure is VARCHAR (10) not (12) Also suggest use same requirements for product code as in Service Order Procedure	IEC agree updated
60	AGL		3.4	MeterSerialNumber should be an optional field. When left blank it indicates the service applies to all meters under the NMI	IEC Refer to response for item 58

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
61	AGL		3.4	Table 9 – Product Code Note – Product Code in Service Order Procedure is VARCHAR (10) not (12) Also suggest use same requirements for product code as in Service Order Procedure	IEC Refer to response for item 59
62	AGL		3.4	MeterSerialNumber should be an optional field. When left blank it indicates the service applies to all meters under the NMI	IEC Refer to response for item 58
63	AusNet Services		3.4	Refer to comments in section 2.2.5 and 2.5.5	IEC Refer response in 22 & 42
64	Active Stream		3.4	Table 8 Service Type : Amend Allowed Value as per below to align with NER minimum services.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Demand to Remote On-Demand Meter Read Meter inquiry to Metering Installation Inquiry Start Scheduled Read Service to Start Remote Scheduled Meter Read Stop Scheduled Read Service to Stop Remote Scheduled Meter Read Change Scheduled Read Service to Change Remote Scheduled Meter Read	IEC agree updated

65	Jemena		3.4 Table 8	<p>Clarification is required for what is the expected process for each “Service Type”</p> <p>A mapping is required between Service Types and Request Codes.</p> <p>For instance, if the LNSP receives a RSR with a Service Type of “Start Schedule Read Service”, a request code of “Frequency” – what does that mean?</p> <p>Can an example of the “UserDefined” fields be given? Are these just free field text?</p> <p>Remote Service Request has the following Service Types;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Demand • Meter Inquiry • Start Scheduled Read Service • Stop Scheduled Read Service • Change Scheduled Read Service <p>And the following Request codes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meter Contactor Status • Voltage • Current • Average Voltage • Events • Frequency • Active Energy • Reactive Energy • Index Read 	<p>IEC</p> <p>Refer to schedule 7 of the new rule this will guide you as to to the use of this request.</p> <p>As this is a contestable service it can pretty much be configured by the parties by agreement.</p> <p>User defined means that the users can define the use of these fields by agreement. It provides flexibility</p>
----	--------	--	--------------------	---	---

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
				• <User Defined>	
66	ActewAGL		3.4	Table 8 – RecipientID Remove full stop after “ParticipantID”, and insert space before “as” , insert full stop at end of description	IEC agree corrected
67	ActewAGL		3.4	Table 8 – MeterSerialNumber Remove full stop after “field”, and insert space before “to”	IEC agree corrected
68	ActewAGL		3.4	Table 8 – ResponseFormat Should be capital T at beginning of description, Insert full stop at end of description	IEC agree corrected
69	ActewAGL		3.4	Table 8 Remove space as these are field names <i>MeterSerial Number</i>	IEC agree corrected
70	ActewAGL		3.4	Table 8 Remove / as these are xml field names <i>Fromdate/time</i> <i>Todate/time</i>	IEC agree corrected

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
71	ENERGYAP, TCAMP, TCAUSTM		3.4	<p>Table 8</p> <p>Ausgrid requests that the 'Initiator Role' be included in the RemoteServiceRequest transaction. This is consistent with the ProvideMeterData and VerifyMeterData Requests.</p> <p>The presence of the InitiatorRole field helps with system validations.</p>	<p>IEC believe that NMI and ParticipantID are sufficient enough to perform validations required for this request.</p> <p>Services provided by this request are contestable so the expectation would be that parties would already have agreed to these services and what is required by them.</p>
72	Endeavour Energy		3.4	<p>Table 8 RemoteServiceRequest Data</p> <p>Is there a specific reason Initiator Role was excluded from the RemoteServiceRequest. It is inconsistent with PMD / VMD Request.</p> <p>It would help with validation as you will know which role to check for otherwise each participant now has to store a table with Participant and Role.</p>	<p>IEC Refer to response for item 71</p>

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
73	United		3.4	Table 8 - Initiator ID - this is redundant – delete this – It must already be supplied in the transaction header.	IEC Agree these fields form part of the header and do not appear in the transaction today. We have removed them from the transaction data for all transactions.
74	United		3.4	Table 8 - Recipient ID - this is redundant – delete this – It must already be supplied in the transaction header.	IEC refer to response for item 73
75	United		3.4	Table 8 - Fromedate/time : Make it clear that this refers to EST (not local / daylight saving time) - Fix spelling of 'From'	IEC agree statment has been added. The time will be EST unless otherwise agreed. Spelling fixed
76	United		3.4	Table 8 - Todate/time : Make it clear that this refers to EST (not local / daylight saving time)	IEC refer to response for item 75

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
77	Momentum Energy		3.4	Table 8, Field = 'RequestCode', UOM = KWH / MWH are missing from definition	IEC this is a contestable service so agreement would be sought prior to raising this request what UOM is required.
78	Momentum Energy		3.4	Table 8, Field = 'ResponseFormat', does Retailer system need to have "BASE64" as payload. What is "BASE64" Payload for?	IEC these formats are agreed between both parties so unless both parties agree to a format it will not be used. BASE64 is binary-to-text encoding scheme.
79	Momentum Energy		3.4	How can we obtain an example representing the format in table 8	IEC – As its agreed between the parties and example will not be available.

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
80	Momentum Energy		3.4	Table 8, Field = 'ResponseFormat', what does <User Defined> means? How will this be managed by various participants systems?	IEC – this means a format agreed by both parties this is not in the Allowed values list. As it's agreed between the parties you would only agree to a format that you can process.
81	Momentum Energy		3.4	Does "DATETIME" Format imply YYYYMMDDhhmm or some other specification?	IEC refer to response for item 56

82	Red Energy & Lumo Energy		Table 8	<p>Suggest aligning the terminology between Allowed Values and Standard Values. By adding a 'User Defined' field, it is no longer a list of allowed, but standard values. Red and</p> <p><i>ServiceType</i> VARC M HAR(40)</p> <p>Describes the specific service required Standard Allowed Values: <input type="checkbox"/> On Demand <input type="checkbox"/> Meter Inquiry <input type="checkbox"/> Start Scheduled Read Service <input type="checkbox"/> Stop Scheduled Read Service <input type="checkbox"/> Change Scheduled Read Service (Add: <User Defined>)</p> <p><i>RequestCode</i> VARC M HAR(40)</p> <p>Describes the specific type of measurement/data that the initiator requires. Standard Allowed Values: <input type="checkbox"/> Meter Connection <input type="checkbox"/> Contactor Status <input type="checkbox"/> Voltage Voltage and Current <input type="checkbox"/> Average Voltage <input type="checkbox"/> Events <input type="checkbox"/> Power <input type="checkbox"/> Frequency <input type="checkbox"/> Active Energy <input type="checkbox"/> Reactive Energy <input type="checkbox"/> Meter Event <input type="checkbox"/> RetrievalIndex IRead <input type="checkbox"/> <User Defined></p> <p>Lumo recommend that this is also checked throughout the B2B Procedures to ensure consistency.</p>	IEC Agreed updated
----	--------------------------	--	---------	--	-----------------------

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
83	AGL		3.4 & 3.5	<p>Suggest amend the definition to cross reference the Meter Serial ID from the Glossary:</p> <p>The m<u>M</u>eter s<u>S</u>erial <u>ID</u> number uniquely identifies a meter for a given NMI.</p>	IEC no change. <i>MeterSerialNumber</i> is used throughout the B2B documents and is a current field in the schema. As it appears in the Glossary no need to define it here.
84	Simply		3.4 & 3.5	<div> <div>ResponseFormat</div> <div>VARCHAR(20)</div> <div>M</div> <div> <p>This defines the structure of the response payload as agreed between the Initiator and Recipient</p> <p>Allowed Values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSV • MDFF • XML • BASE64 • <User Defined> </div> </div> <p>Our proposal is to make this field as an Optional field and not Mandatory. If it is left blank, it should result in a standard MDFF payload as a default response.</p>	IEC refer to response for item 27
85	Momentum Energy		3.4 & 3.5	Field "RequestCode" has allowed value as "Meter Contactor Status", what does "Contactor" Means	IEC The contactor is equipment in the meter that opens and closes a circuit to stop and start energy flow.

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
86	AGL		3.5	Table 9 The remote service request and response are linked through the RequestID field. Information which can be gathered from the request should not be added to the response. For instance the ServiceType and RequestCode add no value to the response.	IEC No change it is retained as it can aid processing of response
87	AGL		3.5	Table 9 The remote service request and response are linked through the RequestID field. Information which can be gathered from the request should not be added to the response. For instance the ServiceType and RequestCode add no value to the response.	IEC Refer to the response for item 86
88	AusNet Services		3.5	Refer to comments in section 2.2.5 and 2.5.5	IEC refer to response in 22 & 42
89	Simply		3.5	<u>RemoteServiceResponse Data:</u> We do not support the inclusion of “ResponsePayload” embedded in the response transaction, where an MDFF is expected. It becomes very complex and a bespoke solution to extract the payload from the transaction whereas if it can be sent as a separate MDFF, it follows BAU logic. We would like to propose that a response of this transaction should be a two-step process, i.e. if a request transaction is accepted, MDN should follow the response however not to be embedded in the response itself.	IEC Refer to the response for item 27

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
90	ActewAGL		3.5	Table 9 – RecipientID Remove full stop after “ParticipantID”, and insert space before “as”, insert full stop at end of description	IEC agree removed.
91	ActewAGL		3.5	Table 9 – MeterSerialNumber Remove full stop after “field”, and insert space before “to”	IEC agree corrected.
92	ActewAGL		3.5	Table 9 – ServiceType Why is this field required in a response to a RemoteServiceRequest?	IEC No change it is retained as it can aid processing of response
93	ActewAGL		3.5	Table 9 – ErrorDescription Change Use from M/N to M Reword definition Not Required Mandatory when Error Code does not equals 0.	IEC no change wording is sufficient
94	ActewAGL		3.5	Table 9 Remove / as these are xml field names From date/time To date/time	IEC agree removed

95	ENERGYAP, TCAMP, TCAUSTM		3.5	<p>Table 9</p> <p>Ausgrid does not agree with the payload being in the RemoteServiceResponse. New processes should not be enforced if existing infrastructure, available today to market participants, can perform the same function e.g. the MeterDataNotification</p> <p>Ausgrid would like to see a:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request mechanism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To Request the service • Response mechanism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Request Outcome ○ Billing Outcome (Product Code) • Service Delivery mechanism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bilateral agreement that is not defined by the market. <p>Ausgrid request the 'ResponseFormat' be updated to an 'optional' field. This allows for new or existing infrastructure to be used to deliver Remote Service response files.</p>	<p>IEC</p> <p>Refer to response for item 27.</p> <p>We have provided a mechanism to deliver outside of the response</p>
----	--------------------------------	--	-----	--	---

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
96	Endeavour Energy		3.5	Remote Service Response Make the <i>ResponseFormat</i> Optional to provide further flexibility. It may be agreed between participants that the data is provided outside of the SO response transaction in the same way the PMD and VMD transactions currently cater for.	IEC Refer to response for item 27
97	United		3.5	Table 9 - Initiator ID - this is redundant – delete this – It must already be supplied in the transaction header.	IEC refer to the response for item 73
98	United		3.5	Table 9 - Recipient ID - this is redundant – delete this – It must already be supplied in the transaction header.	IEC refer to the response for item 74
99	United		3.5	Table 9 - Fromdate/time : Make it clear that this refers to EST (not local / daylight saving time)	IEC refer to response for item 75
100	United		3.5	Table 9 - Todate/time : Make it clear that this refers to EST (not local / daylight saving time)	IEC refer to response for item 75
101	Red Energy & Lumo Energy		Table 8 & Table 9	Red and Lumo consider that the User Defined fields should be expanded to at least 10 to future proof the transaction and avoid schema changes on this specific transaction in the future.	IEC Agree for request and response

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
102	ActewAGL		3.6 (b)	Table 11 All fields should be Mandatory if MDN not Accepted	IEC no change KeyInfo is not required if the event code is related to the aseXML transaction and not the CSV data. Context is not required if KeyInfo is not populated.
103	ActewAGL		3.6 (b)	Table 11 Why is this table only relevant for MDN? Section 2.2 discusses using the appropriate event codes but no tables associated.	IEC because MDN is the only transaction that uses block events all of the other transactions are either accepted, partial or rejected.
104	AGL		3.7	Table 12 – Table headers should repeat across page breaks for ease of reading	IEC agree updated

Reference No	Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments	IEC Response
105	Red Energy & Lumo Energy		Table 9	<i>Response Format</i> VARCHAR(20) Red and Lumo consider that ResponseFormat should match Table 8, which has VARCHAR(200) and in Table 9, it has VARCHAR(20).	IEC agree corrected
106	Aurora Energy		Table 8 & 9	From e date/time Aurora Energy comment: Remove the e	IEC agree corrected
107	Pacific Hydro		Table 12	General Comment: where Tables cover more than one page can the header rows be repeated?	IEC agree corrected