

# July 2023 Retail Electricity Market Procedures Consultation

## FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant:*** Evoenergy

***Submission Date:*** 23/08/2023

[AEMO | July 2023 Retail Electricity Market Procedures Consultation](#)

# Table of Contents

- 1. Context ..... 3
- 2. Feedback on Net System Load Profile Methodology (ICF\_072) discussion ..... 3
- 3. Feedback on Substitution Type review (ICF\_054) discussion..... 4
- 4. Feedback on Summation Metering Changes (ICF\_073) discussion..... 5
- 5. Feedback on NMI Discovery for MCs discussion..... 5

## 1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback on the content of the initial draft version of the *July 2023 REMP Consultation*.

## 2. Feedback on Net System Load Profile Methodology (ICF\_072) discussion

Question	Participant Comments
<p>1. Do you agree that Option 1 best achieves the desired objectives and principles? If not, why?</p>	<p>Keep it simple</p>
<p>2. Do you believe an alternative methodology would better achieve the desired objectives and principles? Why? Please provide details of the alternative methodology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection of an alternative methodology would likely result in a delay to the longer-term methodology being implemented, as AEMO would need to develop, analyse and test this alternative.</li> </ul>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>3. Do you agree that the preferred methodology should not be implemented prior to October 2024 and that with the</p>	<p>No comment</p>

Question	Participant Comments
implementation of the new methodology should occur during a historically less volatile pricing period? If not, why?	

### 3. Feedback on Substitution Type review (ICF\_054) discussion

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree that the proposed changes, to the substitution types and reason codes, will achieve the desired objective? In not, why?	Agree with proposal, but we need more reason codes. Suggest the following rewording and new one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Device</del>-Temporarily unmetered connection point</li> <li>• Defined load method – Where Retailer/LNSP profile data based on off-market meter or other measured data that best represents the connection point load.</li> </ul>
2. Which of the proposed implementation dates do you believe should be pursued, and why?	Date should be after all proposed settlement changes. Allows time for incremental system development.

#### 4. Feedback on Summation Metering Changes (ICF\_073) discussion

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed inclusion of the three summation arrangements? If not, why?	This should only apply for existing HV connection points. A new connection point design should not have a physical restriction, allowing for standard metering.
2. Do you believe that an alternative approach would better achieve the desired objective?	In all instances, Summation metering should be avoided in new designs.
3. Is the summation method detailed enough or should it be more prescriptive?	Much more prescriptive to define or maybe better defined in the Rules Ch 5/5A.
4. Do you agree with the proposed effective date? If not, please provide an alternative effective date with reasoning.	No comment.

#### 5. Feedback on NMI Discovery for MCs discussion

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed change to the CATS Procedure? If not, why?	No relevant comment.
2. Do you believe that an alternative approach would better achieve the desired objective?	No comment.

Question	Participant Comments
3. Do you agree with the proposed effective date? If not, please provide an alternative effective date with reasoning.	Fine.