2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: *CitiPower Powercor*

Submission Date: *08/07/2024*

Table of Contents

1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback on the content of the initial draft of the 2024 Metering Services Review Package 1.

2. Feedback on the Implementation of the AEMC Metering Services Review Rule

Question - LMRP	Participant Comments
1) What is your preferred format (e.g. YYYY or Q#-YYYY or DD-MMM-YYYY) to meet the requirement of the ASMD Draft Rule for the LNSP?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
4) Are standing data quality reports required to be created for participants to meet their procedural obligations for LMRP? If so, what are the components of these reports?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
2) Do you agree with the proposed approach of creating two new standing data attributes of Site Remediation Status and Site Remediation Status Date to track site defects?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
4) Are standing data quality reports required to be created for participants to meet their procedural obligations for defects? If so, what are the components of these reports?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
5) Which option is preferred to manage now the defect field, site remediation status field and site remediation date field is nullified when a smart meter replaces a legacy meter which had a defect? Why is this option preferred?	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors
6) Do you believe an alternative option/approach would better achieve the desired objectives? If yes, please provide your reasoning and details of your alternative approach	CitiPower Powercor does not consider the proposed change to be applicable to Victorian distributors

3. Feedback on the AEMO review of Retailer of Last Resort processes

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the removal of the RoLR reports as proposed? If not, why?	CitiPower Powercor supports the RoLR reports being removed

4. Feedback on the Issues and Change Forms (ICFs)

Question – ICF 077	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree that the proposed changes, to the CATS Procedure and MSATS system, will achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	CitiPower Powercor supports the proposed changes

Question – ICF 078	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed changes, will they achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	CitiPower Powercor supports the proposed changes

Question – ICF 079	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the Meter Data File Format Specification	CitiPower Powercor suggests the proposed changes still provide ambiguity and seeks clarification on the following:

| NEM12 & NEM13, will achieve the desired objective? If not, why? | **Section 4.4 Interval data record (300)**

• **300 record** - *Where the same QualityMethod and ReasonCode apply to all IntervalValues in the 300 record, the QualityMethod, ReasonCode and ReasonDescription in the 300 Record must be used. If either of these fields contains multiple values for the IntervalValues, the QualityMethod in the 300 record must be set to "V" and the 400 record must be provided*
Does this imply we can't have (use?) multiple codes (eg 79, 89, and 61) and also use "A"?

• **Quality method** - *The QualityMethod applies to all IntervalValues in this record. Where multiple QualityMethods or ReasonCodes apply to these IntervalValues, a quality flag 'V' must be used*
As above, does this imply we can't have (use?) multiple codes (eg 79, 89, and 61) and also use "A"?

Section 4.5 Interval event record (400)

• **400 record -** *This record is mandatory where the QualityFlag is 'A' or 'V' in the 300 record and the quality or reason codes are not the same across the entire day, then the 400 line must be provided*
Does this now imply we <u>can</u> have (use?) an "A" with multiple codes?

• **Quality method** - *If quality flag = "A" no method required*
For reason codes 79, 89, and 61 a quality method must be provided. CitiPower Powercor recommend the following word amendment: *"If quality flag = "A" the method is optional" or "If quality flag = "A" the method must be provided if it is 79, 89, or 61".* |

5. Feedback on Embedded Network settlement anomalies

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed changes to limit: ○ the ability of ENMs to activate and de-activate NMI(s) retrospectively ○ the ability of MDPs to activate and de-activate datastreams in embedded networks retrospectively If not, why?	CitiPower Powercor supports the proposed changes