

2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: EnergyAustralia

Submission Date: 11 July 2024

Table of Contents

- 1. Context 3
- 2. Feedback on the Implementation of the AEMC Metering Services Review Rule 3
- 3. Feedback on the AEMO review of Retailer of Last Resort processes..... 6
- 4. Feedback on the Issues and Change Forms (ICFs)..... 6
- 5. Feedback on Embedded Network settlement anomalies 7

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?	DD-MMM-YYYY
2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?	Yes
3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?	Yes
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?	The report required needs to contain the NMI; LMRP date; Defect type; site remediation status;
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	Unlike VIC, this smart meter rollout is landed on the retailer, from communication, appointments, customer service, issues management, complaint management and potential bad debt where customers can't pay accounts or for site upgrades. There is not a standard approach to either customer communication or financial support for customers to upgrade sites. We will be impacted by all of this as well as the 'One in All in' proposed solution. The responsibility should be shared between the DB's and the retailers especially on the Shared fuse process. We dismissed looking at the most efficient way to

Question - LMRP	Participant Comments
	manage these replacements – there is no standard or requirement for anyone other than the retailer to manage this.

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?	EA Support this
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?	EA Support this
3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?	EA Support this
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?	The report required needs to contain the NMI; LMRP date; Defect type; site remediation status;
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?	Option 2, is preferred. This will give an audit trail to follow if required and will also be able to be managed by just the one party raising the CR and then AEMO being able to manage the updates.
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	N/A

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?	Yes EA support this

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?	Yes EA support this

Question – ICF 078	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed changes, will they achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	Yes EA support this

Question – ICF 079	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the Meter Data File Format Specification	Yes EA support this

NEM12 & NEM13, will achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	
---	--

5. Feedback on Embedded Network settlement anomalies

Question	Participant Comments
<p>1. Do you agree with the proposed changes to limit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the ability of ENMs to activate and deactivate NMI(s) retrospectively o the ability of MDPs to activate and deactivate datastreams in embedded networks retrospectively <p>If not, why?</p>	<p>EA would support this position of our EMN to ensure that they can still function and facilitate EN settlements as required for TENC.</p>