2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Evoenergy

Submission Date: 04/07/2024

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?	Why have YYYY? Just have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to closer reflect the 'Interim period' in the determination. If the proposed date agreed is YYYY, must stipulate that this means financial year start. If the proposed date agreed is Q#-YYYY, must stipulate that this means calendar year Q1 etc. Not preferred. If the proposed date agreed is DD-MMM-YYYY, must stipulate that this defines the period the MC can schedule works from date, and must be first day of that month. Otherwise risk of getting too many variations. Preferred option: DD-MMM-YYYY or 1,2,3,4,5. Either way, needs qualifying statements.
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?	Preferred. Do not want to slow or impede MSATS operability and speed. Keep it simple.

Question - LMRP	Participant Comments
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?	Generally No, as participants understand their obligations and already report to AER. May want a report on 1 July 2025 where no LMRP entered.
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	LMRP MSATS field. YYYY is not preferred. Just have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to closer reflect the interim period in the determination, or DD-MMM-YYYY with qualifying statement.

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?	Yes
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?	It will do
3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?	Yes
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?	Generally No, as participants understand their obligations and already report to AER. May want a monthly automated report for FRMP/MC where: Defect field populated, and SiteRemediationStatus is Third[or Final]Notice, and SiteRemediationDate is older than 60 business days.
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 1 does not include what to do if a 3051 and 3001 are submitted instead of a 3004/3005. Preferred Option 2

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	At Step 3 of the Site Defect, Step ID 7. This was already set to SecondNotice in Step 2 of the Site Defect. This should read ThirdNotice or FinalNotice.

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, too many to monitor yet generally have the same information. There are References in this document that refer to sections deleted [11.2.(f)]

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, reduces Change Requests therefore market traffic. Simplifies participant system requirements and costs, especially new particpants.

Question – ICF 078	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed changes, will they achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	This is a long and awaited change to align the B2B and B2M address requirements.

Question – ICF 079	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the Meter Data File Format Specification NEM12 & NEM13, will achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	Yes. It allows clearer usage of what is already the current practice.No comment

5. Feedback on Embedded Network settlement anomalies

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed changes to limit: o the ability of ENMs to activate and de-activate NMI(s) retrospectively o the ability of MDPs to activate and de-activate datastreams in embedded networks retrospectively If not, why?	No comment