

2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Origin Energy

Submission Date: 11th 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?	Origin supports the format of DD-MMM-YYYY with a clear definition that the date is the 'LMRP due date' as per LMRP schedule. For avoidance of doubt, field name should be self-explanatory, i.e., LMRP due date
2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?	Origin supports the use of BUT tool for initial LMRP data population in MSATS, followed by CRs for any subsequent change in that field to ensure the CATS history model is maintained.
3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?	Yes, Origin supports AEMO's coordination in managing LMRP data population in MSATS, similar to the MSDR project as it worked seamlessly across all participants.
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?	<p>Origin recommends new SQ reports to be developed and sent to the current FRMPs every week as an RM-xx individual results and summary report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key components of this RM report should be based on the new standing data fields that are being created as a consequence of ASMD rule change, including (not limited to) NMIs in current LMRP year for a particular FRMP, NMIs that are overdue NMIs with defect flag, and NMIs with different Site Remediation Statuses and Dates. • Second RM report should provide any missing values in Site Remediation Status and Dates where defect has been flagged.

Question - LMRP	Participant Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="987 284 1910 384">• Origin suggests another report be created and issued to the new/current FRMPs end of each month with NMIs that have LMRP year as the 'current year' where a FRMP has changed due to an in-situ or move-in transfer.
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	No further comments

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
<p>1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?</p>	<p>Origin supports the defect flag to be updated and maintained by the current MC in MSATS.</p> <p>While Origin understands that AEMO has removed the ‘Defect Type’ from this issues paper, Origin strongly supports the defect ‘information’ to be also stored in MSATS for operational efficiencies. This may be subject to the clarification provided in the AEMC’s final rule; however the site defect information can be stored in MSATS in a way that does not overlap with any customer specific information. For e.g. ‘obstruction’ may be customer specific, however ‘asbestos board’ is site specific that may have no correlation with customer data.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Agree, however in addition to these two fields, we also suggest ‘Defect Type’ to be included in MSATS.</p>
<p>3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?</p>	<p>Origin agrees with the allowed values, however for avoidance of doubt, Origin suggests that since ‘RemediationSuccessful’ is based on customer advise and may not be the true reflection of remediation status unless MP revisits and confirms. Origin suggests a clear definition of this value and updating the name to ‘RemediationConfirmed.’</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Origin recommends a new SQ report to be developed and sent to the current FRMPs every week as an RM-xx individual results and summary report.</p> <p>The key components of this RM report should provide any errors in the standing data, e.g. NMIs with missing values in Site Remediation Status and Dates where defect has been flagged.</p>

<p>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?</p>	<p>Origin supports option 1, i.e. where a legacy meter has been replaced on-site, the Defect Flag, Site Remediation Status and Site Remediation Date will be set to Null by AEMO.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>No further comments</p>

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

Question	Participant Comments
<p>1. Do you agree with the removal of the RoLR reports as proposed? If not, why?</p>	<p>Origin agrees with the proposed approach</p>

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

Question – ICF 077	Participant Comments
<p>1. Do you agree that the proposed changes, to the CATS Procedure and MSATS system, will achieve the desired objective? If not, why?</p>	<p>Origin agrees with the proposed changes associated with this LCCD field</p>

Question – ICF 078	Participant Comments
<p>1. Do you agree with the proposed changes, will they achieve the desired objective? If not, why?</p>	<p>Origin agrees with the proposed changes associated with address fields and supports the concept of establishing an Energy Addressing Standard linked to AS4590.1:2017.</p> <p>Having said that, Origin highly recommends a single release cycle to implement these schema changes across the board to ensure there are no address element mismatches in participants’ application systems, especially for those who operate in both electricity and gas markets.</p>

Question – ICF 079	Participant Comments
<p>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?</p>	<p>Origin has no objections with this proposal</p>

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 de-activate NMI(s) retrospectively 	<p>Origin has concerns with AEMO’s proposal and do not agree with the proposal to no longer allow retrospective NMI activation and deactivation as it will have a negative impact on our on-market embedded network (EN) customers. All NMI activations and de-activations are retrospectively applied. This is due to us being</p>

<p>o the ability of MDPs to activate and deactivate datastreams in embedded networks retrospectively</p> <p>If not, why?</p>	<p>notified after the fact of a meter change. No longer allowing for these changes to be retrospectively applied will cause billing issues for our on-market customers.</p> <p>To provide further context, the instance where an EN customer has gone on-market (i.e. left the embedded network), it often takes 2-3 days (sometimes up to a week) for a meter replacement to take place and then advise Origin of the new meter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Origin ENM then process a change request to update the status of the NMI to reflect that the new meter is "A" = Active• If the customer is moving to off-market, we change the status to "N" = Non-Active. <p>These advices, as to the change of meter, can only be processed by us once we are advised of the new meter details. We then back-date the status change to equal the meter exchange date. The status change date is important, as this is the official date that the new Retailer can take over the billing for this meter.</p>
--	---