2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant*: Alinta Energy*

Submission Date*: 15th July 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?	The preference would be YYYY, subject to confirmation of this is calendar year and any data loaded in a partial calendar year as a result of go-live date, provides data for the following year. For example, a go-live 01-JUL-2025 would not have any dates as 2025, only 2026.
2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?	Alinta's preference is for CRs to be processed (with agreed volumes & timing) to ensure that internal systems are updated upon receipt of the transacation from market.
3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?	No preference recorded.
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?	No preference recorded.
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	The transparent and consistent engagement of FRMP with DNSP will be critical to success.

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?	Yes. Alinta would like to see this as a B2B transaction and recommend AEMO consider the inclusion of an effective date field to ensure that participants are aware of the date the defect flag is activated and removed / cleared.
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?	No. Given the high likelihood of changes to customers associated with the standing data, along with changes to FRMP due to insitu movements, this is will overly complicate the solution & retailer obligations. In addition, this data is not fit for purpose to standing data.
3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?	Partial. The process itself is agreeable bar the response provided above in question 2. It will also require some additional clarity to ensure that when FRMP role changes during the process, it is clear what the role & responsibilities are / where they pick up, as a result of the change in participants.
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?	No preference recorded.
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?	Alinta supports Option 1 - the auto update of MSATS following a successful meter exchange being processed in market. As a participant, we would expect to have a B2B transaction receipted that acknowledges the clearance of the field and effective date associated with this.
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	Please see above.

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?	No preference recorded.

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?	Agree.

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

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?	Agree.

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 preference recorded.