

IN003/20 – Gas Life Support Supplementary Questionnaire

Responses to be emailed to grcf@aemo.com.au by due **COB 31 March 2020**.

Review comments submitted by: *EnergyAustralia*

Date: *27 March 2020*

Contact Person: *Lexi Harris* (Lexi.Harris@energyaustralia.com.au)

Topic	Please Provide Response Here
Question 1 – Benefits of change	
<p>Please provide, in detail, what benefits the change will have on your organisation (in terms of efficiency, customer benefits, privacy, etc.). If any monetary benefits are provided (e.g. in terms of annual FTE savings), these will be kept confidential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in emails between retailers and gas distributors to clarify Life Support details; most of this interaction can be moved to B2B via LSRs and responding LSNs. However, the number of registered gas life support customers is low, thus the volume of email communications currently is low. • Due to low volumes of gas life support registrations compared to electricity, EnergyAustralia does not believe this change would result in significant FTE savings. • Transaction acknowledgement (accept or reject) will improve data quality and efficiency. • Alignment of transaction delivery to aseXML will reduce further cost and effort of gas schema upgrade/alignment in the future.
Question 2 – Costs of change	
<p>Please provide what costs the change will create for your organisation as an order of magnitude (i.e. "low", "medium", or "high"). If any monetary values (e.g. once-off implementation costs, and any ongoing annual cost)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost impact for EnergyAustralia is high. • EnergyAustralia requires 7-12 months for formal impact assessment and implementation • Energy Australia's implementation timeframe is subject to change pending more in-depth impact assessment.

<p>are provided (e.g. in terms of the cost of system changes), these will be kept confidential.</p>																		
<p>Question 3 – Volume of gas life support customers</p>																		
<p>Please provide the volume of gas life support customers your organisation currently has registered. Please also provide the average rate of gas life support registrations and deregistrations per month for your organisation, as well as any notes you would like to provide on how AEMO should interpret these data.</p>	<p>EnergyAustralia currently has approximately 3,300 gas accounts registered for life support and this number is slowly increasing. EnergyAustralia receives approximately 10 new gas life support registrations per day; however, following system enhancements this volume has been declining since December 2019. EnergyAustralia processes approximately 5-6 gas life support de-registrations per day.</p>																	
<p>Question 4 – Alternatives to LSN and LSR</p>																		
<p>If AEMO decides not to recommend the adoption of LSN and LSR, will your organisation likely make any changes to your existing implementation of the Gas Life Support Industry Guide process?. If so, provide details on the type of changes you intend to put forward.</p>	<p>EnergyAustralia will not make any changes to its current gas life support process if this change does not proceed. LSNs will continue to be delivered to distributors in an encrypted CSV file via email. EnergyAustralia will continue to liaise directly with gas distributors to facilitate reconciliations.</p>																	
<p>Question 5 – Value Rating (1-7)</p>																		
<p>Please indicate your organisation's value rating if the proposal to adopt the LSN and LSR aseXML transactions proceeds, as compared with the status quo or the alternative(s) identified in Question 4. Please select one of the following.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Value Rating</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>																
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1002 851 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 =</td> <td>Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 =</td> <td>Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 =</td> <td>Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 =</td> <td>No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 =</td> <td>Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 =</td> <td>Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 =</td> <td>Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Rating	Description	1 =	Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds	2 =	Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds	3 =	Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds	4 =	No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds	5 =	Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds	6 =	Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds	7 =	Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds
Rating			Description															
1 =			Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds															
2 =			Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds															
3 =			Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds															
4 =			No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds															
5 =			Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds															
6 =	Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
7 =	Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1042 851 1082"> <tr> <td>1 =</td> <td>Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	1 =	Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds																
1 =	Large negative outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1082 851 1121"> <tr> <td>2 =</td> <td>Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	2 =	Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds																
2 =	Moderate negative outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1121 851 1161"> <tr> <td>3 =</td> <td>Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	3 =	Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds																
3 =	Small negative outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1161 851 1201"> <tr> <td>4 =</td> <td>No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	4 =	No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds																
4 =	No net benefit or cost if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1201 851 1241"> <tr> <td>5 =</td> <td>Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	5 =	Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds																
5 =	Small positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1241 851 1281"> <tr> <td>6 =</td> <td>Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	6 =	Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds																
6 =	Moderate positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 1281 851 1321"> <tr> <td>7 =</td> <td>Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds</td> </tr> </table>	7 =	Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds																
7 =	Large positive outcome if proposal proceeds																	

Question 6 – Any other comments?		
Does your organisation have any other comments that it wishes AEMO to consider in its formulation of the IIR?	<p><i>EnergyAustralia would prefer the CDN/CDR uplift to occur at the same time. We see a more positive benefit in combining the gas life support and CDN uplift changes.</i></p> <p><i>Due to cost of implementation and small volumes of gas life support registrations the net benefit of this change on its own is low.</i></p>	