

2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: Ausgrid

Submission Date: 11/7/24

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..... 5
- 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
<p>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?</p>	<p>Ausgrid’s strong preference is either of these Q#-YYYY or DD-MMM-YYYY.</p> <p>Ausgrid strongly urges AEMO to allow participants flexibility in the population of the LMRP field. This is critical for the successful scheduling of multi occupancy one in all in works and overall meter reading route efficiency. Ausgrid is currently negotiating with a number of participants around identification of flexible LMRP dates within each LMRP year.</p> <p>Once a format is decided a standard arrangement must be agreed between all LNSPs. Is it the start or the finish of the LMRP year (i.e. 01072025 or 30062026).</p> <p>Ausgrid does not support YYYY.</p>
<p>2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?</p>	<p>Ausgrid supports the use of the BUT for initial load and CRs for any updates.</p>
<p>3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?</p>	<p>AEMO should consult with industry and allow for LNSP to schedule updates using the BUT.</p>
<p>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>	<p>AEMO should provide reports to LNSPs where a Type 5/6 NMI does not have an appropriate LMRP date populated.</p>

<p>5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?</p>	<p>Why are greenfield sites included in LMRP assessment? A NMI should not be in MSATS without a meter installed.</p> <p>LMRP date should not be nulled after the legacy meter is replaced for reporting purposes.</p> <p>Individual CSV files will not be provided once the LMRP date has been populated in MSATS.</p>
<p>Question - Defects</p>	<p>Participant Comments</p>
<p>1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>LNSP must have visibility of this flag (pending the outcome of the final rule).</p> <p>Allowing the LNSP visibility of the defect flag allows the LNSP to make an assessment of whether the site has been visited by an MP and a defect exists. This in turn allows the LNSP to make an assessment on meter reading route scheduling and when to convert walking routes to an alternate strategy.</p> <p>Allowing LNSP defect visibility, would also assist in minimising wasted LNSP scoping visits. If a retailer raises a TIGS scoping SO on a NMI where a defect already exists for another NMI associated with the scoping, which the retailer who is raising the new TIGS scoping SO has no visibility of, the LNSP could close off the SO as defect exists to that retailers scoping SO request.</p> <p>As it is proposed that the defect flag should remain in use after the acceleration period, Ausgrid suggest that the defect flag should be able to be used on non legacy meter NMIs.</p>
<p>2) Do you agree with the proposed approach of creating two new standing data attributes of Site Remediation Status and</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Site Remediation Status Date to track site defects?	
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?	Ausgrid does not require reports for defect, just visibility of them in MSATS NMI standing data.
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?	Ausgrid supports option 1 or 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	No.

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. Ausgrid notes that the referencing in the procedures has not been updated and do not align. Suggest AEMO conduct a review and update as required.

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.

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

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.

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>With the future implementation of Flexible Trading Arrangements, Ausgrid believes that this issue should be further discussed with industry rather than a blanket rule. AEMO should audit ENMs for compliance and report any discrepancies to the AER.</p>