

2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Participant: INTEGP

Submission Date:

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)..... 5
- 5. Feedback on Embedded Network settlement anomalies 6

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?	Preferred format: Q#-YYYY
2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?	Yes, the proposed tools are adequate to update the LMRP field.
3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?	No, AEMO coordination is not required for us to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025.
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?	Yes, a report would ensure that obligations are met. The components of the report are to include: - NMI
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?	Yes, we agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS.
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?	Yes, we 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.
3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?	Yes, we agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process.
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, we would not be requiring standing data quality reports for us to meet our obligations as related to site defects.
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>Option 1: For 3004/3005 or 3090/3091 only, where a legacy meter has been replaced on-site, the Defect Flag, Site Remediation Status and Date will be set to Null by AEMO.</p> <p>This option has the least development and administrative overhead.</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	

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?	We agree with the removal of the ROLR reports as proposed.

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?	We agree with the proposed changes for AEMO to automate populate the LCCD field based on NMI status.

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

Question – ICF 079	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the Meter Data File Format Specification	Yes we agree with the proposed changes

NEM12 & NEM13, will achieve the desired objective? If not, why?	
---	--

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>Yes, we agree with the proposed changes.</p>