

# 2024 Metering Services Review Package 1 Consultation

## FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant:*** SA Power Networks

***Submission Date:*** 11-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 .....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?	SAPN sees YYYY would be the preferred format, while at the same time is also open to the DD-MMM-YYYY format if there is enough support and justification. However, we do not support the Q#-YYYY option.
2) Are the proposed tools (BUT and CRs) adequate to update the LMRP field?	SAPN sees the proposed tools are adequate.
3) Is AEMO coordination required for DNSPs to load LMRP into MSATS from May 2025 to 29 June 2025?	SAPN sees minimal support and coordination will be required from AEMO to ensure there should be no surprise in both the volume and schedule for performing the update.
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?	SAPN sees there would be value to run the snapshot report only for the type 5&6 NMIs. This will help ensuring all the NMIs require to be included in the LMRP and the BUT process are correctly captured.
5) Are there other considerations or approaches which could be taken to meet the requirements of the ASMD Draft Rule?	No comment.

Question - Defects	Participant Comments
1) Do you agree with the proposed Defect flag allowing an MC to record a defect in MSATS?	SAPN sees allowing the MC to record the Nature-of-defect information in MSATS instead of only the Defect flag can avoid having the need to have separate B2B transactions for exchange of the information. This can help streamline the process and better data consistency as comparing to the approach of allowing MC to record a defect with only the Defect flag in MSATS and then need to have a separate B2B transactions for the exchange the Nature-of-defect information.
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 comment.
3) Do you agree with the proposed enumerations which indicate the steps in the Site Remediation Status process?	No comment.
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 comment.
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?	SAPN sees Option 1 as the most efficient process and is our preferred option.

<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 comment.</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>SAPN supports the proposed change.</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>SAPN supports the proposed changes.</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>SAPN supports the proposed changes. However, we do not believe there is any urgency to implement this change. Given this change require changes to the</p>

	schema, SAPN see it should not proceed on its own and can wait to be included with other changes where a schema change is justified.
--	--

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?	SAPN supports the proposed changes.

## 5. Feedback on Embedded Network settlement anomalies

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed changes to limit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the ability of ENMs to activate and deactivate NMI(s) retrospectively</li> <li>o the ability of MDPs to activate and deactivate datastreams in embedded networks retrospectively</li> </ul> If not, why?	No comment.