

## Appendix B Format for submissions

Printable form – Code amendment proposals

Submitter	Corrie Stobie
Organisation	Intellihub Ltd and Influx Ltd
Proposal number	<b>CRP6-002</b>

Questions	Comments
Q1. Do you agree the issue(s) identified by the Authority need attention? Any comments?	Yes We agree the issue needs attention to clarify to all participants who has use of load management.
Q2. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? Any comments?	Yes While we agree in principle of the objective the reality is that with the current evolving technologies it can't be guaranteed that Distributors are able to control load when required for a Grid Emergency.
Q3. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? Any comments?	Yes / No. Comments:
Q4. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to any other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objectives in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.	No There needs to be more consultation including all participants in the industry.
Q5. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?	
Q6. Do you have any further comments on the proposal?	Whilst we support the evolving technologies in load control, we believe that the issue is wider than just clarifying its use by Distributors and Retailers. The code also needs addressing because two parties controlling load prevent both MEPs and ATHs being compliant in numerous parts of the code such as Part 10 - 10.34 Installation and modification of metering installations. 10.7 - 2 Design Reports 10.7 19 Modification of a metering installation. 10.7 – 20 Cancellation of certification of metering installation. 10.7 – 33 Requirements for a metering installation incorporating a control device.

	10.7 – 35 Control Device bridged out Pat11 – Schedule 11.4 Table 1
Q7. Is any part of your submission confidential? If yes, please explain which part, why it is confidential and provide a publishable replacement (refer paragraphs 1.10 to 1.12 of the consultation paper)	No

## Appendix B Format for submissions

Printable form – Code amendment proposals

Submitter	Corrie Stobie
Organisation	Intellihub Ltd and Influx Ltd
Proposal number	<b>CRP6-007</b>

Questions	Comments
Q1. Do you agree the issue(s) identified by the Authority need attention? Any comments?	No The majority of ATHs use years on their certification reports and requiring them to use months will in fact cause confusion and unnecessary costs in the industry. (AS/NZS 1284 compliance tables refer to periods of years not months). Part 10.7 27 Meter certification expiry date appears to allow for the date to be calculated in years from table 1. It is the responsibility of the ATH to determine expiry dates not MEPS.
Q2. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? Any comments?	No
Q3. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? Any comments?	No
Q4. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to any other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objectives in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.	No Clarify in the code that Validity periods can be years calculated from table 1.
Q5. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?	The drafting assessments are inaccurate.
Q6. Do you have any further comments on the proposal?	
Q7. Is any part of your submission confidential? If yes, please explain which part, why it is confidential and provide a publishable replacement (refer paragraphs 1.10 to 1.12 of the consultation paper)	Yes / No. If yes, comments:

## Appendix B Format for submissions

Printable form – Code amendment proposals

Submitter	Corrie Stobie
Organisation	Intellihub Ltd and Influx Ltd
Proposal number	<b>CRP6-009</b>

Questions	Comments
Q1. Do you agree the issue(s) identified by the Authority need attention? Any comments?	Yes
Q2. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? Any comments?	Yes
Q3. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? Any comments?	Yes
Q4. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to any other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objectives in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.	Yes The wider review of the raw meter data output tests required in Table 3 has been signalled to the E.A for several years now without action. This issue is costing the industry a lot of money.
Q5. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?	
Q6. Do you have any further comments on the proposal?	
Q7. Is any part of your submission confidential? If yes, please explain which part, why it is confidential and provide a publishable replacement (refer paragraphs 1.10 to 1.12 of the consultation paper)	Yes / No. If yes, comments:

## Appendix B Format for submissions

Printable form – Code amendment proposals

Submitter	Corrie Stobie
Organisation	Intellihub Ltd and Influx Ltd
Proposal number	<b>CRP6-011</b>

Questions	Comments
Q1. Do you agree the issue(s) identified by the Authority need attention? Any comments?	Yes The issue has been a big problem for us in our stat sampling program.
Q2. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? Any comments?	Yes
Q3. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? Any comments?	Yes
Q4. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to any other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objectives in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.	No We believe the proposed amendment does not require the records of the removed metering components to be supplied to the ATH. The components have been returned and available for testing.
Q5. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?	
Q6. Do you have any further comments on the proposal?	Yes A suggested method was sent to the E.A on 10/09/2024.
Q7. Is any part of your submission confidential? If yes, please explain which part, why it is confidential and provide a publishable replacement (refer paragraphs 1.10 to 1.12 of the consultation paper)	Yes / No. If yes, comments: