

# Load Profiling Methodologies

## FIRST STAGE CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant:*** Alinta Energy

***Submission Date:*** 27 October 2022

# Table of Contents

- 1. Context ..... 3
- 2. Feedback on Load Profiling Objectives and Principles ..... 3
- 3. Feedback on Load Profiling Methodologies ..... 3
- 4. Feedback on proposed Other Matters ..... 4
- 5. Other Issues Related to the Load Profiling Methodologies and Other Matters ..... 5

## 1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback on the content of the initial draft version of the *Load Profiling Methodologies*.

## 2. Feedback on Load Profiling Objectives and Principles

Question	Participant Comments
1. Do you agree with the proposed objectives and principles?	The proposed objectives and principles seem appropriate to address the issue identified.
2. Are there any other objectives and principles you believe should be considered?	N/A

## 3. Feedback on Load Profiling Methodologies

Question	Participant Comments
1. Which methodology do you consider would best achieve the objectives and principles? Why?	Alinta Energy does not have a strong view on whether options 5, 5(a) or 6 would best achieve the objectives and principles- all rank closely according to AEMO's grading criteria. Option 5(a) and 6 are slightly preferred as option 5(a) does provide a buffer either side of the profile crossing the x-axis. Option 6 addresses the negative (below the x-axis) events and reduced the risk of spikes.

Question	Participant Comments
<p>2. Do you consider that an alternative methodology would better achieve the objectives and principles? Please note that the selection of an alternative methodology would likely result in a delay to the longer-term methodology being implemented, as AEMO would need to develop, analysis and test this alternative.</p>	<p>This would require further analysis by FRMPs and interested parties. The chosen option should be reviewed and refined over time (as we suspect AEMO will do anyway) and if changed further, consulted on with market participants.</p>
<p>3. Do you believe the preferred methodology should be applied to both 5MLPs and NSLPs where the observed conditions have been met? If no, why?</p>	<p>For consistency, the preferred method should apply to both the 5MLPs and the NSLPs.</p>
<p>4. When do you consider the preferred methodology should be implemented? On 30 May 2023?</p>	<p>We do not have specific views on implementation date for the preferred approach, but May 2023 provides time for AEMO to build, apply (and test) the method selected.</p>

#### 4. Feedback on proposed Other Matters

Question	Participant Comments
<p>1. Do you agree that the proposed amendments associated with obtaining and applying embedded network codes provide for the correct interpretation of the</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Question	Participant Comments
<p>procedures, as well as achieving industry objectives? If no, then please provide a better alternative.</p>	
<p>2. Do you agree that the inclusion of the 'House Number To Suffix' element enables a better quality site address to be recorded for energy participants? If not, please specify your reasoning.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>3. Do you agree with the proposal to removal of the current NMI Discovery Type 3 validation? If not, please specify your reasoning.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

## 5. Other Issues Related to the Load Profiling Methodologies and Other Matters

Stakeholders to provide details of other Load Profiling Methodologies related aspects that have not been included in the issues paper and provide details.

Participant Comments

Participant Comments