

Summary of questions - Evoenergy - Issues Paper

<p>Consumer engagement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the key themes from Evoenergy’s engagement resonate with your own preferences? Are there additional issues you would like to see influence Evoenergy’s proposal and our assessment of the proposal? 2. Do you think Evoenergy has engaged meaningfully with consumers on all key elements of its 2024–29 proposal? Are there any key elements that require further engagement? 3. To what extent do you consider you were able to influence the topics engaged on by Evoenergy? Please give examples.
<p>Regulatory asset base</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Do you have views on Evoenergy’s proposed depreciation approach, as set out in its 2024–29 proposal?
<p>Capital expenditure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Do you consider Evoenergy’s capex proposal addresses the concerns of electricity consumers as identified in the course of its engagement on the proposal? 6. Do you consider Evoenergy has demonstrated and supported the need for the increase in augmentation capex? 7. Do you consider Evoenergy has explored all non-network options to address or alleviate the likely capacity constraints arising from the uptake of electric vehicles, including the consideration of tariff solutions and network load control options? 8. Do you consider Evoenergy’s approach to forecasting replacement capex is appropriate and likely to produce a forecast of efficient replacement capex?
<p>Contingent projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Do you consider Evoenergy’s proposed contingent project should be included as contingent project for the 2024–29 period? Are the proposed project triggers appropriate?
<p>Operating expenditure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Do you consider Evoenergy’s opex proposal addresses the concerns of electricity consumers, as identified in the course of its engagement on the 2024–29 proposal? 11. Do you consider Evoenergy’s forecast opex for the 2024–29 period reasonably reflects the efficient costs of a prudent operator? 12. Do you consider Evoenergy’s opex in its base year of 2021–22 as providing an efficient basis for forecast base opex for the 2024–29 period? 13. Do you support Evoenergy’s distributed energy resource integration step change, and consider that it meets stakeholder expectations? 14. Do you support the security of critical infrastructure step change, and consider that Evoenergy has provided a sufficient level of information to articulate the requirement to uplift its relevant security program?
<p>Corporate income tax</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Do you have views on the approach to corporate income tax in Evoenergy’s 2024–29 proposal?

Incentive schemes and allowances

16. Do you consider the EBSS carryover amounts proposed by Evoenergy provide for a fair sharing of the efficiency gains and losses it has achieved in the 2019–24 period?
17. Do you consider applying the EBSS to Evoenergy again in the 2024–29 period would provide it a continuous incentive to reduce its opex?
18. If we apply the EBSS to Evoenergy in the 2024–29 period, are there any cost categories that we should exclude from the scheme?

Control mechanisms

19. What do you consider to be an appropriate rate for a margin recovered on quoted services? Should this be set at the average nominal WACC for the period, or some fixed value (e.g., 6%)?
20. Do you consider the tax component of the quoted services price control formulae should be set at the corporate tax rate of 30%, or an alternative rate?
21. Do you consider the AER should review the current price cap form of control for legacy metering services following the AEMC’s decision?
22. More generally, do you have any comments on Evoenergy’s proposed control mechanisms?

Tariff structure statement

23. Is there any adjustment to its TSS you think Evoenergy should make in order to mitigate its proposed capital expenditure?
24. Do you consider Evoenergy has demonstrated and supported its proposed contingency to assign electric vehicle owners to its demand tariff if its triggers are met?

Ancillary network services

25. Do you consider that sufficient justification has been provided in the provision of new services?
26. Do you consider the proposed labour rates and fee-based prices to be reasonable?

Metering

27. Do you consider legacy metering cost recovery should be socialised at the network level, or be left to retailers?
28. Do you consider accelerated depreciation of the legacy metering asset bases to be preferable to wind up legacy metering charges?
29. More generally, do you have any comments on Evoenergy’s proposed cost recovery for legacy metering services?

Transmission pricing

30. Do you consider Evoenergy’s proposed changes to its pricing methodology for the 2024–29 period appropriate and that they give effect to the pricing principles for prescribed transmission services and the pricing methodology guidelines? ,
31. More generally, do you have any comments on Evoenergy’s proposed pricing methodology for the 2024–29 period?