

Subject: Submission: Exposure Draft – Electricity Industry (AES) Regulations 2025 – Feedback on Interaction between SPN and OPS Definitions
Date: Tuesday, 27 January 2026 12:35:33 PM

1. Context

Edenlife owns and operates land lease communities (lifestyle villages) in Western Australia. Under the Exposure Draft, our communities fall within the definition of a Single Property Network (SPN). We intend to register as an SPN AES provider upon commencement of the regulations.

2. The Issue: Ambiguity regarding SPN-Owned Distributed Generation

We seek urgent clarification regarding the definition of On-site Power Supply (OPS) AES in Regulation 11. Specifically, we are concerned that the current drafting inadvertently captures distributed generation assets that are owned by the SPN operator and integrated into the SPN network, creating a "double registration" requirement that contradicts the commercial reality of the service.

3. Our Operational Model

Edenlife installs solar PV assets within the village to support the microgrid. The mechanics of our model are:

Asset Ownership: Edenlife retains full ownership and maintenance liability for the PV assets.

Connection Point: The PV assets are connected in front of the revenue meter (child meter).

Asymmetric Deployment: Solar panels are installed only on a subset of homes, sufficient to meet the aggregate load of the village. Not every home hosts panels.

Uniform Product: All residents - regardless of whether their home hosts solar panels - receive the exact same electricity product and tariff structure.

4. The Ambiguity: Physical Location vs. Commercial Entitlement

Regulation 11(2) defines an OPS AES as existing where there is an arrangement facilitating a person's entitlement to consume electricity from an OPS system located on their land.

A strict reading of the draft regulations creates a regulatory absurdity in our village:

Resident A (Host): Has panels on their roof. The regulator could deem them to have an "implied entitlement" to that power (Reg 11(2)(c)), requiring Edenlife to register as an OPS AES provider for this home.

Resident B (Non-Host): Has no panels. They receive the exact same supply from the SPN pool but would only fall under the SPN AES framework.

Furthermore, we have a "bundled" component to our tariff structure - the first 5kWh consumed per day is included in the rent - any consumption over and above the first 5kWh is metered and billed accordingly. There is a risk that a regulator may interpret this concession for Resident A as an "implied entitlement" to the solar on their roof, whereas for Resident B it is clearly just a retail tariff feature.

In reality, the panels on Resident A's roof are network infrastructure. The electricity they generate feeds the common pool. Resident A has no special right to the electrons generated on their roof compared to Resident B. The location is determined by engineering requirements, not by a customer request for solar.

5. Regulatory Consequence

Without clarification, Edenlife faces the risk of needing to register as an OPS AES merely because we utilise available roof space for network generation assets. This would trigger duplicative fees, reporting, and Ombudsman obligations for a service that is already fully regulated under the SPN AES registration.

6. Suggested Amendment

We request that DEED clarify that generation assets forming part of the SPN infrastructure do not constitute an OPS AES, even if located on a resident's dwelling.

Proposed Drafting insertion for Regulation 11:

We suggest adding a sub-regulation to Regulation 11:

(5) The supply of electricity from an OPS system is not an OPS AES if:

(a) The OPS system is owned or operated by the holder of an SPN AES registration for the Single Property; AND

(b) The electricity generated by the OPS system is supplied to the person as part of the SPN AES supply measured by the parent meter or child meter, and not via a separate commercial arrangement specific to the OPS system output.

We believe this clarification will correctly categorise distributed network assets under the SPN framework and avoid unintended "double regulation" of single-service customers.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Hicks

Consultant to Edenlife