

1. Please confirm the target percentage of LED penetration and the year – The Energex Alternative Control Services Document has contradicting target percentages and year (i.e. pg 11, section 10 mentions that a target of 47% LED penetration is programed to be achieved by 2020. In contrast pg 15 section 13.3 mentions LED will form around 40% of the public lighting in Southeast Queensland by the end of 2025.
2. The proposal mentions that this program is driven by customer funding, however does not make mention of Councils obligations if they were to sign up to be a part of this program. (I.e. If Council does not have the budget to fund this program and meet Energex's targets what are the consequences?)
3. Given that the program is driven by customer funding, further clarification is required in regards to the capital costs that Council will need to bear (and in turn plan for in their budgets) to drive this program.
4. Clarification is required regarding the costing determined for NPL4 tariff. If Council is funding the cost of converting NPL1 lights to NPL4 shouldn't the NPL4 tariff represent something similar to NPL2? Based on table 61 of the Energex Regulatory Proposal 2020-25, NPL4 tariff and NPL1 tariff are almost the same despite Council funding the LED conversion.
5. Further clarification is required as to what the process would be should Council not agree to this program and/or if Energex is required to fund the conversion of NPL1 and NPL2 lights? (I.e. if Energex was to convert a NPL2 light to LED, will the luminaire become Energex Asset despite Council funding the initial installation? Will the converted light remain as NPL2 or will it be transferred to NPL4 which has a higher tariff despite Council funding its initial installation?)