

Power of Choice Procedures Working Group (POC-PWG) 7 July 2016 Workshop

Meeting notes

Attendees

Name	Company
Tim Sheridan	AEMO (Chair)
Noura Elhawary	AEMO
Roy Kaplan	AEMO
David Ripper	AEMO
Peter Gunn	AEMO
Evy Papadopoulos	AEMO
Jeff Roberts	ActewAGL
Helen Stimpson	Active Stream
Ty Crowhurst	Acumen
Shane McDonald	Agility CIS
Mark Riley	AGL
Paul Willacy	Aurora Energy
Stephen Zok	Ausgrid
Jackie Krizmanic	AusNet Services
Justin Betlehem	AusNet Services
Mark Pilkington	Citi Power/Powercor
Peter Cole	ENA
Dino Ou	Endeavour Energy
Georgina Snelling	Energy Australia
Rob McDougall	Energy Australia
Gareth Morrah	Ergon Energy
Tony Woolfe	Essential Energy
Joanne Rankine	GMDR
Mansour Rahimi	Jemena
Nirav Rajuru	Jemena
Mara Tennis	Lumo/Red Energy
Andrew Mair	M2
Charles Coulson	Metropolis Metering
Aakash Sembey	Momentum Energy
Darren Bailey	Origin
Katie Lippens	Origin
Malcolm Hempel	Pacific Hydro
Kam Vessali	Power & Water Corporation
Ian Wolhuter	Powermetric
Haiden Jones	Powershop
David Woods	SA Power
Lance McMinn	Secure Australasia
David Sales	TasNetworks
Nichole Chaplin	United Energy
Verity Watson	United Energy
Brett McLean	United Energy
Ben Davidson	United Energy
Dean Van Gerrevink	Vector

Important Note

The intent of this document is to capture the commentary in summary form, from the POC Procedures Working Group (POC-PWG) meeting on 7th July 2016. The topics under discussion were led by the slides provided for the day and were presented by AEMO representatives.

The information on the slides is not reproduced here, nor are the comments provided to the slides from the presenter, save for a summary of the discussion or in direct response to a question from an attendee.

Please note that procedure changes must be made in accordance with the NER Rules consultation procedures and therefore, all matters discussed will be considered by AEMO and will assist in AEMO to determine the content of relevant procedures, but should not be taken as a representation, or agreement, express or implied, as to the final procedure changes.

Introduction

T. Sheridan (Chair) welcomed all those in attendance and thanked all participants who provided submissions during the first stage of consultation. He noted:

- The purpose of the meeting was to inform participants of the key issues from the draft determination and to assist participants in preparing their submissions for the second stage of consultation.
- Scope for the discussion was limited to the material contained in the draft determination for package 1.
- No decisions would be made by AEMO at the meeting and participants were encouraged to raise issues in their submissions, clearly explaining their views and offering alternative drafting suggestions.
- AEMO had previously notified participants of its decision to extend the second stage consultation window by a further 4 business days, with participants now having until 20th July to provide their second stage submissions.
- AEMO noted the following corrections to the draft report and determination:
 - Section 3 of the draft report – 12 material issues are noted, but there should only be 11, as reflected in the discussion of these material issues in section 4
 - Appendix A (Tables 6 and 7) – there are some incorrect cross-references to material issues in the draft report. AEMO indicated that it will amend the document containing these cross-references and post it on the POC consultations webpage
- AEMO also noted that it was following up with several participants where further information was required to clarify a participant's submission. AEMO intends to collate this further information in document and post it on the POC consultations page.

Participants raised the following questions:

- Will the new Glossary and Framework document be consulted on for packages 2 and 3? AEMO indicated that the Glossary will be consulted on for packages 2 and 3 and that in the future, it would be consulted on alongside the impacted procedures subject to the Rules consultation procedures.
- Participants questioned if clause numbers change in the Rules, why do we have to reference particular Rules clause numbers in the procedures? AEMO's response is that it is preferable to refer to the Rules by clause numbers rather than repeating or reinstating the law in the procedures.

- Participants raised that by removing duplication in some of procedures, the industry may end up with an incomplete set of procedures. AEMO clarified that it has reviewed all of the procedures and removed duplication with the Rules in order to avoid any misalignment between changes to the text of particular Rules clauses and the procedures. Participants were encouraged to raise examples in their submissions where removing duplication may cause process gaps.
- Participants suggested that if some of the definitions were being deleted or would be expiring, such as those relating to VIC AMI, it would be useful to keep those definitions in the Glossary rather than having to source them in old versions of the Rules. AEMO noted this and indicated that it would be considered during the final determination.

Topic 1 – Metrology Procedures (Jurisdictional Metrology)

R. Kaplan presented this topic. The key points were as follows:

- AEMO has engaged the Jurisdictions through the Commonwealth (DOIIS) to review the jurisdictional material in the Metrology Procedures. This review is to ensure that the material is still accurate, relevant and required. DOIIS is coordinating a process with the relevant jurisdictional regulators to obtain approval to make these amendments.
- The proposed amendments are in two tranches:
 - Tranche 1: - updated terminology to accommodate Rule changes (i.e. replace RP with MC, etc.)
 - Tranche 2: - review all material for relevance
- The amendments for Tranche 1 have been incorporated in consultation for package 1. The amendments for Tranche 2 will be incorporated in the consultations for package 2 and 3.

Participants raised the following questions:

- Will some jurisdictions be able to decide on their own reversion policy? AEMO confirmed the new Rules do not allow for reversion.
- Why is reversion still in the Metrology Procedures? AEMO indicated that it cannot remove those sections from the Procedure unless COAG-EC requests removal.
- A loophole in NSW jurisdictional material may permit the installation of meters between 100MW and 160MW for commercial customers. Does the COAG-EC have any views on this? AEMO suggested that participants contact the COAG-EC with this information along with any other requests they may have.

Topic 2 – Metrology Procedures (Type 4A Metering Installations)

R. Kaplan presented this topic (please refer to the slides).

Participants raised the following questions:

- Is it possible to have type 4A above small, as in Chapter 7 of the Rules it goes up to 750MW? AEMO indicated that this is possible.
- What are the requirements for forward estimates for type 4A, and is it possible to have forward estimates for type 4A meters? AEMO answered that type 4A meters would only be required on an exceptional basis. The requirements for forward estimates for type 4A are the same as those for other manually read interval metering installations.
- Participants raised concerns that if type 4A and type 4 meters are treated differently with regards to meter readings that this may cause issues in relation to meter churn, especially in

areas where communications are unreliable and can be turned on and off. Participants suggested the harmonisation between 4 and 4A by applying similar methods to both meter types.

- What is the requirement for storing the reason of installing a type 4A meter (i.e. customer refusal or no comms)? This reason should be stored in MSATS and it should be NMI discoverable. AEMO clarified that type 4A meters are exceptional cases and the MC or retailer should be storing this information in their systems.
- Participants questioned which definition of small customer is to be used? AEMO clarified the definitions to be used are those provided in Rules.

Topic 3 – MSATS Procedures: Embedded Networks

D. Ripper presented this topic (please refer to the slides).

Participants raised the following questions:

- Why isn't ENM identified on the parent NMI and stored in the NSP2 field? This would allow for the identification of the ENM for an embedded network. AEMO clarified that a list of embedded networks and their assigned ENMs will be published by AEMO.
- DNSPs questioned the retention of a NMI when it moves from a DNSP network to an embedded network. Some DNSPs considered the NMI should be made extinct, while others indicated this should be a "may" requirement to allow DNSPs to choose whether to extinguish the NMI or not.
- AEMO clarified that it proposed to retain the NMI, but it will take into consideration the new feedback, and that the NMI Procedure which is part of package 2, will be the right place where this obligation will be and where participants can provide their feedback.
- It was suggested that ENMs be added to the ROCL.

Topic 4 – MSATS Procedures: Disconnection and Reconnection (Site Identifier)

N. Elhawary presented this topic (please refer to the slides).

Participants raised the following suggestions:

- For remote disconnection status at the meter level, the retailer should be sent the MSATS notification for the remote disconnection and that the meter register status should be NMI discoverable.
- An obligation should be added on the DNSP to notify the retailer of a remote disconnection to be consistent with the NERR.
- The obligation on the FRMP to notify the DNSP of a remote disconnection should not be in the MSATS Procedures as the notification will not occur in MSATS.

Topic 5 – MSATS Procedures: AEMO Administered Fields

N. Elhawary presented this topic (please refer to the slides).

Participants raised the following suggestions:

- There is no value in making the fields "controlled load" and "Time of Day" AEMO administered fields. These are "nice to have" changes should not be a priority as there are more important changes to consider.

Topic 6 – MSATS Procedures: Objection Codes

N. Elhawary presented this topic (please refer to the slides).

Participants made the following comments:

- There was general agreement with keeping the BADMETER objection code for the CR1000 series.
- The BADMETER scenario that AEMO presented for CR505x is not relevant as objections are not valid for CR505x series. The objection logging period is zero which means no objections are allowed.
- There was general disagreement from Participants with the proposal to reduce the objection logging period from 5 to 1 business day. Comments from Participants included:
 - The proposed changes will have a material impact on operations for 2nd tier retailers, who do not have the resources or automated systems to meet a 1 day objection logging period.
 - AEMO has not provided a cost-benefit analysis for the proposed change.
 - Objections are likely to increase substantially as retailers and LNSPs will have not enough time to review the CRs and, as a result, they will just object to be able to have time to review it.
 - What are AEMO's projections for the potential increase in objections?
 - Further clarification is required on the MSATS data referred to by AEMO indicating that 92% objections occur within 1 business day. What proportions of CRs make up this 92% and what about the remaining 8%? Will AEMO still permit objections of more than 1 business day for these?
- Instead reducing the objection logging period, participants suggested that the objection clearing period be reduced from 20 to 15 business days.
- Changes to the objection logging period should be considered under the AEMC's Customer Switching Review, not this consultation.

Other Business

Participants raised the following matters under other business:

- The Metrology Procedure Part B only allows types 51 and 52 substitution methods to be used for VICAMI meters. It was suggested that AEMO allows all substitution methods currently applicable to type 5 meters to be used for VICAMI meters.
- Clause 12.1.1 of Metrology Part A has elements that are not related to the network device procedure, as there is a network device definition in the rules. It was noted that AEMO is required to provide a deeming provision for network devices.
- It was suggested that significant alarms in the Metrology Procedures be aligned with the MDFF Reason Codes (Appendix E). These should be harmonised with the Metrology Procedure.
- Why is there are no obligation on the MDP to provide reactive energy data to anyone in the MDP Service Level Procedure?
- It's difficult to reference procedures after the removal sub-clause numbers. AEMO clarified that it is trying to create a narrative around sub-headings and grouping provisions together that fit in the same section. AEMO is happy to include further sub-headings and section clause numbers if participants can provide particular examples.
- Clause 9.3 of Metrology Procedure Part B – this type of obligation should only apply to large customers.
- MDP Service Level Procedure - the clause related to de-activating the MDM datastream after physical de-energisation should be re-worded to let the MDP provide data if it is there.

- Clause 2(c) of MDFF should be redrafted to “use best endeavours to ensure” instead of “must ensure”. However, if AEMO is to keep must ensure they need to add to the clause that the MDP must ensure all NMI suffixes associated with a NMI for a single read event/date are included in the same 100-900 event block.
- In relation to the making the Network Tariff Code mandatory, it was suggested that:
 - The C7 report should be made available to MPs at anytime
 - The C4 report can also be generated when requested
 - The NMI suffix should be made a mandatory field in CR3000 series to be provided by the MPB (The majority of participants were happy with this proposal)
 - Notifications should be sent to the current LR and LNSP for CR507x (NSRD update)