Power of Choice Procedures Working Group

6th March, 2017.

**Meeting notes**

**Important Note**

The intent of this document is to summarise the discussions during the POC Procedures Working Group (POC-PWG) workshop held on 6th March.

N Elhawary led the discussion using the presentation slides provided for the day. The slides are not reproduced here.

Please note that procedure changes must be made in accordance with the National Electricity Rules (NER) consultation procedures and, therefore, all matters discussed at workshops and other meetings will be considered by AEMO and should not be taken as a representation as to the final procedure changes.

**Purpose of the Workshop**

The purpose of this workshop was to inform industry participants on AEMO’s plan for Package 3 (As Built) , and to seek participants’ input into key Package 3 (As Built) procedure changes.

1. **Introduction**

Please refer to the presentation slide pack emailed to participants on 6th March for this workshop.

* Background information is provided on slides #4 and #5.
* The scope for Package 3 (As Built) is on slide #6. The focus for Package 3 (As Built) will be making “As Built” changes, corrections and clarifications. No new features or functionality will be introduced.
* The procedures, guidelines and other documents in Package 3 (As Built) are listed on slides #7 & #8.
* Package 3 (As Built) consultation timeline is on slides #9 and #10. AEMO notes the extended timeline for stage one consultation and additional time factored in for any issues that might arise from system testing.

1. **General Items**

Participants had the following questions for AEMO with regards to Package 3 (As Built) program:

Q2.1: The slide-pack only lists three issues to be discussed in this meeting. Should other changes in Package 3 (As Built) also be worked through with the working group?

A2.1: Currently, there are only three issues that AEMO requires participants’ input on. The other changes identified so far are simple as built changes or corrections to the procedures and participants will get the chance to provide their feedback on all changes through the formal consultation.

Q2.2: Will AEMO consider sending participants a log of all Package 3 (As Built) issues to participants?

A2.2: AEMO will take this onboard, and believes it is reasonable to keep and share a log of Package 3 (As Built) changes with participants.

Q2.3: Will the procedures have a new version number when they are re-issued for Package 3 (As Built) consultation?

A2.3: AEMO will ensure there is a new version number for each document.

Q2.4: What kind of changes are expected in the guide documents? Will the changes just be something like MC=RP?

A2.4: The changes will reflect the new rule and procedure requirements. They will also include drafting changes but there will be no new functionality outside of the regulatory requirements.

Q2.5: Transition planning hasn’t started yet, is 12th April too early to start consulting on these documents?

A2.6: AEMO plans to provide participants with information on the changes as early as possible and that is why consultation will start on 12th April. Participants will be given an extended period before first stage consultation closes. Extra time has also been factored in for any changes that might arise from system testing or readiness activities.

A2.7: When will the Exemption Guideline for Small Customer Metering Installations be issued? Will it be the final version?

A2.7: Due to the amount of feedback received, AEMO has decided that it will need more time to consider all the feedback and will delay the release of this document until April. It is not known yet whether this document will be issued as the final version. AEMO may issue it as a draft to provide participants with another opportunity to comment on the changes.

Q2.8: Can AEMO publish participants’ feedback on the Exemption Guideline for Small Customer Metering installations?

A2.8: AEMO has already published feedback that was received as part of WP2, but if there is any new feedback, AEMO will ensure it is published.

Q2.9: Is there any point in discussing new changes when AEMO has decided that it will only make clarifications and corrections in Package 3 (As Built)? Will AEMO be making any new changes? if yes, then there are other items that it should also consider such as changing the objection logging period from one day to three days.

A2.9: The scope for Package 3 (As Built) will only include “As Built” changes, clarifications and corrections, Package 3 (As Built) will not be relitigating procedures changes from WP1 or WP2 and will not be introducting any new features or functionality.

1. **Procedure discussion topics**

## 3.1 Embedded Network Information

Please refer to slides #12 and #13 for presentation on the issue and proposed solution.

Participants were not in favour of AEMO’s proposal for the LNSP to provide AEMO with additional Embedded Network Information in an email which includes the EN EENSP, Parent NMI TNI Code, and Parent NMI DLF Code, for the following various reasons:

* LNSPs are not responsible for providing the EENSP details.
* LNSPs currently provide the DLF code and TNI Code details on the parent NMI itself in MSATS, AEMO can obtain this information from the parent NMI.
* Parent NMI DLF Code and TNI Code are subject to change, LNSPs maintain the values of those codes by updating the NMI standing data of the parent NMI, hence AEMO should be getting the up to date information from the parent NMI instead of relying on the information provided in an email from the LNSPs, as this information will become outdated once the codes are changed.
* The C1 report that AEMO generates should link to the parent NMI to obtain the DLF Code and TNI Code.
* Embedded Network Operators can provide the required embedded network information of EENSP, Parent NMI DLF Code, and Parent NMI TNI Code to the Embedded Network Managers.

## 3.2 MSATS Extinction of NMI

* Please refer to slides #14 and #15 for presentation on the issue and proposed solution.
* Participants were not in favour of introducing new NMI status code to handle extinct NMIs when they move between LNSP network and embedded network.
* Participants were in preference of using the existing NMI status code of ‘X’ after modifying its definition to cater for the extinction of NMs when they move between LNSP network and embedded network.

## 3.3 Review of CR1500 within Change Role Change requests

* Please refer to slide #16.
* AEMO noted that CR1500 was included CR6200, CR6300 and CR6700 in WP1. It was discussed in the Meter Churn meeting that CR1500 will be removed from CR6300. AEMO asked for participants’ feedback on whether CR1500 should also be removed from CR6200 and CR6700.
* Participants agreed that CR1500 should be removed from CR6300 for Changing Metering Coordinator, as physical work or meter read will not always be required when an MC changes.
* Participants agreed that CR1500 should be kept within CR6700 and CR6200 as meter read or physical work will always be required for those CRs.
* Participants also discussed the following with regards to CR6300 – Change MC:
* For small customers, no one outside the FRMP and the MC know what arrangements are in place. MC (A)(current) does not know:
  + if MC(B)(incoming) has an agreement with FRMP and that the FRMP has nominated MC(B)as MC (perhaps that is why the Rules say that the FRMP appoints the MC as they have the relationship with the customer)
  + MC (A) does not know if current MPB and MDP has an agreement with MC(B).
* Challenges for a competitive world:
* MPB/MDP cannot object to a CR6300 – what if they do not have a relationship with new MC?
* What if the CR6300 has been raised in error – The current MC has had no notification of the FRMPs intention to cancel their agreement for that NMI. If the FRMP was to raise the MC churn request that is a form of notification.
* Objection period is now 1 day – FRMPs may miss the objection period to an incorrect
* Participants proposed that:
* To avoid confusion in industry, CR6300 should only be made available to MC for Large NMIs
* CR6301 could be used for both small and large.
* Objections are opened to MPB/MDPs in CR6300
* Objection codes are ‘fit for purpose’ – propose amendments to the wording of objection codes NOTRESP and CONTRACT
* With Regards to the additional changes proposed by participants to CR6300, AEMO noted that it is not ideal for MP and MDP to object to the appointment of an MC in CR6300, as the MC is the one that appoints MPs and MDPs, and the MC is appointed by the FRMP and the FRMP currently has the ability to object to the appointment of an MC in CR6300.
* AEMO also noted that ideally in the contract between FRMP and MC, the FRMP should inform the MC when they want to terminate the contract or the appointment of that MC.
  1. **Other discussion topics**
* Participants requested that AEMO publish a list of items raised by participants which has been considered for Package 3 (As Built) and another list of the items which AEMO did not consider for Package 3 (As Built).
* AEMO noted that it will look into publishing a log of changes included in Package 3 (As Built), however the scope of Package 3 (As Built) is clear and it will not be ideal to publish items which AEMO did not consider as this will open the door to wish list items outside the scope of Package 3 (As Built).
* AEMO noted that the ENA has raised an issue regarding deemed network devices that there is a misalignment between the rules requirements and the network devices procedure in metrology part A, AEMO noted that if any changes are required to Metrology A, then it will be part of Package 3 (As Built).
* Participants requested that AEMO publish what ENA has submitted to AEMO, and AEMO has noted the request.
* Participants requested an update on the jurisdictional metrology clauses. AEMO noted that it has been communicating with the jurisdictions regularly on this and has notified the jurisdictions that we need the trench 2 material before 12 April this year to be able to publish it in the Package 3 (As Built) first stage of consultation.
* Participants questioned who and how is the ‘as built’ decided on? If the AEMO system does not align with the rules or procedures then what is the process to manage this? Does AEMO or a working group decide if the system gets updated or the procedure get updated to align with the ‘as built’ system? AEMO noted that as built changes will be communicated to participants regularly through the appropriate working group and will be decided upon on a case by case basis as long as it fits within the scope of Package 3 (As Built).
* Participants questioned when will the ‘as built’ be locked down? When will changes to AEMO systems be stopped? AEMO noted that the readiness work stream will communicate the transition and cutover plan when all system and procedure changes will be stopped.
* Participants asked for confirmation if any changes will be made to support the meter churn process as they are designing systems and process as per the rules and procedures. If any changes are to be made then this should be communicated as early as possible. AEMO noted that it will provide an update on meter churn around mid-march.
* Participants asked to discuss the request from B2BWG for a two new fields (Faulty Meter Flag, Reason) to indicate meter requires replacement. AEMO noted that it is looking into this request, however the scope of Package 3 (As Built) might not allow it as it introduces a new functionality.
* Participants requested clarification that metering data that is not related to settlements or network billing must not be sent to the LNSP, as they are starting to see metering providers putting on extra meters or channels for the customer’s or retailer’s benefit but the metering data is not to be used for settlements or network billing. In these scenarios the MDP SLP should make it clear that the MDP must NOT send metering data for these extra meters or channels to the LNSP. The benefit of this it would avoid double billing, disputes and confusion within the market. At the moment some MDP have interpret that they must send the meter data because it states any metering data collected must be sent to all entitled participants. Some participants suggested that this is not a POC related issue and that it should be raised with the AEMO metering team.
* Participants asked for clarification on whether LNSPs will be updating the NMI Status Code when a meter is remotely disconnected. Some LNSPs responded that they will only update the NMI status code if they are the ones who has performed the disconnection. AEMO noted that the obligations are clear in the MSATS CATS procedure with regards to NMI Status Code updates.
* Participants asked if the NMI Status code of ‘N’ will become obsolete and be replaced by the status ‘X’ when NMIs become off market? AEMO clarified that the ‘N’ status is not redundant and will not be replaced by status ‘X’, the ‘N’ status is used for child NMIs when they become off market, which is quite different from the extinction of NMIs when they move between LNSP network and embedded network. Child NMIs becoming on market and off market does not mean that the NMI gets made extinct.