MINUTES – DER REGISTER DELIVERY TEAM 2 MEETING

MEETING:	DER Register – Delivery Team 2 (Process Design) Meeting
DATE:	Friday, 15 March 2019
TIME:	2.00 – 4.00pm (AEDT)
LOCATION:	Webex (dial in)

ATTENDEES:

NAME	COMPANY / DEPARTMENT
Tom Butler	AEMO
Roy Kaplan	AEMO
Eloise Taylor	AEMO
Adrian Honey	TasNetworks
James Patterson	Clean Energy Council
Rob Cahill	Energy Queensland
Lisa Forden	AusNet Services
Salman Gillani	AusGrid
Kevin Smith	AusGrid
Annie MacDonald	Endeavour
John Dalgliesh	Solarscope
Jared Green	Formbay
Jaz Singh	Formbay
Thanh Bui	Jemena
Anthony Kavaliauskas	Endeavour Energy
Robert Simpson	AusGrid
Greg Szot	Citipower Powercor United Energy

(note: best efforts were made to compile a complete attendee list, however some dial in attendees may have been omitted)

1. Agenda

1. Terms of Reference
2. Update on Project
3. Summary of stakeholder engagement
4. Proposed collection process
5. Interfaces with DNSP collection
6. Interfaces with DER installation process
7. Options for Standardisation
8. Next steps

2. Action Items

ITEM	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE	DUE
1	Send additional concerns/ information on the collection process step 2.5 – installer submit to DER Register.	All meeting attendees	

3. Notes

3.1 Welcomes and Introduction

- Noted that Terms of Reference (ToR) had been circulated previously to the group and all other delivery teams.

- No comments on TOR. If delivery team members would like to propose any questions or changes, please email derregister@aemo.com.au.

3.2   Update on project (slides 3–4)

- AEMO briefly provided a background on the DER Register project. It was noted that the collection process was not detailed in the issues paper, but is being covered in this delivery team and going forward.

3.3   Stakeholder engagement (slides 6–10)

- Energy Queensland noted that only 10% applications are lodged by the installer. Other cases are by others. This is a challenge that AEMO is currently working through.

3.4   Proposed collection processes (slides 12–14)

- AEMO walked through most recent diagram (available on AEMOs website)
- AEMO noted that we are looking at an API-based solution, rather than MSATS/AseXML framework.
- **DERID discussion**:
  - How does AEMO see the DERID being created and how will it be allocated to installations? How will this be linked to the NMI?
    - AEMO will distribute the DERID like we do the NMI now. How it gets populated into the Register is still being worked out.
    - AEMO noted that the issue of allocating a DERID has been raised by a number of stakeholder submissions to the Issues Paper. Step 1 for AEMO is to consider how the DERIDs will be used in the data model (e.g. is the key a combination of the NMI plus other identifiers), which is related to the Delivery Team 1. Step 2 is consider and define how that ID is allocated out as part of the collection process.
  - Other suggestions included:
    - DNSP-issued Job Numbers associated with each connection application.
    - Could explore nationalising the 'job number' concept through the DERID (likely a Delivery Team 3 or 4 action).

Process diagram discussion

- **Step 2.1 – *Approved installation commences***
  - This step can assist with controls, verification and linking to original application information. Needs to ensure transactions between applicants and installers are managed.
  - What will be used to ensure that the installation is approved.
    - Energy Queensland - have connection reference numbers / job numbers
    - Endeavour - approval/ job number
    - Ausgrid - unique job number for each connection application
- **Step 2.4 – *Submit DER Installation data***
  - Does the onsite verification loop mean that installers or responsible parties would be able to correct information when they're inputting it? AEMO: Yes.
  - DNSPs use sanding offers for Basic and Standard connections as per NER Chapter 5A. The interface or app could be programmed with the standard information as defaults.
  - A further consideration could be a number/contact for the installer to call to rectify exceptions. However, this can create an expectation that exceptions might be the norm. DNSP view is that the connection agreement should be upheld in the first instance.
- **Step 2.5 – *Submit to DER Register***
  - How do you enforce installers submitting the data?
    - Accreditation schemes such as CEC provide an opportunity to link the DERR to a CPD and demerit point system.
    - Leverage for data quality may also depend on CER/STC generation as this creates a financial incentive.

- Sunset clauses could be based on connection offer duration, where default settings are automatically confirmed and the DNSP receives an exception flag. Suggestion that DNSPs could ask for an intended connection date from installers. This intended connection date could be used to anchor the time window used for the sunset clause.
- All accredited installers through the CEC have approved licence numbers. This may help with steps 2.1 and 2.5, but is less meaningful for larger installations (>100kW).
  - Additional detail provided by CEC following the meeting: The mandatory CEC guidelines require that CEC accredited installers follow the local rules as stipulated by service and installation rules and electricity distributers. CEC rules still are meaningful for jobs >100kW so long as the installer is CEC accredited. However, the STC scheme incentivises installers to be accredited for jobs < 100kW so 'every' installer is part of the CECs compliance scheme. However, there is no incentive for CEC accreditation above 100kW. Therefore, installers in the >100kW space might not be accredited.
- Consider incentives for app developers too as they need a revenue stream to justify working on a feature.

3.5 Interfaces with DNSP connection and DER installation processes (slides 16-25)

- Basic connection process
  - Endeavour Energy case: set application up for total generator system capacity.
  - AEMO need to have a think about how much information they want DNSPs to enter. Is there a way to standardise default protection settings across DNSPs for basic connections?
  - Can a default/auto-populate arranged be implemented for each DNSP to promote efficiency? What are the differences between DNSPs?
- Larger systems
  - Consider potential interactions between DERR and LGC generation.
  - Need to think about the practicality of scanning 5MW of panels.
  - Would an alternate process / solution be needed for capturing the information in larger installations?
  - Additional identifiers might be available for negotiated connections as SLDs need to be submitted for LGC generation.
- Installer access
  - DNSP already has the relevant information that the installer would need. Note that new installations cannot happen without permission and DNSPs expressed a view that a DER installation should not proceed without DNSP approval and therefore installers putting in data without approval of the connection should not be permitted.
- Commissioning and metering requirements
  - There is a need to align meter installations with DER installations. Export meters need a 'B-channel' and currently there is a reliance on the meter providers to do this with retailers also involved.
  - Metering data can be used to verify DER installation (e.g. 3 months after installation).
  - Participants noted that in some cases larger DER has been installed without bi-directional meters.
- Existing solar panel validation and inverter databases should be used to pre-populate as much DERR data as possible.
- Emergency Services
  - CEC – chatted with fire services NSW. When the initial dispatch happens, they need to know solar and batteries because they need to dispatch hazmat as well.
  - AEMO have not successfully engaged emergency services providers for the DER Register project.
  - AEMO would be grateful if any delivery team members have emergency services contacts that they can share.

3.6 Options for standardisation (slide 27)

- DNSPs have a fair investment in systems that interface with MSATS database.

4. Next Steps (slides 29-30)

- Next meeting proposed for late April.

The meeting closed at 4.15pm.