**MC (Pre Final Determination) Workshop #4 – 25 November 2015**

**37 Attendees:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Company |
| Paul LeFavi | AEMO (Chair) |
| Aaron Bensted | AEMO (Secretariat) |
| Demi Chau | AEMO |
| Sarah Eager | AEMO |
| Noura Elhawary | AEMO |
| Roy Kaplan | AEMO |
| David Ripper | AEMO |
| Allicia Volvricht | AEMO |
| Jeff Roberts | ActewAGL |
| Mark Riley | AGL |
| Peter Ellis | AusNet Services |
| Jackie Krizmanic | Ausnet Services |
| Greg Szot | Citipower/ Powercor |
| Brendon McEntee | Endeavour Energy |
| Dino Ou | Endeavour Energy |
| Lyn McBride | Energex |
| Tom Cole | Energex |
| Randall Brown | Energy Australia |
| Karly Train | Energy Australia |
| David Havyatt | Energy Consumers Australia |
| Peter Munson | Ergon Energy |
| Tim Lloyd | Essential Energy |
| Inger Wills | IntelliHub |
| Nirav Rajguru | Jemena |
| Arunesh Choubey | Lumo/ Red Energy |
| Mara Tenis | Lumo/ Red Energy |
| Charles Coulson | Metropolis |
| Annmarie Lavin | Momentum Energy |
| Darren Bailey | Origin Energy |
| Haiden Jones | Powershop |
| Andy Gillis | SA Power Networks |
| Monalisa Navaria | Service Works |
| Warren Brooks | TasNetworks |
| Ty Crowhurst | TasNetworks |
| Di Signorelli | United Energy |
| Verity Watson | United Energy |
| Opal Russ | Vector |

**Workshop Notes:**

**Red text highlights action items.**

**Purpose of workshop:**

The purpose of the workshop is to continue discussions identifying and work through key retail market processes, role mapping and supporting documentation in preparation for the delivery of the final determination for competition in metering and related services rule change.

The subjects under discussion are aimed at an operating level knowledge of the NEM Metrology and Retail Processes and Procedures combined with an understanding of the AEMC draft determination on competition in metering.

From these discussions, the purpose is to identify key issues and areas requiring further clarification and actions as captured in the POC Issues/Question register as a standing agenda item for PoC workshops moving forward.

**Issues Register:**

R. Kaplan (AEMO) discussed he register, including new items raised since the previous workshop. Please refer to the register for further information.

P. Ellis (Ausnet Services) suggested dates to be captured alongside the issue notes.

The issues log is to be updated to reflect the discussion and new issues raised. The issues log will be circulated with the next meeting pack. Post publication of the Final Determination, open issues will be further reviewed to clarify and consider if any open items can be closed. Any feedback or new issues are invited, and should be sent to [PoC@aemo.com.au](mailto:PoC@aemo.com.au) on an ongoing basis.

**Metrology Procedure Part B**:

R. Kaplan (AEMO provided an overview of the key changes marked up to the draft procedure which have been considered to-date based on the draft rule, it was outlined that this procedure will be further reviewed post the release of the final determination provided

**Highlights of discussion points:**

* Responsible Person (RP) governance concerns were raised by AGLfor Part B obligations around decision making processes for substitutions. This as been captured in the issues log (MC74).
* It was noted that substitution types should be reviewed post the final determination, this has been captured on the Issues Register and will be discussed at future workshops. Issue number MC32
* AEMO noted that some substitution methodologies for Type 4 metering installations may not apply to small customers. This will be reviewed as part of the next procedure review post the final determination. .
* .

**Service Level Procedure – Metering Data Provider (SLP MDP)**

D. Chau (AEMO) provided an overview of the key changes marked up to the draft procedure which have been considered to-date based on the draft rule, it was outlined that this procedure will be further reviewed post the release of the final determination provided

**Highlights of discussion points:**

* Obligations for MDP have largely remained the same.
* Change for Metering Competition: RP is replaced by MC and MC is responsible for appointing the MDP.
* AEMO notes the role of RP is treated separately from role of FRMP and DNSP in this procedure which allows replacement of RP with MC.
* AEMO notes changes made to incorporate type 4A into existing requirements of SLP MDP.
* Type 4A is a manually read meter and is anticipated to have the same collection process requirements as type 5 and 6.
* Group questioned how will special read requests for type 4A be managed? This will be considered post final rule. Issue to be added to issue register (issue MC77).
* Networks from Queensland ised a question in regards to how type 4A may be treated in Queensland. It was noted their feedback has been .captured on the issue register (MC78)
* Group discussed s that type 4A must be capable of providing the minimum services. Type 4A is different from type 5.
* Group discussed draft clause (6.10.2) that explicitly states that although MC is a registered participant, and is one of the parties that can access metering data, delivery of metering data to MC is not mandated. Some do not think the clause is required. Some believe it is required (not necessarily in current section of the procedure) as the clauses in SLP MDP state “The Metering Data Provider **must** deliver to…..Registered Participants…”. Participant views are captured.
* Group discussed draft clause (6.3.2) that states the requirement for MDP to ensure minimum services are managed in accordance with Minimum Services Specification procedure. Some do not agree with the “where applicable…” statement. To be confirmed what is outlined in the final determination
* Group discussed removal of clauses relating to AMI Meters. A participant questionedwhether it is appropriate to undertake changes relating to AMI Meters when the workshop is about Metering Competition. AEMO notes that the clear direction relating to Victorian arrangement appears to be provided in the draft determination. For example: Draft determination suggests that the derogation will be extended until when the new chapter 7 commences and Victorian DNSPs are to take on the initial role of metering coordinators. Issue captured on the issue register MC22 relates to VIC AMI Transition. To be confirmed what is outlined in the final determination.
* A participant raised question (during SLP MP walkthrough) regarding accreditation requirements for MDP. Issue captured on issue register – MC82.

**Minimum Service Specifications (MSS)**

N. Elhawary (AEMO) provided an overview of the key changes which have been considered to-date based on the draft rule, it was outlined that the changes will be further reviewed post the release of the final determination provided. It was noted that the document will be used as supporting material

**Highlights of discussion points:**

* It was noted that terminology used for the service levels and performance standards should be consistent between the rules and the minimum services specifications procedure.
* .
* Point raised that a review of the final rule will be required to consider whether it clarifies if agreement between the service requestor and the Metering Coordinator is required in order to be able to request the service.
* It was suggested that the Requestor and Supplier Dependencies sections could be moved outside the service templates in the document and added to a common section which could applies to all It was suggested by the group that a broader validation statement could be considered. A list of validations could be considered and a comprehensive list of validations which may reference other documents in the upcoming workshops .
* Point was raised to clarify post the final rule if the rule is clear in respect to whether the remote disconnection service could be acted upon by both the MP and the MDP
* It was noted that the contents of the emergency priority procedure are yet to be determined and to be considered post the final rule determination.
* .
* A review of the final rule will be required to confirm if it outlines minimum specific timings. Timings. It was suggested In terms of service levels, the times specific should be the local time of the NMI location and a definition for ‘day’ (e.g. business day-hours) would need to be considered.
* Question raised; who would be responsible for arranging the meter read and when it should occur, it was suggested by the group that this could be discussed further when considering future review of the processes.
* Suggestion was raised for the need to define what is meant by service availability, acknowledgment timeframes, and completion timeframes.

Discussion raised by the group for 5.2 Remote Reconnection Service:

* The group suggested clarification is to be considered to confirm if a DNSP was to request a remote DN if the Requestor of the remote reconnection service could be performed by the MDP? In contrast if a Retailer could cancel the request to reconnect remotely? There is an issue captured on the issues register MC53 - remote and manual Re-en/De-en relating to processes

Discussion raised by the group for 5.3 Remote on-demand Meter Read Service:

* Discussion occurred in regards to possible scenarios as to when to use this service and suggestion was made to consider including examples in the SLP.
* It was suggested to consider if clarification with regards to how faults should be handled is required and that in faults scenarios the supplier should report to the relevant parties.
* It was noted that data retention is not relevant to the on-demand meter read service.
* Comment was made that MDFF specifications NEM12 and NEM13 could still accommodate part day data in an on-demand meter read using Zeros and NULLs.

Discussion raised by the group for 5.4 Remote Scheduled Meter Read Service

* similar points which were discussed as outlined in the discussions under other services above

Discussion raised by the group for 5.5 Meter Installation Inquiry Service

* .
* similar points which were discussed as outlined in the discussions under other services above

Discussion raised by the group for 5.6 Advanced Meter Recognition Service

**Service Level Procedure – Metering Provider (SLP MP) - Summary**

N. Elhawary (AEMO) provided an overview of the key changes which have been considered to-date based on the draft rule, it was outlined that the changes will be further reviewed post the release of the final determination provided. Refer to slides included in the PowerPoint slide pack handout.

**Highlights of discussion points:**

* It was suggested that examples of minimum services specifications like remote disconnection/reconnection shouldn’t be included in the SLP MP as it is not determined yet who will be performing those services
* A question was raised in regards to what happens when there is no communications and no exemption in place, and a meter needs to be installed or replaced outside of business hours?
* A question was raised about accreditation vs re-accreditation for MPs to provide the minimum services specifications, it was noted that this question should also apply to the SLP MDP
* A suggestion was made to have an online NEM wide agreed form to replace the existing manual meter read and meter change form.

**Next meeting:**

AEMO to send out the draft agenda for the December two day workshop which will be held on 14 and 15 December.

Agreed topics for workshop 6;

* Detailed Requirements post Final Determination
* Updated Issues Register