Forum meeting Q&A

Forum:	Flexible Trading Arrangements
Date:	16 May 2026
Time:	10:30am
Location:	Teams

This document provides responses at an industry forum convened by AEMO on 16 May 2025 on matters relating to the Flexible Trading Arrangements forum. AEMO is currently consulting on these amendments following changes to the Unlocking CER benefits through flexible trading made by the AEMC on 15 August 2024.

Question	Answer
The NERs allow for a Type8A at a PSP?	Identified in MSATS as type 4 - the device could be capable of being a type 8A, but the baseline requirement is for a type 4.
The Rule allows for Type 9 NMI Aggregation using CMS as per Type 7 Public Lighting and AEMO previously suggested this would be dealt with in the procedures and involve consent from the LNSP - however now it seems the NERR customer load aggregation for settlement purposes rather than underlying NMI aggregation- is that addressing the aggregation proposed under the Rules or in addition to it? (BTW The NERR doesn't apply in Victoria?)	The proposed large NMI agg code is designed to meet the requirements of the NERL (section 5(3) and National Energy Retail Regulations 7(b), allowing multiple Small NMIs to be aggregated to create a large customer
Is the obligation for the MDP to provide a reason code for outages and disconnections only for a PCP NMI?	A reason must be provided for the PCP and SSP NMIs.
Are there going to be any changes to the EMMS reports, or adding additional information into the statements , if so what will these be?	No changes to the EMMS reports
- **The NMISP has no visibility of the PCP - which makes if almost impossible to create the SSP NMI without the requesting FRMP providing a LOT of detail.** - **Yes, but is it practical for the FRMP to duplicate all PCP data and provide this to the NMISP?**	- The FRMP is requesting the NMISP to create the NMI and should be able to provide all required information. - As discussed at the B2B-WG, AEMO is happy for Participants to provide alternative solutions for consideration.
Why the additional Y/N flag still required for PNSP to receive the data, should the PNSP role assignment sufficient?	The DNSP has the ability to receive the SSP metering data (not a right) therefore the DNSP may have to have an agreement with the MDP for delivery of SSP metering data.
How will the DNSP receive notification that a new device has been added to SSP and is compliance with the connection agreement on PCP? normally DNSP would get an EWR however this may not be received. Would it be expected it will be the requirement of the PCP FRMP to notify the DNSP even if they are not the FRMP on the SSP.	The DNSP, as the PNSP, will receive standing data information of the SSP. Any flexible load device that is installed would need to go through the usual network BAU process before being installed.
With the generation going though AEMO will this have any impacts on credentials , that may affect bank guarantee's - Also with there will be an impact to settlements with the up coming change to Shortening the settlement cycle.	All energy consumed and sent out are included in the Calculation of Prudential, and will be used in Bank Guarantees as any other market CP.

Question	Answer
What happens in RoLR event for SSP FRMP large site, if PCP FRMP fails?	If the PCP retailer fails the normal RoLR process will apply for the PCP NMI.
Is the following still applicable "Large customers can establish SSPs and engage multiple FRMPs at their premises" or has it changed to have only one FRMP at their premises?	Large customers can select a different FRMP for an SSP, than that appointed at the PCP
Why do we need agreements?	AEMO has proposed using the CONTRACT function in MSATS – however AEMO will review this approach based on today's meeting.
Is a DNSP able to undertake a non-payment disconnection to a Large PCP and leave the SSP (different FRMP) on if electrically feasible?	No, the customer's SSP arrangement is dependent on the connection status of their PCP
Does AEMO intend to mark a NMI as not a PCP when all the associated SSP NMIs have a status of 'X'?	Yes, AEMO intends to remove the value from the Is PCP field when all associated SSPs have a Status of 'X'
Type 9 CMS for public lighting, is it an aggregated data stream for say 500 lights or 500 NMIs suffixes (eg. NMI XXXX E1 - E500	Yes, it is one data stream
Where can I find details on the impact to the lvl1, lvl2, lvl3 data once the new meter types are live? **Eg: is the data at the main meter raw data or Net (Primary settlement point - Secondary secondary point)**	The current Lvl1, 2, 3 reports will not be changed. A new report will be created to provide Settlement data for SSPs and PCPs. Existing metering reads will not be changed
Many of the CMS can have the original lighting load in as a base reference so if a node goes out, the asset load is still there	AEMO will consider this as part of its consultation.
AEMO are obviously talking to CMS providers. Is there any information that AEMO can make available on how these things work before the draft so MP's can understand these?	AEMO directs participants to the IPWEA submissions to the AEMC Unlocking CER benefits through flexible trading rule change for background on CMS applications
When would an SSP NMI status be made 'D' if it does not have a connection point fuse or remote re-en\de-en capability?	When an SSP is de-energised it should be set to n (Off Market), Therefore an SSP would not be set to D status
Can I ask about the term 'flexible load' - is this defined or do we have a better term? MSATS NMI 9.2 NMI extinction... only when... (vii) the flexible load of the secondary settlement point it is measuring is removed	The final determination used the term flexible load and generation to describe Consumer Energy Resources. AEMO is interested to receive participant feedback of a more appropriate term.
Are SSPs allowed to have SSPs of their own? If yes, how are they expected to be set up in terms of MITC etc.?	No, SSPs are secondary to a PCP

Question	Answer
MSATS Principles 15.4 suggests an SSP will always be moved off-market and inactive on churn. I assume this is only for small NMI (not aggregated) where the prospective FRMP hasn't requested churn of the PCP and the SSP	Correct
MDPs can object to opt-in request, What if the MDP changes sometime after the PNSP opted in, and there is no contract between the new MDP and PNSP?	AEMO is re-considering the use of the Contract term in the MSATS Principles after today's meeting.
To clarify, can a SSP NMI be established with a VIC AMI NMI?	Under the final rule no. However, AEMO has submitted a rule change to enable this.
When a customer requests an SSP, the retailer will need to be able to identify if the customer's device can be connected as an SSP. Will AEMO hold or publish a list of accredited devices?	Our expectation is that this would be part of each MC/MP/MDP's arrangements - e.g. there is no obligation for any type 8 accredited MP to work with any given device, rather it would be something they adopt and include as part of their accreditation processes. AEMO would be required to keep this information confidential. MC's can provide this information to retailer clients however.
For a PCP NMI which is De-energised/Outage, should the MDPs for the SSPs be notified by AEMO that the SSP meter reads are "zeroed out" and as a result they re-send FRMPs corrected meter reads? Otherwise the wont MDPs have data inconsistencies if their reads are not updated?	These are 2 different items, the Metering reads are what is recorded at the meter, the settlement data is what is being used for charging purposes. Currently Parent EN NMIs are settled using Subtraction meter calculations while the metering data is what is on the meter.
Will I VicAMis need to be 5 minute if a customer wants an SSP ?	Yes
Wouldn't that zeroing for settlements still leave meter data being incorrect for an SSP when it may need to be amended to reflect the PCP status?	The FRMP of the SSP will receive metering data from the SSP when AEMO has applied zero settlements against the SSP. At the point the PCP actuals are applied, data revision will occur.
was the rule specifically tied to 5 min - it would be better if it allowed for smaller intervals which are multiples of the trading interval (eg to allow for 1 min meters)	The Final Rule specifies trading interval metering data. The MDP must for type 1, 2, 3, 8A, 8B and 9 metering installations collate metering data into trading intervals (NER 7.10.5(a)(1)).
Are AEMO planning on including SSP NMI's in C1 reports?	The C1 report will include all market connection points this includes SSP NMIs.
Type 9. Why must the minimum standards for the devices be 5mins or 1min, should only be the CMS delivery of data	AEMO requires the node to record at the trading interval.

Question	Answer
Identifying Type 9 and Type CMS , including Inbuilt or MP provided. Has AEMO considered making these distinctions available in MSATS?	AEMO consider the Meter Manufacturer and Meter Model to define type 9 and type 9 CMS
Can the NMI Discovery Type 1 or 2 be updated to indicate the corresponding SSPs linked to the PCP (i.e. return all the SSP NMIs) rather than provide just a flag to indicate SSP?	NMI Discovery using the Type 1 address will display all NMIs for the address, the PCP will be flagged as a Premises CP and each SSP will display the Premises NMI it is linked too. SSP NMIs can not be displayed on the PCP as this information is confidential and may be displayed to parties that are not entitled to the data.
Is there scope to amend the IsPCP field so it doesn't just identify it is a PCP but could also identify if it is an SSP?	The Is PCP field is to identify the NMI as having SSPs attached. The SSP will include the Premises NMI. To identify all PCP and SSP NMIs the Service Type can be used where the value = FTA>
When there is an existing NMI which is NCONUML or Type 7 and the customer wants to move to a Type 9, does the existing NMI type need to be set to 'Extinct' before creating a new Type 9 NMI to prevent having two active NMI types?	Yes, the DNSP is required to make the NCONUML or Type 7 extinct.
In regards to AEMO's belief that DNSP's do not have a "right" to SSP Meter Data >>> From the Draft Decision: **The AEMC's intention was to provide a "Right" but not an "Obligation" - this should guide AEMO's interpretation of "May"** **I see no argument for Agreements or Payments arising from a "Right"** **DNSPs could access secondary NMI metering data** **Noting stakeholder feedback and broader CER integration considerations, the Commission considers that DNSPs should have access to secondary NMI metering data (that is, energy flow data). We propose that rules provide DNSPs with the right, but not the obligation, to access metering data from secondary NMIs. Stakeholder feedback post-submissions indicates that providing DNSPs with access to this data would involve minimal costs for relevant market participants (DNSPs, metering parties, energy service providers, AEMO)**	AEMO to discuss this matter further internally.

Question	Answer
Is the obligation for the MDP to provide a reason code for outages and disconnections only for a NMI with a SSP NMI associated with it, effectively only for a PCP NMI?	No, the appropriate reason code should be applied for all connection point NMIs.
Someone in one of the earlier meetings mentioned that "Large NMI Agg Code" is a new code value adding to the field CCC. However, from reading AEMO's document, "Large NMI Agg Code" is not only a new code value but actually also a new field in MSATS standing data, is that correct?	The Large NMI Agg Code is new field to store the FRMP unique identifier for the Customers Large NMI Aggregation Code against each of the aggregated NMIs. The Large NMI Agg Code will be included in the Customer Classification Code Change Request, i.e., you will be able to update the Customer Classification Code and/*or* Large NMI Agg Code using the same CR.
If the Large NMI Agg Code is populated then does this mean the SSP NMI must only have a 8A meter and not a 8B meter?	Yes
Will the AGG flag get removed on Churn?	This was not the original intention, however after today's meeting AEMO will discuss this matter further internally.

Questions prior to FTA forum

Question	Answer
If a Small customer with SSPs churns to a new retailer that doesn't support SSPs, the SSPs are made inactive/off market. If the churn was in error or the customer decides in the cooling off period to return to the previous retailer, are there any changes to all the applicable CR10XXs to return that customer? Will there be any new CR10XXs for this scenario? Will the customer's SSPs be activated again by AEMO?	AEMO expects the FRMP to engage to the NMISP to reactivate the SSP into the market and use the existing CR1060/1061 where applicable or error correction CRs for each PCP and SSP.
When there is an existing NCONUML NMI, does the existing NMI type need to be set to 'Extinct' before creating a new Type 9 NMI to prevent having two active NMI types?	The LNSP will be required to ensure there are not two active NMIs as part of the transition from NCONUML to type 9.
When transitioning from a Type 7 to Type 9 meter, does the FRMP need to make the existing NMI type 'Extinct' before creating the Type 9 NMI? If not, won't both Type 7 and Type 9 NMIs be active?	NMI creation/maintenance for type 9 is the responsibility of the LNSP.
In the Pre-Formal Consultation workshop for Create type 9 (Page 19) there is a step: "Customer registers details in Asset list" – Can AEMO confirm what does this asset list consist of?	This process describes the Customer recording that the assets associated with the NMI creation are recorded by the customer.

Question	Answer
Can AEMO confirm that it is not the FRMPs responsibility to manage Type 9 meter malfunctions? Also, whose responsibility is it to manage any CMS malfunctions and how will this be done?	The responsibility of type 9 meter malfunctions is the MC. Because the CMS is part of the metering installation 7.8.10 of the NER applies for rectification.
In the issues paper, page 31 section 3.5.2, for the point "For FRMPs at the PCP, they will be able to obtain access to the metering data, and receive CR notifications, as they will be the LR for the SSP NMI", can AEMO confirm if it is the CR 2040 or CR5065, or both, that will provide the LR the access to the metering data?	On Creation of the SSP the FRMP at the PCP will be assigned to the LR role of the SSP. When the PCP has a FRMP churn current processes (used for EN Child NMI) will be used to update the LR role on the SSP NMIs. CR5064 is proposed to be used for PNSP to receive metering data from MDPs only
In the issues paper, the CR for SSP Meter Read Opt-in is CR 5065 whilst the MSATS procedure doc refers to it as CR5064. Can AEMO confirm the correct CR?	AEMO is reviewing this CR based on the forum discussion but the issues paper had the incorrect CR code.
When down tiering a customer from Large to Small, which CR (CR 5054 or 5065) will be used to notify the FRMP of the SSP of a change in NMI classification code? Or will the FRMP be notified by the NMI SP?	When the LNSP updates the NCC form LARGE to SMALL on the PCP they will use CR5050/5051. At this point the PCP FRMP should engage the customer to manage their relationship to the premises. AEMO proposes to use a SDQ report to notify the SSP FRMP of the change from Large customer to Small customer.
When creating a SSP (with Type 8a meter) for a Large customer, can a customer appoint their own NMI SP?	No, only the FRMP can appoint the NMISP .
Is there a specific RoLR process for Type 9 Meters or will it be similar to other meter types (excluding SSP meter types)?	This RoLR process does not change for a type 9.
Can AEMO provide a high-level use case scenario for Missing reads / read failure (PCP and/or SSP)?	This would be consulted by the IEC as part of the B2B consultation
Can AEMO provide a high-level use case scenario for Meter removal / addition / alteration ?	This would be consulted by the IEC as part of the B2B consultation
Can AEMO provide a high-level use case scenario for Customer Details Notifications ?	This would be consulted by the IEC as part of the B2B consultation
Can AEMO provide a high-level use case scenario for Planned Interruptions (PIN) ?	This would be consulted by the IEC as part of the B2B consultation
Previously AEMO had imposed restrictions on SSP's being transferred separate to a PCP, however this does not appear to be present in the current proposal and may be addressed via SDQ reports and the	AEMO will include validation in the change retailer CRs to ensure this requirement. If the Small PCP transfers to a new Retailer and the SSPs are not transferred, AEMO will inactivate the SSPs. The only exception to this rule is where a Retailer

Question	Answer
Large NMI Agg Code, can AEMO confirm if this is correct and SSP's can be transferred independently?	has identified multiple NMIs as being aggregated to create a large customer recorded in the Large NMI Agg Code field, then the validation for maintaining the same FRMP at SSPs will not be enforced.
To confirm, is this allocated to a PCP or an SSP? If it is applied to a PCP does this then allow for the separation of retailers for the customers SSP's? Does this mean a customer must first agree to aggregate their PCP's before enabling contestability for their SSP's?	Yes, the large NMI Agg code is allocated to the Small PCP. And yes, the Small PCP needs to be aggregated before a different FRMP can be applied against the SSP
Is the PNSP intended to be the LNSP of the Connection Point connected directly to the distribution network (Eg Ausgrid) or is this intended to be the LNSP of the PCP - noting that in Embedded Networks the PCP will have the ENM as the LNSP and not one of the core DNSP's.	Yes, the PNSP must be the LNSP of the connection point. Which for a SSP on an embedded network child will be the ENM associated to the Premises CP of the Child NMI.
Is the volume limit on SSP's and the new metering types total throughput (import and export), net throughput or export only?	Volume limit is the maximum in either direction – generation or load. For SSPs it is less than 750 MWh.