Meeting Notes – B2B-WG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MEETING: | Business-to-Business Working Group |
| DATE: | Tuesday, 8 March 2022 |
| TIME: | 9:30am-12:00pm  |
| LOCATION: | Teleconference |
| meeting #: | 03 |
| CONTACT | b2bwg@aemo.com.au  |

 ATTENDEES:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Company  |
| Blaine Miner (Chair) | AEMO |
| Nandu Datar | AEMO |
| Kate Gordon | AEMO |
| Meghan Bibby | AEMO |
| Rosie Elkins | AEMO |
| Aakash Sembey | Origin Energy |
| Adrian Honey | TasNetworks |
| Christophe Bechia | Red/Lumo |
| David Woods | SA Power Networks |
| Dino Ou | Endeavour Energy |
| Helen Vassos | PLUS ES |
| Justin Betlehem | AusNet Services |
| Mark Riley | AGL |
| Paul Greenwood | VectorAMS |
| Robert Lo Giudice  | Alinta Energy |
| Robert Mitchell | EnergyQueensland |

# Preliminary matters

## Acknowledgment and Apologies

Wayne Farrell, Carla Adolpho and Lenard Bull were noted as apologies.

## Confirm agenda

The B2B-WG confirmed the agenda.

## Action items from previous meeting and standing list of consultation items

Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that the following items were being proposed to be closed since the last meeting, responsible owners were asked to provide the group an explanation as to why the actions should be closed:

| **Action Meeting Date** | **Description** | **Responsible** | **Outcome** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2001-01 | Organise meeting with Mark Riley and David Woods to progress work on fields tied to an Australian Standard | Kate Gordon (AEMO) | Mark and Kate had few meetings and Mark is putting together some initial analysis.8/3 – Mark Riley requested to leave this item open |
| 2001-03 | Change the layout of open action items in the meeting pack to include the due date | Nandu Datar (AEMO) | Due date added to the open items on meeting pack |
| 2001-05 | Aakash Sembey to provide response to Dino Ou's first comment in section 2.1.1 of the B2B Issues Paper | Aakash Sembey (Origin) | Response provided |
| 2001-06 | B2B WG members to propose rewording of the paragraph related Dino Ou’s second and third comment in section 2.1.1 of the B2B Issues Paper | B2B-WG | B2B WG provided rewording and updated in issues paper |
| 2001-07 | B2B WG members to provide further explanation in response to Dino Ou’s fourth comment under section 2.1.2 of the B2B Issues Paper | B2B-WG | Explanation provided and reflected in issues paper |
| 2001-08 | B2B WG members to provide changes to the wording in Table 7, last issue of the B2B Issues Paper | B2B-WG | B2B WG provided rewording and updated in issues paper |
| 2001-09 | Mark Riley to provide wording to replace content in section 2.2 | Mark Riley (AGL) | Mark Riley provided rewording and updated in issues paper |
| 2001-11 | Mark Riley to provide rewording for section 2.3(a) in SO process version 3.8a | Mark Riley (AGL) | Mark Riley provided rewording and updated in issues paper |
| 2001-12 | Change all mandatory to optional in last column of Table 3 in SO process version 3.8b | Nandu Datar (AEMO) | B2B WG decided that the last column was not needed and has been removed from the issues paper |
| 2001-13 | Remove sections 2.3.1 and 2.19 from SO process version 3.8b | Nandu Datar (AEMO) | Sections 2.3.1 and 2.19 removed from SO procedure 3.8b |
| 2001-14 | Mark Riley to provide wording for an additional clause in 2.16.2 in SO process version 3.8b | Mark Riley (AGL) | Mark Riley provided rewording and updated in issues paper |

Discussion on Open action items:

* There are various open action items related to the B2B Guide. Mark Riley (AGL) suggested creating an ongoing action item for improving the B2B Guide.

Actions:

* Create an ongoing item for improving the B2B guide

# Items for discussion or noting

## Impact of IESS on B2B Procedures – Rosie Elkins (AEMO)

Discussion:

* Rosie Elkins (AEMO) spoke to the IESS presentation.
* David Woods (SAPN) queried if the roadmap noted in the presentation replaces the Regulatory Industry Roadmap. Meghan Bibby noted that this is not clear at this stage and an action is taken to confirm further details
* Mark Riley queried how the Integrated Resource Provider (IRP) participants relate to the Demand Response Service Providers (DRSP). Meghan Bibby noted that DRSP is a specific activity whereas the IRP is lot broader, an action was taken to provide further information.
* Robert LoGiudice queried if there will be a new NMI classification. Meghan Bibby noted that these details are yet to be worked out. Mark Riley queried how an IRP is related to a NMI in MSATS.
* Dino Ou (Endeavour) queried if we will be moving away from identifying certain participant types by looking at certain relationship patterns e.g. looking for the SGA suffix at the end of the FRMP ID to identify Small Generation Aggregators (SGA), and instead move towards having a field/flag instead. Meghan Bibby noted that the project is still at the HLIA stage and such details are still to be confirmed.
* Blaine Miner (AEMO) queried about the proposed approach for industry engagement. Rosie Elkins noted that the first step is to publish the regulatory approach document, which will outline the outcome of initial review, and then provide further details as to AEMO intends on engaging industry.
* Mark Riley noted that he is not clear from the high-level design if IESS applies to over 5MW only or residential or small sites as well. Rosie Elkins noted IRPs would be able to classify market connection points but was not sure of the impact on small loads. Meghan Bibby took an action to confirm these details.
* Mark Riley queried if an IRP can be an ‘extended FRMP’ and then depending on the customer classification an IRP would need to meet jurisdictional and regulatory requirements of dealing with small customers.
* Rosie Elkins requested that the B2BWG, on behalf of the IEC, conducts a high level assessment for B2B procedures by 31 May 2022.
* Helen Vassos asked if the intent of IESS was to maintain a one-to-one relationship between a NMI and a FRMP or was it moving to a multiple FRMPs to NMI arrangement.
* Rosie Elkins noted multiple FRMPs at a NMI is not enabled through the rule change.
* Rosie Elkins shared the high-level impact assessment template with the WG.
* Helen Vassos noted that unless the B2B WG knows the answers to the fundamental questions asked at the meeting that it is going to be impossible to fill in the template with an accuracy. Meghan noted that AEMO would send the WG a link to the rule change and high-level design.
* Blaine Miner requested members to consider any additional questions which my be needed for them to conduct the requested HLIA. Blaine also noted the proposal from Mark Riley to establish a subgroup of the WG to conduct the initial assessment e.g. a representative from retailer, metering and distribution.
* Paul Greenwood requested for AEMO to run a more detailed summary session for the rules and the high-level design. This would assist in raising any more questions as noted by Blaine above.
* Paul Greenwood queried what is driving the 31 May deadline. Blaine Miner suggested, that due to dependencies on B2M HLIAs and responses to questions asked today that the IESS team consider potential contingencies should the WG not be able to achieve the 31 May 2022 deadline.

Actions:

* Find out if the roadmap noted in IESS presentation will replace regulatory industry roadmap
* Confirm the relationship between IRPs and DRSPs.
* Confirm what loads IESS applies to.
* Confirm what fundamental assumptions the B2B WG need to consider in completing the HLIA
* Confirm if IESS is proposing a potential 2 FRMP to 1 NMI arrangement.
* Send links to the IESS Rules and high-level design to the WG.
* AEMO to schedule a meeting with the WG to provide a more detailed summary of the IESS Rules and high-level design.
	+ Completed, meeting has been scheduled for 23 March.

Please note most of the actions noted above are answered in the attached IESS Questions and Answers document.

## Update B2B Guide with feedback from Networks and Technical feedback from members – B2B-WG

Discussion:

* Nandu Datar spoke to the context of this item and noted that it involved the members identifying issues with the contents of the guide and propose changes. It also involved improving the formatting of the guide.
* Dino Ou queried the purpose of the guide in relation to jurisdictional and specific matters and noted that some sections of the guide could be misleading. David Woods agreed with Dino’s comment.
* Paul Greenwood noted if the group could ask the industry about usefulness of the document.
* Mark Riley noted that the option of using distributor’s handbooks could result in 15 different types of instructions.
* Helen Vassos noted that some participants only refer to the guide and ignore the procedure.
* Aakash Sembey agreed with some of the earlier comments and also noted that the guide was created to separate out business processes from the procedures. This information needs to exist somewhere. He is not aware that every distributor provides a handbook.
* Helen Vassos noted that the guide does deliver some value to the new entrants to the market.
* Dino Ou noted the information in the guide can be categorised in 2 groups. First group providing supporting information about the B2B transactions defined in the procedures. The other category is mainly the jurisdictional or network organisation specific processes is of concern. Mark queried where the processes related information goes. Dino responded that new participants reach out to them and that the guide does not provide the information a new participant needs to know. The information in the guide is a starting point and they still have to reach out to the network for further details.
* Helen Vassos agreed with Dino’s comment and noted that distributor specific information should be removed from the guide. The procedures could include a generic reference for the participant to refer to the distributor for specific processes.
* David Woods noted that survey may not be as useful. The guide contains lot of information that was point in time and can be removed. The formatting could be improved, e.g. information relating to a specific procedure brought together.
* Blaine Miner queried if all distributors have a handbook. There was no conclusive response from the members. Blaine also queried if the WG are comfortable to make the decision on behalf of the wider participants or if their preference is to conduct a survey with wider participants. Blaine noted further that the key points from the discussion could form the basis of the survey.

Actions:

* B2B WG to consider the objective of the guide. Ask 2 to 3 questions about the guide, does it add value to the wider participants, is an alternative preferable.
* B2B WG develop 2 to 3 questions to survey the wider participants.

## Update OWN to include NCOMUML Inventory files – Mark Rikey (AGL)

Discussion:

* Mark Riley spoke to the ICF and noted that it proposes using the One-Way Notification (OWN) transaction to send the NCOMUML inventory files instead of current process of using an email. The reason for moving away from email is concern about cyber security and manual handling of emails. It is possible to automate the process when the files are received via OWN.
* David Woods noted that they do not support the ICF. The files do not contain confidential information. David also noted that the cost of implementing this solution is not justifiable.
* Dino Ou queried if the proposal was recommending that the OWN the option must be used, or can be used, by Participants. Mark Riley noted that a query about the file name in OWN is still outstanding from AEMO and he was unable to respond to Dino’s query. Mark noted further that the proposal is for OWN option only.
* Blaine Miner requested response from other participants. There was no further response from the members.

Actions:

* B2B WG members to check with their internal stakeholders and provide feedback on whether to progress the ICF or not.

## Potential gap in NEM RoLR Processes – Aakash Sembey (Origin)/Nandu Datar (AEMO)

Discussion:

* Nandu Datar spoke to the issue raised by Aakash Sembey about incorrect reference in clause 104.5 of the NEM RoLR process. Further investigation of the issue identified a potential gap in the procedure where obligations similar to the LNSP did not exist for the roles MC, MP and MDP. The obligation relates to ensuring the service order (SO) response contains all fields according to the B2B procedure SO process.
* Paul Greenwood noted that obligations on contestable metering providers are subject to commercial arrangement.
* Meghan Bibby noted that it may be part of the accreditation/registration for metering providers that the obligations may have to be part of the RoLR process rather than the commercial arrangement.

Actions:

* AEMO to send details of the potential gap in RoLR process to B2B WG members.
* B2B WG members to review the information and provide feedback indicating if there is gap or not.

# Other business

## Wrap-up, actions, questions, parked issues

* Meter install timeframes in QLD – Robert LoGiudice
	+ Robert LoGiudice referred Table 12 of the B2B SO process and item ‘Metering Service Works’ and noted that it refers to Queensland Electricity Distribution Network Code. Robert noted that the current timeframe is 15 business days, whereas according to the Queensland Electricity Distribution Network Code for meter exchange it is 10 business days.
	+ Meghan Bibby noted that the distribution code belongs to the Queensland government and not Energy Queensland. Further discussion also referred to clause 3.3.3 of the distribution code refers to Table 12 mentioned above and that resolves the issue raised.
* Timing of B2B WG April meeting
	+ Blane Miner referred to the consultation 3.8 currently in progress and the associated meeting scheduled for 14 April to discuss responses to the Issues paper and asked the members if the April monthly meeting scheduled for 12 April should be cancelled or rescheduled.
	+ Mark Riley noted that the regular business needs to be separated from consultation and the 12 April meeting should continue.
	+ Blaine Miner noted the item related to IESS high level impact assessment and queried if any members support the meeting on 12 April to continue. Blaine noted the meeting to provide summary of IESS rules and high-level design could be scheduled in 2 weeks' time and leave the meeting on 12 April in member's calendars. The B2B WG could make a call following the meeting in 2 weeks' time as to whether the monthly meeting on 12 April is still required. Members indicated preference for 23 March for the IESS meeting.

Actions:

* Following the out of session meeting in 2 weeks, determine if the regular B2B WG meeting on 12 April is still required.

Discussion

* Approach to the drafting of recommendation to the IEC and Draft report (lead writer)
	+ Blaine Miner requested the B2B WG to consider nominating a lead writer for the draft report and amending the procedures.

Actions:

* B2B WG to consider the suggestion and come up with a response by the closure of the consultation 3.8 submissions.

The next B2B-WG meeting is scheduled for 12 April 2022.

Parked items:

* None