

MEETING NOTES – ERCF

MEETING: Electricity Retail Consultative Forum
DATE: Thursday, 16 December 2021
TIME: 8:30am-11:00pm AEST
LOCATION: Teleconference
MEETING #: 12-21
CONTACT ercf@aemo.com.au

ATTENDEES:

Name	Company
Jordan Daly	AEMO
Kate Gordon	AEMO
Lenard Bull	AEMO
Meghan Bibby	AEMO
Nandu Datar	AEMO
Blaine Miner	AEMO
Jackie Krizmanic	AEMO
Adrian Honey	TasNetworks
Andrew Jumeau	EVO Energy
Chantal Wright	Jemena
Christophe Bechia	Red/Lumo Energy
Dannii Upham	Yurika
David Woods	SA Power Networks
Daniel Hoolihan	Energy Queensland
Dino Ou	Endeavour Energy
Ellie Carey	ActewAGL
Graeme Ferguson	Essential Energy
Greg Szot	Citipower Powercor
Helen Vassos	Plus ES
Jane Hutson	Energex
Jeff Roberts	Evoenergy
Jo Sullivan	EnergyAustralia
Justin Bethlehem	Ausnet Services
Kamal Kisto	Origin Energy
Kambiz Vessali	Secure Meters
Laura Pierano	United Energy
Leon Vilfand	Jemena
Mark Riley	AGL
Mark Leschke	Yurika
Mathew Tanzer	Energy Queensland
Mamta Madan	Active Utilities
Paul Greenwood	VectorAMS
Rebecca Neatnica	Ausnet
Richard Metherell	Mondo
Robert Lo Giudice	Alinta

Name	Company
Sue Richardson	Agility CIS
Wayne Farrell	Energy Queensland
Wayne Turner	Ausgrid
Zahara Magriplis	Energy Queensland

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES – Blaine Miner, AEMO

Blaine Miner (AEMO) welcomed all participants to the meeting and spoke to the items as per the slides.

2. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING – Blaine Miner, AEMO

Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted the closed, progressed and open items, as detailed in the meeting pack and agenda.

3. Proposed Changes to the ERCF change process – Blaine Miner, AEMO

Blaine Miner (AEMO) walked through proposed changes to the ICF template.

- Mark Riley (AGL) noted that there is a lack of known contacts outside of the ERCF to engage other participants to discuss issues with. The issues are raised at the ERCF as the beginning of engaging industry.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that it is a valid point, but happy for AEMO to be used as a conduit between Participants where required e.g. asking if a Participant is happy for AEMO to share their contact details with an ICF Proponent.
- Jeff Roberts (Evoenergy) asked: If a person submits an ICF as a LNSP, then moves to a different company FRMP, is the ICF still valid?
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that yes, the ICF would still be valid.
- Rob Lo Giudice (Alinta) asked: where will the final ICF Template be stored?
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted it would replace the current ICF form that is currently online on the AEMO website
- Mark Riley (AGL) commented: Due to market change, the duration of an issue may not be a correct gauge. Mark believes that some may be too detailed, and may be skewed due to the size of customer base e.g. larger retailers may have a larger FTE impact than a smaller retailer due to customer base size. Mark believes Question 4 on the new ICF template should be separated out and treated as confidential. In addition, it may be that the problem is growing larger, and the requirement is to fix it before it gets too large.
- Jeff Roberts (Evoenergy) noted that he agrees with Mark and noted that: 1 FTE for me (as a participant) could be 20 or 30 to other (participants)
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that from an AEMO perspective it needs to be identified if the issue is worth the effort. Blaine took the feedback on notice.
- David Woods (SAPN) agreed with Blaine Miner stating that the ERCF needs to make sure an issue is worth the effort from a whole of Industry perspective prior to progressing the ICF too far

- Kamal Kisto (Origin): As the impact grows, so does the Risk for Non-compliance. Having workarounds is costly and risky for many participants. We'd rather the issue is rectified if identified and acknowledged by the ERCF to be an Industry issue.
- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) agrees with Mark on quantification and that this needs to be treated confidentially. Helen didn't believe that the high, medium and low impact options on multiple participants is sufficient, it should be based on volume.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that we don't want to create impacts for the whole industry due to impacts on one participant.
- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) asked if the Impact on the ICF form was defined by an individual participant level or by role level, as the issue typically is faced by a market role, not necessarily individual participants.
- Mark Riley (AGL) agreed, if it is done by role, it will cover any participant coming into that role in the future.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that from his perspective, just because an issue impacts a role, that doesn't mean it will necessarily represent a high impact rating.
- Mark Riley (AGL) suggested breaking the section into two, impact, and then if it is a role or individual participant issue.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) note that the participant role could be added into the ICF form
- Dino Ou (Endeavour) suggested the section called 'High-level Issue Impact Assessment' be called 'Participant Impact Assessment'. The issue impact is dependent on all the other sections within the ICF.
- Paul Greenwood (Vector) state that the impact should indicate which roles are affected.
- Kamal Kisto (Origin) noting that the impact assessment from the proponent will still be a subjective view and require AEMO/ERCF members to review/understand and agree/not agree etc. I thought the "quick survey" was an effective way to gauge on impact from all participants.
- Rob Lo Giudice (Alinta) noted concern around AEMO being the determiner whether an ICF is viewed by the wider ERCF group. Rob doesn't believe that AEMO should be the determiner and voiced concern that if an ICF doesn't meet AEMO's criteria/expectations, it would not be presented to the ERCF for discussion. Rob voiced concerns around the process being so streamlined that it doesn't make it to the ERCF forum as other participants may be able to add value or fill in the missing knowledge.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) agreed with Rob's comments and suggested that potentially AEMO could categorise ICFs to indicate the stage the ICF is at e.g. under development, ready for approval, approved for implementation, etc.
- David Woods (SAPN) Agree - validation and endorsement stage of the ICF/change process is the important step
- David Woods (SAPN) suggested the inclusion of a question that asks what Jurisdiction(s) the issue is occurring in (or expected to occur in) to understand the breadth of the Industry impact
- Mark Leschke (Yurika) asked if there was an intention to reform the old participant meetings where, for example, MDPs can discuss any issues they may have in the

market? It might be a good way of gauging how widespread or how big an impact an issue is when providing an ICF to the ERCF.

- Zahara Magriplis (EQ): Yes, agreed. The true complexity/impact from an industry perspective cannot be understood by any one participant. Once an ICF is submitted, can the "next step" be better defined? It is important other participants have the opportunity to understand the issue in detail and have time to put an informed response together, as well as perform their own impact assessment. Going straight to a sub-group is not an efficient way of exploring an
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) thanked the ERCF for their feedback and requested for any additional feedback to be sent to ERCF@aemo.com.au. Feedback will be discussed at the next ERCF.

4. AEMO/Industry Initiated Change Cycles – Blaine Miner, AEMO

Blaine Miner (AEMO) spoke to AEMO's proposal to limit AEMO/Industry initiated change implementations to twice per year. AEMO is seeking feedback on the proposed frequency and approach re prioritisation and timings.

Blaine Miner (AEMO) walked through hypothetical timings illustrating how the proposed approach might work and included NER 8.9 consultation Procedures.

- Paul Greenwood (Vector): Priority should be first in/first out (FiFo). Once a change is accepted then they should all be treated equally.
- Wayne Farrell (EQ) supports the proposed change noting that there has been confusion when multiple different procedure versions have been established through multiple different consultations, it would be nice to see one set of documents as an outcome of this if possible.
- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) agreed with the proposed approach.
- Rob Lo Giudice (Alinta) suggested that a May cycle would be better than an April effective date "Jan is a right off, Feb/Mar is not enough time to build for an April start date."
- Mark Riley (AGL) and you often run into easter in April, which adds delays
- Adrian Honey (Tasnetworks) I understand that we historically had May and Nov as release cycles, but in recent years this has been railroaded by other Rule changes.
- Mark Riley (AGL) that's right - 2 releases/year
- Mark Riley (AGL) we need to consider the alignment of B2M and B2B changes, often a metering type change has a B2B impact, suggested it needs to be looked at the B2B group to see if it ties in
- David Woods (SAPN) supports the structured releases, did enquire as to how changes which will take longer than one cycle to implement will be managed.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) suggested that the cycle allocation process would need to consider consultation and system/process lead times in order to determine the appropriate change cycle. Blaine appreciated that different changes would require different lead times.
- Jeff Roberts (Evoenergy): Can AEMO advise AER and AEMC of these proposed release cycles?

- Mark Leschke (Yurika): Agree Jeff
- Daniel Hoolihan (EQ) also need to consider minor procedural changes that doesn't require a system release
- Helen Vassos (PLUS ES) asked what impact the current bottle neck of Regulatory change would have on ERCF proposed changes? Currently we would be looking 2023 - not very agile. The Roadmap does not include the Operational efficiencies such as these discussed at the ERCF.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) acknowledged Helen's concerns and conceded that the ERCF would need to consider the Regulatory Reform Roadmap as opposed to the other way around.
- Rob Lo Giudice (Alinta): At what point is AEMO having a conversation with other governing bodies asking them to align with these cycles?
- Mark Riley (AGL) noted that the roadmap committee was being developed to help with these issues
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that AEMO does advocate to these governing bodies for appropriate change cycles and noted that we may need to considering aligning to quarter or fin year starts to allow for changes which impact the financial markets.
- Blaine Miner (AEMO) thanked the ERCF for their feedback and requested for any additional feedback to be sent to ERCF@aemo.com.au. Feedback will be discussed at the next ERCF. Blaine also asked for the ERCF to provide feedback as to how they believed prioritisation should occur for ERCF initiated changes.

5. ICF Register Update– Jordan Daly, AEMO

Jordan Daly (AEMO) gave an update on the current ICFs and spoke to each ICF per the slides.

- Jackie Krizmanic (AEMO) spoke to the RPERR3 report. The number of NMIs appearing in this report has reduced. There was one participant which had issues with their systems which was causing the bigger numbers. Jackie noted, that AEMO is open to the idea of sending this report to the applicable FRMPs as well, probably not until the new year, and will now go to both parties, not just the MCs.
- Mark Riley (AGL) noted that giving participants obligations that they are unable to rectify should be discouraged.
- Dino Ou (Endeavour), please confirm if there is a specific obligation on the MC to rectify, believes it should be the FRMP.
- Wayne Turner (Ausgrid) Jackie, was that MC and FRMP for RPERR3? Why send it to the MC if they can't do anything? Other than ask the FRMP to rectify.
- Dannii Upham (Yurika) 100% agree Mark. There are a lot of things that an MC cannot resolve themselves and instead needs to rely on others to act. The obligation to do the right thing, doesn't appear on their AEMO compliance reports.
- David Woods (SAPN) Jackie - could you just confirm, from the stats that you have reviewed, the volume of this issue has reduced to approx. 30 NMIs?
- Jackie Krizmanic (AEMO) Correct.

- An action was taken to broach this issue with FRMPs to ensure they are aware they will also receive the RPERR3 report, before sending it to MCs and FRMPs.

6. Incorrect Assignment of the MC Update – Helen Vassos (PlusES)

Helen Vassos (PlusES) spoke to the Incorrect Assignment of the MC ICF.

- Blaine Miner (AEMO) noted that the subgroup also discussed the possibility of reinstating the ability for an MC to object to an incorrect nomination.
 - Blaine stated that:
 - It may be problematic to successfully reintroduce the MC's ability to object.
 - AEMO does not have the ability to validate MSATS standing data based on commercial agreements between participants, to see if an MC has been assigned correctly or incorrectly.
- Mark Riley (AGL) from memory, the faster switching change had no rule change it was all procedure change based on AEMO assessment
- Daniel Hoolihan (EQ) agreed, it also very clearly stated that the nomination of the MC should not occur as part of the FRMP change procedure, yet that capability was left in the updated procedures
- Meghan Bibby noted that the Customer Switching Rule change did occur and is available at <https://www.aemc.gov.au/rule-changes/reducing-customers-switching-times-retail>
- Mark Riley (AGL) an objection to a winning retailer wont trigger a save, as the previous FRMP shouldn't see that objection
- Daniel Hoolihan (EQ) the CR63xx transaction exists for a reason
- Wayne Farrell agree with Daniel, no MC on the CR10xx and if appropriate a CR63xx following CR10xx com
- Dannii Upham (Yurika): 100% agree with Daniel and when the incorrect MC is nominated it is extremely difficult to have FRMPs review and rectify the issue in a timely manner, which leaves MP/MDP with a different MC and this creates issues with responsibilities and financials and publishing details to market on time. If the Retailers found initiating a second CR to change the MC too cumbersome then they really need to ensure they choose the right MC as part of the CR10xx process otherwise their obligation to rectify in a timely manner should be reportable on the FRMP.
- Rob Lo Giudice if we are now only talking 31 across the whole NEM, is this largely somewhat resolved?
- Helen Vassos stated that number does not include incorrectly nominated contestable MCs.
- Meghan Bibby Rob, the 31 is the DNSP appointment errors. Rather than the Competitive MCs which we can't measure.
- David Woods (SAPN) Regardless of the size of the problem - we should proceed with making the RPERR3 the FRMP's responsibility and remove it from the MC's list.
- Kamal Kisto in my case.. I have 33 Retailers where we are MC which we do not have a contract with to provide MC services.. no operational arrangements - yet we are tied to

all the obligations and subject to all associated breaches. We can't continue to send lists of sites to 33 Retailers.

- Helen Vassos (PlusES) I think this is two pronged ... proactive and reactive processes. Mitigate the issue and timely resolution where it exists.
- An action was taken for AEMO to facilitate a discussion regarding this issue in the new year.

7. General Business

Blaine Miner proposed that the next ERCF be shifted from 27 Jan to early Feb, to allow for the conclusion of 2 current consultations. ERCF agreed. New meeting invite to be sent for the first week of Feb 2022.

Blaine Miner (AEMO) Closed the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS RAISED AT MEETING

Item	Topic	Action required	Responsible	By
1612-01	Proposed Changes to the ERCF change process	ERCF to provide feedback on new ICF template	ERCF members	Week prior to next meeting
1612-02	Proposed Changes to the ERCF change process	ERCF to give feedback on how ICFs should be prioritised and managed	ERCF members	Week prior to next meeting
1612-03	AEMO/Industry Initiated Change Cycles	ERCF feedback on frequency of changes and potential cycles	ERCF members	Week prior to next meeting
1612-04	RPERR3 Report	AEMO to gather feedback from retailers regarding circulating the report to them.	AEMO	Week prior to next meeting
1612-05	Incorrect Assignment of MCs	AEMO to reconvene the subgroup	AEMO	Week prior to next meeting
1612-06	Next Meeting Date	January meeting date to be changed to first week in Feb. New Meeting invite to be sent.	AEMO	