

## MEETING NOTES – ERCF

MEETING: Electricity Retail Consultative Forum  
 DATE: Friday, 21 May 2021  
 TIME: 9:30am-12:00pm AEST  
 LOCATION: Teleconference  
 MEETING #: 5-21  
 CONTACT [ercf@aemo.com.au](mailto:ercf@aemo.com.au)

### ATTENDEES:

Name	Company
Meghan Bibby	AEMO
Gareth Morrah	AEMO
Jackie Krizmanic	AEMO
Aakash Sembey	Simply Energy
Adrian Honey	TasNetworks
Andrew Friis	Yurika
Andrew Jumeau	Evoenergy
Brett Graham	Origin Energy
Chantal Wright	Jemena
Christophe Bechia	Red / Lumo
Daniel Hoolihan	Energy Queensland
David Woods	SA Power Networks
Deepesh Goswami	Secure Meters
Dino Ou	Endeavour Energy
Greg Szot	Citipower PowerCor
Helen Vassos	PLUS ES
Jane Hutson	Energy Queensland
Jeff Roberts	EvoEnergy
Joe Castellano	Origin
John Dawson	1 <sup>st</sup> Energy
Justin Bethlehem	Ausnet Services
Kamal Kisto	Origin Energy
Kambiz Vessali	Secure Meters
Lamiya Marikar	Jemena
Laura Peirano	United Energy (UE)
Leon Vilfand	Jemena
Mamta Madan	Active Utilities
Mark Leschke	Yurika
Mark Riley	AGL

Name	Company
Paul Greenwood	VectorAMS
Rebecca Neatnica	Ausnet Services
Robert Lo Giudice	intelliHUB
Shaun Cupitt	Alinta Energy
Tom Cole	Energy Queensland
Vicki Hennessy	Endeavour Energy
Wayne Turner	Ausgrid

## **PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

### **1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 4–6)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) welcomed all participants to the meeting and spoke to the items as per the slides. The agenda was accepted by attendees.

### **2. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 7–9)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted the closed and progressed items, as detailed in the meeting pack and agenda.

AEMO provided a brief description of the way that UFE will be calculated under global settlement (action 2503-03). Attendees discussed the need (or otherwise) for the MDP to seek approval for substitutions from all retailers in an area due to the way that UFE is allocated. In particular the procedures use the term “affected participants” which can be interpreted to mean all retailers in region, this would represent a significant administrative burden for the MDP. There was also a discussion on the implications for embedded networks. AEMO took an action to determine whether or not on-market embedded network children will be included in the local network global settlement calculation.

Mark Leschke spoke to action 2503-06 and clarified that they are not asking for revision of type 14 substitution time frames, rather seeking clarity when compared to requirements for type 16. AEMO agreed to take this question on notice.

## **MATTERS FOR NOTING**

### **3. ICF Register**

AEMO noted that half of the items on the register are now under consultation. The other half of the items on the register relate to reason codes and substitution methods which are being worked through now in a sub working group.

### **4. e-Hub Accreditation and Revocation Process**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) talked through the proposed changes. Participants asked if the proposed changes mean that if a participant changes their system that they would then only need to test the affected transactions for re accreditation. AEMO agreed that this was the correct interpretation but noted that in most cases that the accreditation relates to a change in the participants gateway which require full testing.

This item will be added to the “To be consulted on” list.

## **MSATS ONLY ITEMS**

### **5. Updating NTC for a Greenfields NMI**

Laura Peirano discussed the issues for the network updating the NTC for a Greenfield NMI. Participants agreed that MSATS should be amended so that this can occur. This may in part be assisted by changing the definition of a Greenfield NMI. AEMO will continue to work with Laura to develop possible options.

### **6. Misaligned NMI Status**

Helen Vassos (Plus ES) described an issue with NMI status which are causing wasted truck rolls. This is as a result of the time lag between a site being disconnected before MSATS is updated or because a customer has pulled a fuse. Plus ES has identified 50% of their wasted truck rolls for communications faults are as a result of this issue. Yurika reported similar rates. Participants discussed the allowable time for DNSP's to update MSATS following a change in status of the NMI. Participants agreed to form a subgroup to discuss this issue further.

### **7. Controlled Load Data Field (MSDR changes)**

Participants discussed the change to the Controlled Load field as a result of MSDR (has become an enumerated list). Metering providers are not sure how the field is supposed to be populated to align with DNSP requirements. Participants agreed to form a sub group to discuss this issue.

### **8. Substitutions**

Only 1 submission has been received to the survey put out by AEMO to contestable MDPs on substitution methods. That survey asked what interval substitution methods would be suited to be split into separate types for small versus large customers. Participants agreed that this issue should be revisited once industry has more experience with 5 minute metering.

### **9. Reason Code Survey Results**

Meghan Bibby advised that four codes have been moved to the obsolete table.

About a dozen replies have been received to date. The key themes from those responses are that a lot of codes are rarely used, and that the pandemic has resulted in an atypical year in terms of use of codes. The sub group will discuss these results.

### **10. Access issues**

Helen Vassos (Plus ES) noted that approx. 35% of communications faults were as a result of access issues which weren't being resolved in a timely manner. In particular either knowing a PI key is in place, or getting access to the PI key would be beneficial.

Participants discussed PI keys and refusal of entry by customers. The broader issue of access can't be resolved in this forum. It was noted that both the AEMC in its competition in metering review, and the NSW Government are currently reviewing access issues more broadly. Participants agreed to hold this discussion until these other reviews had run their course.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **11. GENERAL QUESTIONS & NEXT MEETING – Gareth Morrah, AEMO (Slides 26–27)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) advised that the B2BWG had referred an issue of industry understanding of the codes that are to be used in the Shared Fuse field. In particular, does industry understand that the “I” flag means and when it is to be used.

AEMO proposed to survey ERCF members on this issue and also to include a question on the perceived value of this flag for participants.

**ACTION ITEMS RAISED AT MEETING**

Item	Topic	Action required	Responsible	By
2105-01	UFE and EN	Determine whether or not on-market embedded network children will be included in the local network global settlement calculation.	AEMO	
2105-02	Greenfield site status	How can it be made easier for an LNSP to update Greenfield Sites, AEMO to work with Laura Peirano	AEMO, Laura Peirano	
2105-03	NMI Status	Misaligned NMI status, AEMO to convene a sub working group	AEMO	
2105-04	CL Enumerations	Controlled Load Enumerations, AEMO to convene a sub working group	AEMO	
2105-05	Shared Fusing Codes	Shared Fusing, AEMO to survey participants to clarify use of codes by participants	AEMO	
2105-06	Type 14 Substitutions	AEMO to clarify the time frames for type 14 and type 16 substitutions	AEMO	