MINUTES – DER REGISTER DELIVERY TEAM 1 MEETING

MEETING:	DER Register – Delivery Team 1 (Data Model) Meeting
DATE:	Wednesday, 20 March 2019
TIME:	2.00 – 4.00pm (AEDT)
LOCATION:	Webex (dial in)

ATTENDEES:

NAME	COMPANY / DEPARTMENT
Eloise Taylor	AEMO
Gurindar Singh	AEMO
Kausik Samanta	AEMO
Luke Barlow	AEMO
Roy Kaplan	AEMO (Chair)
Tom Butler	AEMO
Kevin Smith	AusGrid
Robert Simpson	AusGrid
Salman Gillani	AusGrid
Daniel Perry	AusNet Services
Justin Betlehem	AusNet Services
Greg Szot	Citipower Powercor United Energy
Annie MacDonald	Endeavour Energy
Anthony Kavaliauskas	Endeavour Energy
Dean Comber	Energy Queensland
Peter Kilby	Energy Queensland
Kevin Combe	Jemena
Thanh Bui	Jemena
John Dalgliesh	Solar Scope
Dave Sales	TasNetworks

(note: best efforts were made to compile a complete attendee list, however some dial in attendees may have been omitted)

1. Agenda

1. Terms of Reference
2. Update on Project
3. Summary of stakeholder engagement
4. Summary of stakeholder feedback
    - General data model
    - Variables, Data fields and AC connections
    - Data sources
    - Other issues
5. Next steps

2. Action Items

ITEM	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE	DUE
1			

3. Notes

3.1 Welcomes and Introduction

- Noted that Terms of Reference (ToR) had been circulated previously to the group.
- AEMO gave an overview of the TOR.
- No comments on TOR. If delivery team members would like to propose any questions or changes, please email derregister@aemo.com.au.

3.2 Update on project (slides 3–4)

- AEMO provided a brief background on the DER Register project

3.3 Stakeholder engagement (slide 6)

- AEMO provided a summary of stakeholder engagement to date.

3.4 Stakeholder feedback – general data model (slides 9-11)

- Concern about providing some of the detailed information - will all inverter characteristics be available for app developers to supply in an app?
- AC connection to DER device mapping - the more fields that the DNSP is maintain will inherently make it harder to maintain long term. This relationship can change over time and may be invisible to the DNSP. Unsure of the benefit of trying to maintain this relationship long term.
    - General agreement of keeping the connection/ configuration updated particularly in light of site updates.
    - Is it possible for installers to play a role in maintenance?
- Struggle to see this the benefit of this level of detail.
- What do AEMO think the effort and practicality will be for the smaller connections.
    - The collection process is being designed to make it as simple and straight forward as possible, with a good amount of automation.
    - Use of lookup tables rather than multiple data entry points
- Use of the defined term Generator? - AEMO suggested that they will propose more appropriate terminology.
- Lead/ lag terminology - won't affect what we do for the data collection at this stage. AEMO to take on notice and use less ambiguous terminology.
- Use of photos – could be useful to locate equipment on site – particularly for emergency services.
    - Need to consider privacy issue s for customers to have DNSPs and AEMO passing photos between them?
    - It is not something that AEMO need to do their modelling.
    - Note that the resolution of current photos is 200-300kb, which will make the storage size of register need to be larger.
- Should we reduce number of levels in the data model?
    - Gives good amount of flexibility.
    - Not clear when you make a new DERID. Why would you have multiple DERID installations to a NMI. Each DERID would be seen as mapping to a separate application. A way to have an audit or continual reference as the installer.
    - A history model is useful, you can go back and see previous installations. Generally, installers would not want to come back and update an existing DERID.
- Key issue identified is keeping data up to date.

3.5 Stakeholder feedback – variables, Data fields and AC connections (slides 13-15)

- Discrete values – DNSPs want aggregate, and not discrete, settings
- Should we use kW or kVA?
  - EQ – only relates to inverter capacity and export limits.
  - AEMO will consider what we need to do here.
- Suggestion for inclusion of phases.
  - Clarified that the requirement is for (1) phases available, and (2) phases with DER connected
  - Endeavour – agrees.
  - Need to allow for where it is not known.
- Should tilt and orientation of solar panels be captured?
  - App can do this
  - May prove beneficial over time
  - Panels not all installed in single orientation/tilt – makes capturing with any degree of accuracy infeasible
- Need more information relating to protection for non-inverter generators (eg ROCOF, volt/var control, anti-island etc)
- No process too include standby or backup generators
  - Not running in parallel with the network
  - No connection agreements to facilitate inclusion
  - Might be feasible for use with VPP
- Installers – do DNSPs want to know who has worked on what?
- Can we account for DER outside of the threshold?
- Issue – data integrity
  - Draw on existing accreditation schemes
  - Do DNSPS require CEC accreditation?
    - Qld – yes
    - Ausnet - yes

3.6 Stakeholder feedback – data sources (slide 17)

- DERIDs – use DNSP ID framework if no DERID
- Issues better fit for workstream 2 – Delivery Process

3.7 Stakeholder feedback – other issues (slides 19-20)

- Embedded Networks discussion –
  - DERIDs work for embedded networks
  - Can we just deal with the parent NMI? No process for Embedded Network Operator to be involved with collection of DER information for child NMIs.
  - May be considered in current AEMC rule change on consumer issues in embedded networks
  - Don’t want to add in a special Embedded Network field. Note that adding a field is better than adding a level.
- Incentives for data quality

- Incentive of claiming STCs
- Accreditation system – CEC or something similar
- Need firm levers

4. Next Steps (slides 22-23)

- Next meeting proposed for early April after Draft Guideline and Report are published for consultation.

The meeting closed at 4:00pm.