

## POC Program Consultative Forum No.4 Meeting Notes

MEETING: POC Program Consultative Forum (PCF)  
 DATE: Thursday 15 December 2016  
 TIME: 2:30 PM  
 LOCATION: AEMO Offices Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide-  
 Video/Teleconference

Attendees:

Andrew Peart	AGL
Felicia Brady	Active Stream
Phil Gardiner	Citipower & Powercor
Roy Thompson	AusNet Services
Ben Healy	AEMO
Michael Ryan	AEMO
Shavneel Nand	AEMO
Jennifer Fikret	AEMO – Minute Taker
Jacinta Daws	Jemena
Leanne Rees	TasNetworks
Warren Brooks	TasNetworks

**Red indicates an action.**

B. Healy thanked M. Ryan for chairing the previous PCF.

### 1.0 APOLOGIES

Nil.

### 2.0 WELCOME

Attendees were welcomed and introduced to the PCF.

### 3.0 BRIEF UPDATE

The B2B WG are about a half day behind with the draft procedures and Technical Design Specification (TDS) but will catch up this weekend. There were 2000 comments and a draft will be put to the IEC by 21 December. There will be no quality short cuts on the typical processes with these documents due to the time constraints. The documents will be complete. The TDS has had a full day review.

There are changes to CSDN procedures specifically life support. This will be omitted from the document as there is a potential rule change coming.

The SWG and B2B are proposing a new protocol – Web-services which is fully inter-operable with FTP.

WP2 procedures (accreditation and registration) have received good feedback. The Draft Determination is available on AEMO's website. The workshop occurring on 20 December is to discuss the reasons behind decisions made so far, and the proposed fee for the purpose of accreditation and registration.

The Readiness WG ran a trial Readiness Report in November with a good response. There were themes in the risks and issues that have been raised, in line with those investigated by the PCF. **Action: B. Healy will forward a copy of the Readiness Report to the PCF.**

There are around six organisations AEMO still need to contact to get a report off and also 20 or so participants that AEMO believe should be partaking in reporting. The total is around 40 entities including metering companies and proposed Embedded Networks. AEMO have a list of potential and actual ENs available. The Victorian Government Options Paper is a key risk that has been identified.

Changes to jurisdictional arrangements will be taken on board in the next cycle of Procedure Consultation. The Commonwealth government have requested participants to supply more information regarding proposed safety regulation changes. The drafting of the B2B procedures accommodates state variations at the moment and, if there is any further changes they are likely to be towards standard approaches rather than further divergence.

Discussion followed on risks and their consolidation.

Watching briefs were discussed.

1. **Victorian Government Options Paper** – timelines and options could be negative on the industry. The Government are targeting the first quarter of next year for a decision, however it may occur in February/March 2017. Option 1 and 2 – system wide will work. Option 3 and 4 will result in changes being required. A new schema will not be backward compatible. Until the Victorian Government decide, there is no costing or timelines available for option 3 or 4. The risk involved from AEMO's point of view is uncertain and it is best to go ahead with what AEMO currently know. If the decision stretches out, it is a risk. **Action: B. Healy to investigate Option 4 impacts.**
2. **The AER's treatment of Vic AMI meters being type 4.** AEMO can take that so far but would need help getting further detail and talking points on the table. AEMO will take this back to the AER. B. Healy will be asking for attendees to "shed light" on the problem. AEMO need to know the impacts on systems and processes. **Action: B. Healy/A. Mascarenhas discuss with AER.**

AEMO have a test lead coming on board and are looking to get industry engagement started mid-February 2017 with an industry meeting. The Draft Test Strategy will be sent about a week prior. The proposed test will go through the AEMO's system and will be integrated with some market trials and market tests. There may be an opportunity to separate out operational testing and the system testing. Orchestrated rehearsal-of-concept type testing may be undertaken in isolation of systems. This will seek to "weed" out some of the bugs in operational activities outside of the communication platform as early as possible. AEMO believe that the industry can concurrently achieve this with systems level testing.

The EN and MC rule changes largely affect MSATS. Those changes were finalised when the procedures were published on 1 September and AEMO have undertaken to make some of those systems changes available for early testing. April 2017 is the current target. The aim is to get targeted testing on those changes (mainly MSATS) to alleviate pressure during the defined industry testing period.

The system, based on the B2B WG and SWG is going to interface with web services and existing FTP interfaces.

There is a potential for AEMO to decommission the current B2B solution and deploy a new solution. The build process is occurring now and AEMO will bring forward as many things as possible to facilitate early testing. AEMO are looking to replicate some of the functionality we had in terms of self-testing that was built into the gas hub recently.

A HP Quality Control Centre will be housing our test scripts and participants will be able to log into this for tracking and reporting. AEMO will release a detailed test plan and our team will be on standby to support throughout testing. AEMO is planning on releasing a “sand box” environment as early as possible.

B. Healy has spoken to the Readiness lead and they have conducted the first round of industry information session in relation to WP1. This will be done again for WP2 also and will include the B2B working group information. **Action: B. Healy to place Participant Information Sessions online.**

#### 4.0 RISK DISCUSSION

S. Nand went over the amended Risk Register.

R01 and R07 are closed and consolidated under R08.

R02 – actions have been added regarding AEMO facilitating the development of a transition cut over plan and participants providing regular Readiness Reports.

R05 – B. Healy spoke about testing strategy document as agreed in last session with E. Clarke.

R9, R10 & R11 have been added as per AGL's request.

R09 – Procedure quality being impacted due to compressed time frames - will not be consolidated with other B2B risks. It is ranked as medium. Members will be kept informed as we go along. D. Ou believes a high risk is more appropriate for the consequences. B. Healy has included this risk in the most recent IEC pack which is going out today. **Action: S. Nand to change to high.**

R10 – industry testing timeframes being impacted due to late participant registration – has been added as a risk. Working group having a look at agreed entry criteria and we have also committed to AEMO reviewing our entry checklist.

R11 – Ranked as high. Discussion took place on making “sand pit” environments to mitigate risk. It was suggested moving planning forward and careful planning around design of testing in terms of combinations. If two participants are ready early (an MC and a Retailer)

they could be permitted to do some testing early to rule out any issues before others try. The design of the test strategy could reduce the risk.

R. Thompson – how do we cope if when we “go live” a participant cannot function? AEMO should include the negative testing in our procedures. The PCF also queried what is the trigger for saying the industry as a whole cannot proceed and how would we test that. What will we do if 2 million customers can't function? F. Brady felt a 'catastrophe' plan is required. The customer experience risk around this is essential. Negative testing scenarios need to be built and generate a customer risk experience – it is a program risk if we are not ready.

**Action: Negative testing scenarios need to build into the Testing Plan.**

There is a concern around customer backlash if the retailers have not informed their customers about the changes that are being implemented. The disruption effect could be substantial. M. Ryan queried if retailers had campaigns started. Readiness should track the confidence level of retailers keeping their customer's informed.

Risks are:

1. Customer awareness and understanding.
2. Readiness - making sure the customer experience is seamless.

All this occurs during a very busy period the emphasis needs to be on transition planning. There should be a fully workable manual option for anyone who falls out of the national systems and who can't transact effectively in the new market. A pre-arranged fall back process needs to be developed and if possible tested.

It will be difficult to request more implementation time. Any decision will be dependant on the circumstances at the time. It is likely that any changes to the effective date of the Rules would require the intervention of either AER or AEMC. The activities planned under the Readiness will provide insight into the criteria for any such discussion and recommendation. There would be a number of options that could be undertaken. For example, whether jurisdictional areas, or group by group would implement the new Rules and Procedures on the effective date. F. Brady noted if there are no fall back plans in place, it is the customer who could potentially be impacted. It was suggested testing (operational and system) should be done in parallel instead of systematically like what occurred in NARGP. AEMO is aiming at de-risking in testing.

Participants noted that the effective date of 1 December 2017 is a Friday. Thursday and Friday are peak call centre times. Readiness has a process in place to capture this conversation thru the transition and cut over planning. The PCF will be able to review and discuss the approaches that will be proposed by the Transition and Cutover group.

Vic AMI type 5 risk wording is satisfactory and it should be escalated to an Issue. **Action: B. Healy to put on Issue register.**

This risk register goes to the IEC, the Executive and AEMO's website. **Action: B. Healy forward Risk Register (updated version) to the IEC and request feedback. Also to be forwarded to the Executive Forum in the next three days.**

J. Daws queried if the risks on the register are residual. The rating on the page is the residual risk rating after the mitigation. **Action: B. Healy to alter column label to Residual Risk Rating.**

J. Daws requested AEMO include a category contingency column in the Risk Register  
**Action: S. Nand to add and there may be actions added if things do not come to fruition.**

Some risks may then need breaking down as the contingency may be different. **Action: B. Healy to speak to E. Clarke. If changes or additions, Register will be re-circulated.**

Next meeting would like the relevant party update the national safety forums –. **Action: B. Healy.**

Contact B. Healy to add to the Risk Register.

Attendees were thanked for their input.

## **5.0 OTHER BUSINESS**

Next meeting will be changed from 8 February 2016 to late January 2017.

This meeting is to include an update from the Commonwealth on the National Safety Forum.  
**Action: B. Healy to arrange.**

Merry Christmas to all attendees.