

SDWIG MINUTES

MEETING: DEIP – Standards, Data and Interoperability Working Group #6
DATE: Wednesday, 16 September 2020
TIME: 14:00 – 16:00
LOCATION: WEBEX

ATTENDEES:

COMPANY / DEPARTMENT
AEMC
AEMO
AER
AGL
ANU
AREMA
ARENA
CSIRO
ENA
ESB
SAPN
Standards Australia
<i>Farrerswier – presentation only</i>

APOLOGIES:

COMPANY / DEPARTMENT
AEC
Ausgrid
CEC
ECA
PIAC

Actions

Action 2.1: AEMO to allocate priorities outlined in the DER integration future priorities discussion, and any additional items raised as part of the ARENA DER integration maturity assessment and SAPN update, to the relevant taskforces. These allocations will be shared with SDIWG for endorsement before distribution to relevant taskforces. Taskforces will be expected to review priorities and provide recommendations to SDIWG to support the development of a workplan for the SDIWG and associated taskforces for approval by the DER steering group.

Action 2.2: CEC to provide more background details in regard to the Vector and Amazon deal raised during agenda item 7 – API taskforce update.

Action 2.3: AEMO to consider/request for increased representation from Consumer groups in taskforces.

Action 2.4 SDIWG members to advise on any further questions regarding AS 4755 via DERSDI@aemo.com.au

Items to note

Agenda item 3 – AS 4755 Update

Discussion:

- (AER) Regarding the choice available to consumers that have multiple DREDs on multiple home devices, would we assume the consumer or their agent chooses which device will be curtailed?
 - (AEMO) The consumer has the ability to choose whether they install a DRED on a single device to manage the whole system (e.g. home management system), or multiple devices. They also have the option to enable the AS 4755.2 capability.
- (ANU) How do we ensure there is compatibility between DRM modes and the capabilities provided via IEEE 2030.5 – is it going to be a one or other scenario, or will the DRED requirements be prioritised ahead of IEEE 2030.5.
 - (AEMO) The standard will outline the methods and pathways for implementing the DRED requirements (via an appendix). These have already been defined in AS 4755.1 (DRED standard); examples include via Zigbee or ripple control. The framework of the standard is that new or not yet defined/established pathways can be included as normative appendixes (which creates a standardised mapping of these new pathways onto the AS4755 DRMs). This could include IEEE 2030.5, in which case the interaction would be required to be mapped out.
- (ANU) In a scenario where there are directions via DRM modes, this might be communicated via 2030.5; only 1 mode can be communicated, and you can't communicate via any other ways (e.g. price signals).
 - (AEMO) While the DRM might be 'output at 50%', this could be achieved through comms via 2030.5 using price signals etc. however the device response would need to be tested. The purpose of AS 4755 is to confirm the device response – which is not yet something specifically developed in any international standards. This is the minimum capability that is required (i.e. the response) and interoperability can be achieved with bridges/protocol convertors (without replacing the appliance)
- (AGL) Does the new DRED standard provide 2-way comms for customers to opt out? For example, on a hot day can a customer communicate back to the device to cancel the DRM mode.
 - (AEMO) This functionality is dependent on how the remote agent handles customers – e.g. the arrangement may be negotiated with the remote agent as part of their agreement, that a customer can indicate they don't want to participate on certain days, so the remote agent cannot send commands to these customers *or send cancelation of the DRMS to these appliances.*
 - (AGL) Appliances currently in the market may not have this capability and it may disengage customers if they are unable to have control.

- (AEMO) AEMO recognise this could be an issue, but there has been some testing around the capability that indicates that it exists.
- (ANU) In terms of compliance under the non-DRED circumstances, how does the manufacturer demonstrate that they can receive and act on the appropriate commands, given that the mechanism for communication and implementation can theoretically be any protocol? Does this mean the remote agent would need to be able to support every communication protocol?
 - (AEMO) These would need to be tested. In the case of the remote agent, they may choose to be a remote agent for specific manufacturers only so would only need to be able to support those protocols.

To Note:

- (AREMA) Not all devices can meet DRM capabilities as some appliances simply cannot drop to certain levels. Until there are international drivers on these requirements (e.g. international standards) there is not enough demand for manufacturers to develop these capabilities, as the Australian market is not large enough to warrant it in isolation. It is important to consider the implications of making certain requirements mandatory which may be hard to comply with or become cost prohibitive.
 - It is recognised that manufacturers are currently not building to the requirements outlined in AS 4755, however, previous experiences have shown that manufacturers are capable of developing appliances that align with Australian requirements. The development of AS 4755 has referenced international standards (EchoNet – Japan, IEC – Germany), however, no specific international standard was able to deliver the capabilities required for Australia. Work will be done with industry and manufacturers to understand the challenges associated with meeting this standard.

Agenda item 4 – DER technical integration maturity assessment

To Note:

- (ARENA/Farrierswier) The final report on DER technical integration maturity assessment is planned to be released in the next month.
- (ARENA/Farrierswier) There were some levels of complimentary and synergistic opportunities to produce better results by matching the capabilities identified across projects.

Agenda item 5 – SAPN DER technical integration challenges

To Note:

- (SAPN) The operating envelopes established in the demonstration are intended to help us understand the level of latent capacity is in the network, and plan to continue to run this service beyond the demonstration with the provision of locational and time varying signals to offer the additional capacity.

Agenda item 6 – Feedback on Future DER integration Priorities

To Note:

- (AGL) Agree to empowering taskforces to look at the priorities outlined in the presentation.
- (ARENA & AGL) Important to consider the work already taking place in the cyber space e.g. Auscyber and NSW government are already involved in cyber security in the energy industry.
- (ESB) Alternative approach is to cross reference with the priorities outlined in the ESB DER integration workplan to ensure alignment and identify any key gaps.

Agenda item 7 – API taskforce Update

To Note:

- All taskforces should include members who represent the consumer
- Privacy component of the “DER Monitoring and Visibility Best Practice Guide” to be considered by API taskforce
- Considerations around the Vector-Amazon deal (NZ) to be taken into account – and whether this type of arrangement is likely to happen in Australia.
 - Further information on the Vector-Amazon arrangement to be investigated.

Agenda item 8 – Other committee/project updates

To Note:

- AEMO to review membership of DER Device Standards Taskforce and identify any gaps – noting consumer representatives are required to be included.

Agenda item 9 – Other Business

- Members encouraged to participate in ARENA’s Operating Envelopes Webinar and Workshop series
 - [Dynamic Operating Envelopes Webinar Registration](#) link (30 September 2020)