

# MINUTES – ELECTRICITY RETAIL CONSULTATIVE FORUM

MEETING: 1  
 DATE: Wednesday 6 March 2019  
 TIME: 1.00 PM – 3.00 PM AEDT  
 LOCATION: AEMO Offices and Teleconference  
 CONTACT: [ercf@aemo.com.au](mailto:ercf@aemo.com.au)

## ATTENDEES:

NAME	COMPANY	LOCATION
Meghan Bibby (Chair)	AEMO	Teleconference
Jordan Daly	AEMO	Teleconference
Michelle Norris	AEMO	Teleconference
Glenn Wrest	AEMO	Teleconference
Colette Reedy	ActewAGL	Teleconference
David Chambers	ActewAGL	Teleconference
Kate Goatley	ActewAGL	Teleconference
Justin Poole	Aurora Energy	Teleconference
Paul Willacy	Aurora Energy	Teleconference
Wayne Turner	Ausgrid	Teleconference
Greg Szot	CitiPower/PowerCor	Teleconference
Lenie Aquiatan	Endeavour Energy	Teleconference
Dino Ou	Endeavour Energy	Teleconference
Shawn Tan	EnergyAustralia	Teleconference
Ingrid Farah	Ergon Energy Retail	Teleconference
Daniel Hoolihan	Ergon Energy Retail	Teleconference
Jeff Roberts	EvoEnergy	Teleconference
Tim Sheridan	Jemena	Teleconference
Linda Brackenbury	PlusES	Teleconference
Stephen Zok	PlusES	Teleconference
David Woods	SA Power Networks	Teleconference
Adrian Honey	TasNetworks	Teleconference
Laura Peirano	United Energy	Teleconference
Paul Greenwood	Vector AMS	Teleconference
Arjun Pathy	AEMO	Melbourne
Mark Riley	AGL	Melbourne
Justin Betlehem	Ausnet Services	Melbourne
Travis Worsteling	EnergyAustralia	Melbourne
Robert Lo Giudice	IntelliHUB	Melbourne
Chantal Wright	Momentum Energy	Melbourne
Joe Castellano	Origin Energy	Melbourne
Stephanie Lommi	Red and Lumo Energy	Melbourne
Malcolm Hempel	Tango Energy	Melbourne

## **1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 1–2)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) welcomed all participants to the meeting.

Apologies received from David Buck and Vicki Hennessy of Endeavour Energy, Daniel Pludek of Utility Software Services.

## **2. ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 3–4)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that both action items have been completed.

## **3. UPDATED TORs AND PLAUSIBILITY IN COMBINING ERCF AND ERMCF – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 5–6)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) informed the ERCF that AEMO is currently working on draft terms of reference for a combined ERCF–ERMCF (dubbed ERCF), which will be ready by the May 2019 meeting. Meghan noted that this is proposed due to the repeated agenda of both meetings, the overlap in attendees, and the fact that metering is covered by both MSATS and Metrology/Service Level Procedures. Meghan proposed that the agenda for a combined forum firstly addresses common items, then MSATS-only items, and finally addresses items pertaining to Metrology and Service Level Procedures. This will allow for forum participants to join and leave meeting as relevant to their role.

Stephanie Lommi (Red and Lumo Energy) expressed support for the combined forum, noting the parallels with the Gas Retail Consultative Forum’s incorporation of the Western Australian Procedure Change Committee. Stephanie asked whether a participant would be able to change representatives mid-meeting (for instance, to allow a metering subject matter expert to discuss a metering item); Meghan Bibby (AEMO) confirmed that this would be acceptable. David Woods (SA Power Networks) asked if a combined ERCF would remain an open forum; Meghan confirmed that it would.

Mark Riley (AGL) noted that it would be preferable to run a combined ERCF on a day adjacent to any proposed Business-to-Business Working Group (B2B-WG) meetings, since the participants of that working group overlap considerably with the ERCF.

Stephanie Lommi (Red and Lumo Energy) suggested that the next ERCF and ERMCF meetings be run as a combined forum with a combined agenda so that participants could evaluate the format. Meghan Bibby (AEMO) agreed that this would be done (**Action item 1.3.1**).

## **4. TIMELINES FOR PROPOSED CONSULTATION, MEETINGS & MSATS RELEASE SCHEDULE – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 7–9)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that AEMO is attempting to align ERCF consultations and release dates with Five-Minute Settlement (5MS) consultations. Meeting dates have been proposed to avoid clashes with other retail or wholesale industry meetings.

Paper submissions to the ERCF are due generally three weeks before the meeting date. This timing allows AEMO and participants time to review the papers before the meetings.

The ERCF consultation starting in April will cover any ICFs that are accepted in this meeting, the AEMC request that industry streamline metering installation timeframes, and the NMI Standing Data review.

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) also noted that MSATS has moved away from a fixed release schedule. This was due to the inflexibility of the old system, which sometimes lead to long lead times on resolving issues. As such, MSATS releases will loosely attempt to align with rule commencement dates or follow approximately six months after a procedure consultation.

Stephanie Lommi (Red and Lumo Energy) noted that participants’ IT teams formerly used the May and November MSATS releases to structure their own releases. Stephanie expressed that, while the old system’s inflexibility made it not fit for purpose, some indication from AEMO regarding MSATS release dates would be very helpful to participants. Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that AEMO will take an action to discuss this internally and see how feasible an MSATS release schedule would be (**Action 1.4.1**). Mark Riley (AGL) noted that, while AEMO had its strict bi-annual MSATS releases, participants had a

fixed date that they could provide to jurisdictions considering changes so as to align commencement dates. Therefore, since AEMO now has no fixed release dates, jurisdictions can simply give participants a six-month window before releases and participants will have no recourse. Meghan took this point on notice.

Malcolm Hempel (Tango Energy) noted that MSATS releases dates should be forward-calculable from consultation dates, since they would be roughly six months subsequent to the release of the final determination. Michelle Norris (AEMO) noted that AEMO is now publishing an industry meetings calendar (for all retail and wholesale gas and electricity meetings) and will very soon publish a calendar of all upcoming and ongoing consultations, which (in line with Malcolm Hempel's comment) would assist participants in planning their own releases. *Secretariat note: both of these calendars have since been published on the [Industry forums and meeting groups page of AEMO's website](#).*

Dino Ou (Endeavour Energy) asked whether, under the flexible MSATS release schedule, AEMO would potentially run a parallel consultation to the consultation on the ICFs progressed from this session if another issue were to arise. Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that AEMO would avoid parallel consultations wherever possible but that it would depend on the criticality of the change being requested.

David Woods (SA Power Networks) gave feedback on slide nine, which he noted lacked "industry input" as a variable in determining release windows.

#### **5. NMI STANDING DATA REVIEW – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 10–11)**

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) advised the ERCF that AEMO will be conducting a review of NMI Standing Data based on the changed framework following PoC. Participants have identified three key concerns about NMI Standing Data: data quality and breadth, technology limitations of the current platform, and participant roles within MSATS (specifically with reference to embedded network operators and managers). This review will exclusively cover data quality and breadth issues. That is, this review will examine whether fields should be mandatory / required / optional, whether new fields should be added, etc. AEMO intends for this review most fundamentally to support metering competition subsequent to PoC. Technology limitations and participant roles in MSATS will be the subject of future reviews.

Robert Lo Giudice (IntelliHUB) stated that all fields should be made compulsory and all new fields added need to be populated as of day one. That is, merely making the fields mandatory from the effective date of any changes is insufficient, as it will mean that ongoing compliance costs to MCs will remain substantial as the data for NMIs is slowly filled out. Stephanie Lommi (Red and Lumo Energy) asked whether AEMO has the capacity to support en masse population of these fields; Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that AEMO's bulk data tools can fulfil this purpose. Lee Brown (AEMO) noted that this strategy was employed to add in DPID codes.

#### **6. CUSTOMER TRANSFERS – Lee Brown, AEMO (Slide 12)**

Michelle Norris (AEMO) noted that the COAG Energy Council jointly tasked AEMO and the AEMC with improving processes surrounding customer transfers, for which AEMO is currently preparing consultation papers.

Lee Brown (AEMO) noted that this consultation paper will be released approximately in March and is intended to address COAG's request that AEMO and the AEMC address recommendations eight and nine of the ACCC's *Electricity supply and prices inquiry final report*. AEMO and the AEMC have subsequently broadened the scope beyond these two recommendations, and the goal of their joint proposal will be that customers can transfer retailers within two business days of their raising the transfer request.

Robert Lo Giudice (IntelliHUB) asked whether the AEMO proposal is considering allowing a transfer on customer self-reads. Lee Brown (AEMO) responded that AEMO has considered this issue (owing to its being in the ACCC report). Lee noted that customer self-reads only currently have an impact on the relationship between the retailer and the customer; it does not affect the wholesale market. He further noted that other markets have been managing two-day (or shorter) transfers on customer self-reads for a substantial time period, which gives AEMO and the AEMC a basis from which to work. Customer self-

reads are currently allowed in NERR, but only for type 6 meters and only under specific circumstances. This may mean the NERR is to be amended to improve customer outcomes under shorter transfer timeframes.

Malcolm Hempel (Tango Energy) asked, since these customer transfer reforms will be tied to the NERR, whether they will be operational in Victoria. Lee Brown (AEMO) responded that the salience of customer self-reads is massively diminished in Victoria due to the extremely low volume of accumulation meters.

Lee Brown (AEMO) noted that markets elsewhere have moved to next-day transfer but have kept cooling off periods at their current lengths. AEMO is not at this stage proposing changes to cooling off periods themselves; instead, customers may choose to transfer within a cooling off period, but if they do so then the retailer must be able to reverse the transfer if the customer chooses to change their mind during that period.

Lee Brown (AEMO) further noted that AEMO and the AEMC will be running their consultations concurrently, and the expected go-live date will occur before the end of 2019.

#### **7. ICF\_007: DE-ENERGISATION / RE-ENERGISATION METER STATUS – Dino Ou, Endeavour Energy (Slides 13–16)**

Dino Ou (Endeavour Energy) spoke to the paper.

Chantal Wright (Momentum Energy) asked what would happen if de-energisation and re-energisation were to take place on the same date under Dino's proposed procedures.

Dino Ou (Endeavour Energy) replied that if an MP recognised they were to be re-energising and de-energising on the same day, they would simply send nothing. If they did not recognise this in advance, they would have to set the meter as "C" the day of the de-energisation / re-energisation and they would have to set the meter as "D" the day after the de-energisation / re-energisation.

Mark Riley (AGL) noted that the process should ideally align with Victoria's remote de-energisation processes. Justin Betlehem (Ausnet Services) noted that in Victoria customers are set as de-energised on the day of the remote de-energisation. Stephanie Lommi (Red and Lumo Energy) noted that the procedures are currently silent on remote de- or re-energisation (they only refer to physical de- or re-energisation).

All participants agreed that the current ambiguity did need to be rectified and that any ongoing disagreements could be resolved in the Information Paper.

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) clarified that an information paper may be sent as a circular to the group instead of being raised in meetings.

#### **8. ICF\_008: DEFINING TIMEFRAMES FOR UPDATING DATASTREAMS IN MSATS – Dino Ou, Endeavour Energy (Slides 17–20)**

Participants agreed that the circular reasoning identified is unsatisfactory and that a timeline should be determined. All participants agree that this should proceed to an Information Paper, though there was disagreement on what the timeframe should be.

#### **9. ICF\_009: DEFINE ALLOWABLE VALUES FOR THE CONTROLLED LOAD FIELD IN MSATS – Dino Ou, Endeavour Energy (Slides 21–24)**

Participants agreed that this should proceed to an Information Paper.

#### **10. ICF\_010: NMI STATUS ACTIVATION DATE WHEN ADVANCED UNIT ON ACCUMULATION METERING IS DETECED – Dino Ou, Endeavour Energy (Slides 25–28)**

Participants broadly agreed that the current situation is not adequate and that this ICF should proceed to an Information Paper. David Woods (SA Power Networks) noted that SA Power Networks has

workaround solutions to this, and that some new wording that allows current practice to continue while removing the non-compliance issue would be ideal.

#### **11. GENERAL QUESTIONS & NEXT MEETING** – Meghan Bibby, AEMO (Slides 29–30)

Meghan Bibby (AEMO) noted that the next meeting is on Thursday 23 May 2019 with papers due Friday 3 May 2019.

Linda Brackenbury (PlusES) asked how long the lead time before a formal consultation tends to be. Meghan Bibby responded that it depended on the nature of the change, meaning that some change proposals would make it into the April consultation while others would remain in pre-consultation for longer.

Mark Riley (AGL) asked, given the large number of proposed changes to embedded networks, including ENOs sending network bills to retailers, whether the ERCF would support requiring the Exempt Embedded Network Service Provider (EENSP) to provide their details for the Retail Operations Contact List (ROCL). Participants agreed to this proposal. Mark noted that he would prepare an ICF (**Action item 1.11.1**).

**Action items raised at meeting**

Item	Topic	Action required	Responsible	By
1.3.1	Combined ERCF and ERMCF agenda	AEMO to prepare a joint agenda for the May 2019 ERCF–ERMCF meeting.	AEMO	May 2019 meeting
1.4.1	MSATS release schedule	AEMO to have discussions internally to see how feasible it is for AEMO to publish an MSATS release schedule.	AEMO	May 2019 meeting
1.11.1	EENSP on the ROCL ICF	Mark Riley (AGL) to prepare an ICF on including EENSP contacts in the ROCL.	M. Riley (AGL)	May 2019 meeting

**Action items raised prior to meeting**

Item	Topic	Action required	Response
1	Network Tariff Code (NTC)	Acumen to raise ICF highlight the issues being experienced where the NTC in MSATS is being changed by metering providers	COMPLETED: NTC procedural clarification effective 20 May 2019
2	Network Tariff Code (NTC)	Participants to provide any statistical information in relation to NTC issues highlight by Acumen	COMPLETED