



# Minutes

## WEM Reform Implementation Group – WRIG Meeting 8

**Time:** 9:30am – 12:00pm  
**Date:** 17 December 2020  
**Venue:** Teleconference

**Attendees:**

Name	Organisation
Aden Barker	ETIU
Aditi Varma	ETIU
Judy Hunter	Western Power
Robin Parsons	AEMO
Mark McKinnon	Western Power
Liz Aitken	Aitken Consulting
Ben Brearley	AEMO
Jenny Laidlaw	RCP Support
Alex Gillespie	AEMO
Kristy McGrath	AEMO
Josephine Nga	AEMO
Mark Riley	Perth Energy/AGL
Patrick Peake	Perth Energy/AGL
Brad Huppatz	Synergy
Wendy Ng	Shell
Leon Kwek	AEMO
Surrey Hughes	AEMO

Slide No.	Issue
2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aden Barker (AB) from ETIU reiterated meeting ground rules and virtual meeting protocols, in particular requesting that microphones are kept on mute other than when contributing to the meeting, and that all attendees state their name and organisation when asking questions to assist in minutes. Queries are also welcomed in the chat and will be responded to at the end of each section.</li> <li>• AB introduced agenda and topics for discussion.</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation Updates and Market Trial, Readiness &amp; Transition – Ben Brearley (AEMO)</b>	
5-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ben Brearley (BB) from AEMO provided an update on AEMO implementation activities and provided a brief update on upcoming activities.</li> <li>• BB outlined deliverables being defined around Market Readiness and Transition planning and noted that next steps would involve further defining the deliverables and developing timelines for their delivery. He invited comments to identify any missing elements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mark Riley (MR) from Perth Energy/AGL commented on learning from NEM projects on the importance of having clear picture of data delivery, processes and systems, and the need to have all these in place well ahead of transitioning.</li> <li>○ Patrick Peake (PP) from Perth Energy/AGL expressed concern over timeframes and the need for a clear technical information that Participants could feed into their requirements and design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BB noted that at WRIG-IT there had been target dates set for the provision of interface specifications and requirements for a number of work packages, and these are in the Joint Industry Plan (JIP). Interfaces around Outage Management, Bids and Offers and the Dispatch Engine are intended to be completed Q1 2021.</li> <li>• PP noted that systems needed to be able to be built with sufficient time for Participants to be able to provide internal training, considering that this will involve trading in new types of services such as ESS. He suggested that if this was not available, then longer periods of no liability would need to be in place for the new Market start.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Liz Aitken (LA) from Aitken Consulting queried what back-up plans may be in place if Participants are not ready and cannot bid. Is there plans for some type of amnesty period? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AB noted that this had been raised in earlier WRIG sessions and noted that a number of options had been identified: consideration of the timed implementation of market power mitigation measures; a compliance holiday for a period after market start has been contemplated; and reporting from Participants regarding progress towards market readiness. He noted that there were a range of measures that could be adopted if necessary to reduce the impact. Risks will be considered as we get closer to the market start date to identify what course of action may be most appropriate.</li> <li>• LA requested clarification on when/at what point serious conversations would be had about these options and encouraged that a date be set at which the ETIU would discuss with EPWA.</li> <li>• AB responded that dates could be set into the JIP where these things could be considered, but felt it was too early to pursue such considerations at this point.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Wendy Ng (WN) from Shell noted that with only 21 months remaining till go-live and still insufficient information to be able to create a scope of work, she recommended that it would be advantageous to come up with a back-up plan earlier rather than later. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clayton James (CJ) from AEMO noted that the other thing happening early in 2021 was the discussions around transitional arrangements, and that these may provide another opportunity to talk about how things should be transitioned in, and identify some of the provisions that would need to be in place beyond the Oct 22 date. He noted that a great deal of effort had gone into ensuring that the Rules would provide useful information on what needed to be built to support initial investigation and scoping.</li> <li>• WN noted the quantity of Rules that needed to be incorporated into scoping makes the timeframes challenging, and that it would be difficult to get all the information necessary incorporated into a scope of work at the current point in time that would allow for Board approvals to progress, and that securing internal funding to progress will take time.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ LA noted that Procedures would be key to understanding the new Market requirements, and that these procedures would not be available for some time. She stated that she was very concerned about the timeframes, and reiterated the need for access to further information that would be provided through the technical system specifications and the Procedures. She also noted the dearth of appropriate IT consultants available in Peth to build new systems required. She emphasised that the timeframes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>discussed did not allow sufficient time to engage appropriately informed consultants to undertake the required works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AB acknowledged concerns expressed and noted the importance that these considerations be understood and fed into the JIP. He encouraged Market Participants to engage in talks with ETIU to ensure that concerns were all being captured and built into the plan.</li> <li>• LA referred ETIU back to document previously produced by herself and PP and stated that she does not believe that the concerns identified have change.</li> </ul>
<b>Rule Drafting Timeline – Aiden Barker (ETIU)</b>	
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AB noted that Tranche 2 &amp; 3 Rules are currently with the Minister for review and gazettal prior to the end of 2020.</li> <li>• Tranche 4 &amp; 5 Rules are intended for Taskforce decision and Rule making prior to the end of tenure of the Taskforce, with the possibility that Rule finalisation may go beyond the tenure of the Taskforce, in particular the Reliability Standards Framework.</li> <li>• Consultation process for Market Power Mitigation will be varied from previous process with an additional step of additional consultation paper following information paper to allow for more detailed feedback prior to finalising policy decisions and taking these to the Taskforce.</li> </ul>
<b>Joint Industry Plan (JIP) – Ben Brearley (AEMO)</b>	
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional milestones have been added by from Western Power and Synergy.</li> <li>• BB encouraged all Market Participants to review and feedback information to help flesh out the plan.</li> </ul>
<b>WEM Procedures Overview – Alex Gillespie (AEMO)</b>	
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alex Gillespie (AG) from AEMO provided an overview of WEM Procedures for discussion, and a list of Procedures targeted for Q1 2021.</li> </ul>
<b>Data &amp; IT Interface Procedure – Surrey Hughes (AEMO)</b>	
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey Hughes (SH) provided a brief overview of changes being made to update AEMO's Data and IT Interface Procedure. These updates remove references to superseded interfaces or interfaces not applicable to Market Participants. Other changes included simplification of the section around redundancy with specific examples removed, and an update to hardware requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mark Riley (MR) requested confirmation that the requirements specified were minimum requirements rather than specific requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SH confirmed that these were minimum recommendations, and that efforts to address issues would only be made to address any issues based on these minimum requirements being met.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• SH noted that it was difficult to maintain compatibility through generations of internet browser software. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MR queried if Participants should lock off automatic up-grades of browser versions until AEMO advise that the next version is suitable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SH to review and consider this approach and any implications.</li> <li>• SH noted that AEMO is currently committing to maintaining compatibility with Internet Explorer 11 or newer.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• AG noted that procedure would be distributed for consultation early 2021 if anyone had any additional feedback.</li> </ul>
<b>WEM Procedure – Credible Contingency Events - Leon Kwek (AEMO)</b>	
2-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leon Kwek (LK) from AEMO provided an overview of new WEM Procedure – Credible Contingency Events which defines the process AEMO will use to classify credible contingency events; identification of reclassification conditions that may reclassify a previously non-credible contingency event credible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mark McKinnon (MMcK) from Western Power sought clarification on what would be changing from 1 February, and what changes would be applicable beyond that date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LK noted that the Framework around defining credible contingency events and reclassification would go live. Reclassification heuristic appendices will be rolled out over time.</li> <li>• MMcK noted the importance of ensuring that control rooms were using common language and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>understanding to support ‘on the desk’ communications and responses to notifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clayton James (CJ) from AEMO noted that they would be keen to work closely with Western Power early in the new year to work through some of the proposed appendices.</li> </ul>
<b>Constraint Formulation WEM Procedure Feedback - Leon Kwek (AEMO)</b>	
<b>2-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LK noted that following feedback on the Constraint Formulation WEM Procedure one material change had been identified relating to ongoing economic efficiency of constraint equations. Section added into procedure that obliges AEMO to review equations for efficiency if they bind.</li> <li>LK noted a few other minor changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Limit Advice Requirements WEM Procedure Feedback – Josephine Nga (AEMO)</b>	
<b>2-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Josephine Nga (JN) from AEMO noted that following feedback on the Limit Advice Requirements WEM Procedure there were no material changes, and only minor format changes to align with procedure template, and minor editorial changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Development of Limit Advice WEM Procedure Feedback – Mark McKinnon (Western Power)</b>	
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MMcK noted that in response to feedback, minor grammatical errors were being corrected. New section to be added to address RCM limit requirements once further details on the process are available in the new year. In addition, randomisation approach is to be clarified, and reference to AEMO congestion information resource procedure included. Western Power anticipate releasing the revised procedure for further feedback early in 2021, and happy to receive any additional feedback in the meantime.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps – Aiden Barker (ETIU)</b>	
<b>17</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AB provided a brief overview of next steps and invited Participant feedback on availability of access to information relating to slides and minutes from WRIG sessions as well as the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) via the website. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WN queried if it would be possible to publish the WRIG slides ahead of the minutes, to enable more immediate review, rather than waiting for the minutes to be available so that these can be published together.</li> <li>MR reiterated this request, noting that versioning could be used so that slides could be published immediately, and minutes and updated slides published as soon as possible after the meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AB acknowledged the feedback and confirmed that slides and minutes could be distributed separately, with slides distributed as soon as the pack was consolidated.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Jenny Laidlaw (JL) noted that initially the format of the website did not make how to access the minutes and the slides immediately accessible, however this seems to have improved.</li> <li>LA queried were the JIP was published. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AB noted that this was not published on the EPWA website.</li> <li>BB committed to circulating the JIP following the meeting.</li> <li>AB recommended that a link to the JIP be published on a website (either AEMO or EPWA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MR requested that if this was on the AEMO website, that there were links from the EPWA site.</li> <li>AB responded that a link would be included on the EPWA site and displayed as prominently as possible within website formatting limitations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>CJ noted that AEMO would be distributing a request shortly for Participants to nominate the number of users that would require access to the GPS system, so that work could commence on user set-up and appropriate licencing.</li> <li>CJ invited further feedback on presentation of Procedure information in the forums. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MR noted the benefits of having feedback from the forums incorporated into Procedures, but also noted the importance of having the opportunity to review the written versions in more detail to enable next level of feedback.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>