

Minutes

WEM Reform Implementation Group – Meeting 10, 2021

Time: 9:30am – 12:00pm

Date: 28 October 2021

Venue: Teleconference

Attendees:

Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation
Alan McDonald		Shelley Worthington	EPWA
Alex Gillespie	AEMO	Simon Akero	Shell
Andrew Walker	South 32	Stuart Featham	AEMO
Ben Connor	Synergy	Teresa Smit	AEMO
Brad Huppatz		Tinna Needham	Western Power
Claire Richards	Enel X	Toby Price	AEMO
Clayton James	AEMO	Wendy Ng	Shell
Dora Guzeleva	EPWA		
Dimitri Lorenzo			
Eliana Zurhaar			
Elizabeth Aitkin	Aitkin Energy		
Erin Stone	Point Global		
Gavin White	ERA		
Harry Street	Entego		
Jas Bhandal	AEMO		
Jeremy Lane	South 32		
Jo-Anne Chan	Synergy		
Judy Hunter	Western Power		
Katelyn Rigden	AEMO		
Kaye Anderson	AEMO		
Kristy McGrath	AEMO		
Liam Staltari	AEMO		
Lize Combrinck			
Lynda Venables	Synergy		
Mariusz Kovler	AEMO		
Mark McKinnon	Western Power		
Mark Riley	AEMO		
Mike Hales	AEMO		
Mike Reid	AEMO		
Niki Eastman	AEMO		
Oscar Carlberg	Alinta		
Paul Elliot	AEMO		
Peter Huxtable			
Ray Wills	Future Smart Strategies		
Rhiannon Bedola	Synergy		
Sam Lei	Alinta		
Sarah Graham	EPWA		

Slide No.	Issue
Joint Industry Plan – Updates (Mike Reid, AEMO)	
2-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Reid (MR) provided overview of the agenda and gave a project management update on the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JIP –there is another update to come but we’re still building out reporting process so no update available at this time • Mariusz Kovler (MK) provided a general update from AEMO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project timelines and schedules continue to be adjusted ○ RTMS market test taking in participant feedback and looking at end of Jan/Feb timeframe ○ AR6 process continuing – all participants who want a one-on-one discussion please take advantage of that ○ Readiness working group – risk register looking to be published through WEM reform portal later this year, pending ability to get that up and running
AEMO Implementation Program activities (Mariusz Kovler, AEMO)	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK provided update on Implementation Program activities noting that participants should be aware of upcoming program activities and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ RCM phase 1 development complete – on track to meet December obligation this year ○ Taking RCM build to market trial on 10 November, looking to release on 24 November ○ RTMS Project we have ongoing development work happening, invites sent for MP interactives showcases ○ WEMDE Project moving forward, really good progress made, have had internal showcase of the development work ○ Outage Management, planning phase complete, system build has commenced ○ Moving forward with forecast integration and MT PASA, we’re evaluating PLEXOS and applying it specifically to WEM model ○ Review of participant feedback continuing • MK acknowledged there was a massive amount of effort going on from a reform perspective, internally we have approx. 12 to 14 projects in execution and we’re entering our busiest period in the coming 6 months
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules Gazettal schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MK advised that in Dora Guzeleva’s absence we just have the gazettal schedule slide that participants would be familiar with - please see slide
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ben Connor (BC) provided an update from Synergy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ advised that no dates to update at this point although we will most likely present some in the next WRIG ○ Like most Market Participants – we’re doing some re- planning around the extension to the market start date ○ General shape – we will maintain our current plan on various site works we are undertaking, our systems build will see a bit of rearranging - we’re no longer optimising to be ready for market trials in April, we can rationalise systems a little bit • Mark McKinnon (MM) provided an update from Western Power: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Similar to Ben’s update we’re looking at impact on various workstreams and plans given the deferred commencement date ○ With regards to generator performance standards there has been steady progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ out of the 71 facilities only waiting on about 20 to make initial submissions ▪ 35 have been assessed and we have gone back to participants to make some further adjustments ▪ 15 that we are sitting on and 1 has received an exemption for a facility that is expected to be decommissioned ○ RCM limit advice – expecting to bring our procedure to January WRIG when we respond to AEMO requirements ○ Loss factors – Is expected to be pushed out further due to deferral of commencement date

9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MR provided an update on Reformer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SharePoint site is set up and has been populated with templates and content ○ Need to establish clear rules internally for how we manage content ○ User account provisioning is being worked through, process should be explained at next WRIG and invitations anticipated to be sent out by the end of the year ○ Any thoughts on content for reformer or structure, please get in touch • Mark Riley (MR) commented the AEMO team in the east have been using SharePoint technology to share files with participants, we have run into some very odd quirks because of different domain security features so you might want to get in touch with the retail market ops team in the NEM group because in some cases it has forced to log out of their work domain and drop VPN to try and access some of the data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mariusz Kovler (MK) replied I think we should be ok from the point of where we are taking the design. ○ MR offered to volunteer to test through the AGL VPN to see if that works. • Ben Connor in chat asked how to get access to the meeting recordings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MR replied we're hoping to use the reformer to share the WRIG recordings, noting these are formally owned by EPWA
------	---

WEM Procedures

<p>11</p> <p>Also see relevant AEMO slide pack</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alex Gillespie (AG) provided overview of WEM Procedures updates and presenters • Paul Elliot (PE) provided an update on the Emergency Operating State (EOS) rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clause 3.5.1 in the new WEM rules gives broad discretion to declare for things we have not previously identified, we needed some wriggle room due to unpredictability ○ Operating States <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Satisfactory ▪ Secure ▪ Reliable ▪ Emergency ○ The difference in EOS to current rules is that the emergency state is hooked on we are required to take actions that otherwise may not be available to return the power system to a satisfactory state ○ Moving forwards - the EOS can exist in any of the other states or none of the other states, which is a change from where we were before in terms of potential technical state – see slide on States and Examples ○ EOS sits in a separate plane to the normal operating states, whereas currently it's just a sequential from normal to high to emergency. This is to reflect that it can occur concurrently with issues in other states or independently of other states ○ Change to EOS is that it is primarily reactive ○ Focussed primarily on power system operations ○ Conditions that cause EOS - see slide for possible actions on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ System Black ▪ Loss of control and visibility of the power system ▪ Insufficient generation adequacy ▪ Insufficient load to maintain system stability ▪ Significant shortfall of ESS for an extended period ▪ Other conditions that may cause fuel supply disruption include – terrorist attack, IT incident impacting on Power System or Market Operation, significant involuntary load interruption is occurring (UFLS) • Rebecca White (RW) commented you mentioned you can't dispatch West Kal unless in an emergency operating state. However, Eastern Goldfields (EG) being islanded isn't an emergency operating state. Is there a risk West Kal is needed when EG is islanded? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PE replied – we can't dispatch west Kal unless in an EOS. AEMO can't direct the operation of those facilities if the eastern goldfields or north country is islanded. Western Power may request us to start those units through an NCS or the new NCESS framework but in terms of dispatching purely for energy AEMO is unable to do that unless in EOS ○ PE dropped out Clayton James (CJ) picked up last point – you need the capability to deal with situations as they arise. EOS are largely unforeseen so rules are structured to enable us to declare one for any type of circumstances, we are trying to capture those that we know of that can occur but also leaving room for other circumstances that can occur that we will still have the capability to raise and EOS for and linked to when we require those additional powers to act
--	--

Declaration of Bilateral Trades (Katelyn Rigden, AEMO)

See relevant AEMO slide pack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katelyn Rigden (KR) provided an update on relatively minor changes to Declaration of Bilateral Trades for the 2021 Reserve Capacity Cycle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total quantity that you choose to trade is what we use in the Appendix 3 calculation which determines the amount of capacity credits that end up being assigned to your facility
------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedure is quite small now with key changes being the Removal of the Reserve Capacity Auction ○ Other main change is the Submission of Bilateral Trades at a Component level if you have a scheduled facility or semi-scheduled facility which contains multiple components, you'll now need to submit your trade declaration to that level – which means we now need more information from you ○ We need this because if you have different types of technologies you will now be assigned certified reserve capacity using different methodologies ○ We have to go live by 1 March 2022, intention is to publish for consultation by the end of the year ○ Next year we will be back to make further changes to the procedure that will take into the NAQ process for the 2022 cycle ● Rhiannon Bedola (RB) asked if you have two semi-scheduled is it done at component level? i.e. solar and wind? Or are they still at facility level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ KR replied if you have 1 semi schedule facility that has both wind and solar both of those technologies are assessed under the Relevant Level Methodology, we would only be expecting the trade declaration for the facility in that example because the solar and wind are both an intermittent generating system so that's one component ● Minor change to Indicative Facility Class and RCM Facility Class assessment Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minor amendments made to 4.8A.3 under Tranche 4B which relate to Conditional CRC ○ If you do intend to apply for conditional CRC for future Reserve Capacity Cycle, this procedure now covers the obligation that you have to apply for this indicative facility class first, so AEMO has an idea of how we are going to certify ○ How AEMO completes the assessment and the types of information that a participant has to provide for the assessment, none of that has changed ○ This procedure has to go live by 1 December ○ Hoping to publish for consultation within the next two weeks
--	---

WEM Reform Program Electric Storage Resourcing Metering (Toby Price, AEMO)

<p>See relevant AEMO slide pack</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Toby Price (TP) provided an update on Electric Storage Resourcing Metering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The rule change relates to facilities that may have an uncertified component as part of a facility which has a separately certified component ○ This essentially requires some slight changes to the Procedure to ensure that we capture those types of facilities and apply those obligations which are identical to those that would apply to any system with multiple separately certified components i.e. install enough metering so that we are able to establish what's been delivered from the separately certified component and what's been delivered by another component ○ Other changes we are putting together are based on the treatment of DC Coupled Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SCADA to be used in apportioning Meter Data Submissions ▪ Facilities will be required to comply with WEM Procedure Communications and Control Systems ● MR asked if the non-certified component was sub-metered – would that be acceptable, are there also National Measurement Issues with the DC metering? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TP replied the non-certified component being sub metered would be acceptable if by metering that component you were capable of inferring the contribution of the certified component in combination with meter data submissions so, as long as we have sufficient sources of data, we can calculate those contributions so I think to your first point that that would be acceptable, to your second one that is something that we are looking into which is the uses of this data, remembering that this is not being used directly for settlement and therefore alignment with the National Measurement Act is something we are looking into. ○ Certainly, there are different ways that we can apply this to meter data submissions, so where we're using it to scale meter data submissions between components rather than directly relying on the SCADA data that may be an option. This is our initial thinking as to where we want to go, the intent is to put out for consultation a version with the updates to the procedure for your review ○ MR made the comment that is valuable to understand that as long as the metering provide that information it doesn't matter where the meter sits, to which TP agreed as long as it allows for the calculation using appropriate metering ● RB asked if you have two semi-scheduled is it done at the component level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TP replied no, if you have a separately certified component, we are looking at the type of certification so wind and solar both running through the RLM, the contribution of those two separate technologies would be viewed as one for the purposes of the RLM and therefore you don't have two separately certified components there
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TP provided update on FCESS Accreditation feedback, noting a number of changes were made and some were left as they were - see slide for other comments and AEMO's response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requested feedback on whether the WEM website is now clear for participants ● Comment from Mark Riley in regard to references on the WEM website – that they should reference the page i.e., the title not necessarily the URL. MR also made a comment on the consultation on final accreditation, noting a participant shouldn't get a surprise on what that final decision is, that would be unpleasant
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TP agreed, I think we have sufficient consultation which is the requirement under the rules to make sure that information is made clear to a MP ○ it's also worth noting that are two processes here, one is transitional accreditation which is really about equivalency for the services provided now and that needs to be a determination by AEMO of the capability of those facilities to provide those services and then in section 3 which is the new accreditation process it's a commercial entry to these markets and there its more optional. The facility must be capable of meeting all of the performance requirements for the accreditation parameters, but it could seek to accredit for less than it was capable of, so I guess those two distinct processes in the procedure try and map out that it is more of an AEMO guided determination for transitional accreditation rather than a back and forth over what a MP wants under the new facilities accreditation process ● MR queried summary of content 4.4.1 should the policy should be reviewed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TP answered – from a power system perspective, there's less evidence that faster response from contingency reserve lower services would result in a better outcome for the system whereas for raise service we have plenty of modelling and evidence that faster speeds of response can be very beneficial in certain system conditions, but we haven't seen the same for lower services... it's a policy position we could throw to EPWA
--	--

WEM Procedure: Communications and Control Systems Feedback (Clayton James, AEMO)

See relevant AEMO slide pack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clayton James (AEMO) provided an update on the Communications and Control Systems WEM Procedure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have taken on feedback and made some adjustments to formatting, links, referencing errors, definitions etc. ○ Please see slides for feedback and resolution ● CJ noted there were questions around what the difference was in the specification between time interval via a normal RTU and the time interval via a data concentrator. We think that's fairly clear but just to explain, the idea of a data concentrator, is that it's an additional piece of equipment that collects information from RTUs in the field, the reason that column is added is to recognise there is an additional time lag ● To this Mark Riley asked, is the concentrator time lag worth an explanatory note for future readers? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CJ replied we can add that in, we have diagrams in there to that show the data concentrator in there already so we though there was enough content in there to show what that was ○ MR replied that if enough people asked the question then... ○ CJ responded, I think it was just one but if that's not clear we can go back and make some more explanatory notes ● MR made the comment to grandfathering existing facilities so that they have a couple of years to come up to speed and make sure it's clear for any new facilities going forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CJ agreed, yes that is fair we would intend to do that anyway, we're trying to get a better understanding of what exists today. Broadly the intent is to cover that single point of failure we want to step through that properly and identify what currently exists before we go and make a change and if there is an impact to participants, we can do that in a structured way ○ MR added I think it's worth clearing with that the system provided through Western Power and where that sits in this debate ○ CJ replied we have discussions about that too and want to cover in the next version of this. We might do a coms session specifically through WRIG and get feedback that way before we do the update
-------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AG thanked everyone for feedback and noted what was upcoming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recently published <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Frequency Co-optimised Essential System Services Accreditation - 1 October 2021 ▪ Communications and Control Systems - 1 October 2021 ○ Upcoming Publication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Certification of Reserve Capacity – 1 November 2021 ▪ Indicative Facility Class and RCM Facility Class Assessment – coming weeks ▪ Facility Sub-Metering – coming weeks
--	--

Transitional SCADA dispatch arrangements

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CJ provided an update on Transitional SCADA dispatch arrangements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provided a recap from a previous WRIG where we discussed some of the future SCADA control requirements - participants will need to look at how their logic is currently implemented and do some design sessions with us to figure out how we might transition from one form of dispatch to another and look at what we can do ahead of time ○ Held individual discussions to look at what some of their arrangements were on site, whether or not some of those changes could be accommodated and how difficult it would be to do that – broad feedback received was that this could be achievable ○ Transitional Dispatch Rules - new section 1.51 included in gazettal of the Tranche 4B rules, commencing October 1 gives us capability to start implementing things ○ Looking to work with participants to understand the timeframes that are likely to be required and identify specific changes that need to be made and what intentions are for fast start
--	--

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Participants to contact AEMO indicating readiness to discuss transitional arrangements via WA.ETS@AEMO.com.au |
|--|---|

Next Steps	
-------------------	--

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● MR gave an overview of the next steps:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Next WRIG 9:30am Thursday 25 November (last WRIG of 2021)○ Next WRIG-IT meetings scheduled<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 11 November▪ 25 November○ Other dates<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 1 November: RTMS Interactive Showcase #1 – JSON Schema and User Interface▪ 3 November: RTMS Interactive Showcase #2 – JSON Schema and API |
|--|--|