

# Minutes

## WEM Reform Implementation Group – Meeting 11, 2021

**Time:** 9:30am – 12:00pm

**Date:** 25 November 2021

**Venue:** Teleconference

### Attendees:

Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation
Alan McDonald	Bluewaters	Simon Middleton	AEMO
Alex Gillespie	AEMO	Shelley Worthington	EPWA
Aditi Varma	EPWA	Stacey Fontein	Western Power
Ben Connor	Synergy	Stuart Featham	AEMO
Brad Huppatz	Synergy	Stuart MacDougall	AEMO
Christopher Wilson	AEMO	Sumar Kaur	Shell
Claire Richards	Enel X	Teresa Smit	AEMO
Dimitri Lorenzo	Bluewaters	Tinna Needham	Western Power
Dora Guzeleva	EPWA	Toby Price	AEMO
Elizabeth Aitken	Aitken Energy	Vanessa Page	Western Power
Erin Stone	Point Global	Wendy Ng	Shell
Gavin White	ERA		
Harry Street	Entego		
Jo-Anne Chan	Synergy		
Judy Hunter	Western Power		
Katelyn Rigden	ERA		
Liam Staltari	AEMO		
Lynda Venables	Synergy		
Mariusz Kovler	AEMO		
Mark McKinnon	Western Power		
Mark Riley	AGL		
Mike Chapman	Western Power		
Mike Hales	AEMO		
Mike Reid	AEMO		
Nicki Eastman	AEMO		
Oscar Carlberg	Alinta		
Patrick Peake	AGL		
Paul (Guest)			
Peter Huxtable (Guest)	Water Corporation		
Raymond Lobo	ERA		
Rebecca Petchey	AEMO		
Rebecca White	Collgar		
Rhiannon Bedola	Synergy		
Sally Campbell	Western Power		
Sara O'Connor	ERA		
Sarah Graham	EPWA		
Simon Akero	Shell		

Slide No.	Issue
1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dora Guzeleva (DG) introduced the meeting and gave an overview of the agenda for the meeting</li> <li>• DG apologised for the last WRIG minutes not yet been published <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ there was some confusion between EPWA and AEMO and minutes were not prepared on time. She has asked AEMO to review them as she was not available for the entirety of the meeting, and hopefully they will be published by the end of tomorrow</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Joint Industry Plan – Plan and Progress Updates (Dora Guzeleva, EPWA, Mariusz Kovler, AEMO, Mark McKinnon, Western Power, Ben Connor, Synergy)</b>	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mariusz Kovler (MK) gave an update on the status of the Joint Industry Plan (JIP) from AEMO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One update – to accommodate changes to the WEM Procedures timeline</li> <li>○ AEMO expects to finalise JIP updates by next Wednesday 1 December, there will be some minor updates, everything else on track</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mark McKinnon (MM) gave a brief update from Western Power: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Working through re-planning our program given changes to timelines</li> <li>○ Main update - Mike Chapman later in WRIG will be providing a GPS update</li> <li>○ Still planning to take WEM Procedure incorporating the RCM limit advice to next WRIG</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ben Connor (BC) gave a brief update from Synergy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Site works – expecting to complete as soon as practicable and everything is progressing according to plan</li> <li>○ Completed all site works on all of the units at Pinjar power station, which is possibly the most complex of what we have to do</li> <li>○ Working on handover of operation control of Synergy’s GT fleet from AEMO to Synergy, working with AEMO to bring forward as much of that as we can. We think this will; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ultimately de-risk the market go live</li> <li>• provide a long kind of training run for our new team</li> <li>• hopefully de-load the AEMO control room</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MK provided an update on AEMO Implementation Program Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Most notable item is RCM release 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRC applications in RCM Portal – successfully deployed to RCM Production yesterday evening, first major milestone for RCM</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Delivered 2 RTMS showcases to participants and undergoing ongoing development work to make that happen, taking into account feedback from showcases and from the various timeframe’s indications from participants across the holiday period as well</li> <li>○ WEMDE project is currently at sprint 9 or thereabouts of about 30</li> <li>○ Core solver engine has been built out <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We’ve had internal showcases, some work remaining</li> <li>• Quite comfortable with how that is progressing internally</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Outage management sprinting ahead nicely</li> <li>○ Completed review of market feedback on WEM Procedures and been published</li> <li>○ Workload is increasing we have roughly 20 projects in execution, massive amount of work going on</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Question from Rebecca White (RW) in chat - How is the WEM reform portal tracking? This is a great initiative by AEMO, but it has been on the cards for a while and wondering when it will be operational? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MK responded, Mike’s going to give us an update on the Reformer in subsequent slides</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mike Reid (MR) provided an update on Market Readiness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Readiness Working Group - next meeting 14 December</li> <li>○ Preliminary discussions on specific criteria for market participants (MP) for AEMO and ERA</li> <li>○ Specific readiness criteria that should apply to Western Power will be discussed at next meeting</li> <li>○ Going out for consultation in new year</li> <li>○ Working through risks in an industry risk register and looking to publish this in the new year – this will be published and maintained on the Reformer which we will ask to be updated and regularly reviewed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Rules Gazettal Schedule (Dora Guzeleva, EPWA)

- 8
- DG provided an update on Tranche 5 and Tranche 6:
  - Tranche 5
    - Issued exposure draft for Tranche 5 on 1 November
    - There were 3 consecutive TDOWG meetings and the slides are now available on the EPWA website
    - Submissions closed Tuesday, 23 November – received a number of helpful submissions, combination of policy questions and typos
    - Additional drafting relates to the Non-co-optimised ESS (NCESS) framework because EPWA received numerous comments both in TDOWG and via submissions
    - Finishing off NCESS changes, half of the draft (part one) has gone to lawyers for final review and the second part is going to the lawyers tomorrow – expecting legal comments by the end of next week
    - Ministerial instruments and commencement notices to start going through approvals early the following week
    - Reason for rush is there are several important changes in Tranche 5, one of which is not listed on the slide, which is changes to AEMO's allowable revenue submission number 6, also some RCM changes that need to commence for the 2022 NAQ cycle
    - Plan to submit to the Minister by the middle of December to go for gazettal before Christmas, will publish rules on website
    - Similarly changes to GSI rules for AR 6 in parallel
  - Tranche 6
    - Still planned for later next year – EPWA has a log, and has collected a lot of clean up issues
    - As AEMO goes through building its systems, if there are major issues they encounter EPWA will advise this group and will potentially have to go through another Tranche of rules

## Update on the “Reformer” web portal (Mike Reid, AEMO)

- 9
- Mike Reid (MR) gave an overview and preview on what the “Reformer” will look like:
  - For each project AEMO will have a landing page that give you some:
    - general information
    - background materials
    - rules and procedures related to the project
    - information to help the user to make connections with other materials that we provide that are relevant to the project as well
    - events that are scheduled and other links
    - sections will be built out as projects continue
  - Wendy NG (WN) commented – this is look really good, when can we get access to it as it will be really handy to our team, everything is in the one sport – can we get a timing as to when it will be available to market participants?
    - MR answered, as soon as possible is the most specific answer I can give you – we're working through some issues internally to get access to technologies that will enable us to do the user management efficiently to make sure that we aren't overwhelmed, and you guys aren't then frustrated by getting delays in having user access requests approved etc, unfortunately I can't give you a date yet on when we'll have those issues resolved.
  - WG asked, when you say issues, are they all internal approval issues, because it would be great if you could give us some insight into that, because like I said its looking really good and I'd like to get our project team into this with all the data and material there
    - MK added, Wendy we certainly understand and share your point of view, as Mike elaborated, we do a have a strong internal cyber team and we need to work through some of the user provisioning and efficiency things that need to meet our standards and that's effectively the thing that's blocking us a little bit, but we will get through that as quickly as possible.
    - This is all approved internally, from a corporate comms perspective we have approval at the highest level as per our CEO messaging, we do want to collaborate with participants as much as possible, we're just working through that internally from a technical perspective and we will get back to you as soon as possible and share this. We're on exactly the same page as you we do see massive benefits for us all.
    - WN replied, thanks for that, it really does help internal processes, we'd be happy to help with testing if need be, whatever we need to do to get ourselves access to this site, we would provide any assistance required.
    - MK responded we understand and what is most useful for us is the comments that are coming in and the feedback because as they're coming in I'm actually sending them to the internal technology GM's that can help us move this forward on a more quicker basis, believe me this is happening in real time as your sharing the comments I'm putting them internally to the teams that can help us moving forward.
  - DG noted two strong supporting comments in chat:
    - Patrick says like Wendy I think this is really useful and would like to see ASAP

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Paul agrees this it would be really useful</li> <li>● Rebecca White (RW) commented, I agree really useful, and this is looking really good so thanks for that – just wondering can we get access for consultants and lawyers and the like? For me that’s definitely good value and a good use of this portal and I recall there was going to be a login, or something so will we be able to get a login for them or is it only for MPs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MR replied, good point Bec – absolutely our intention is to provide access to MPs and the service providers that we already know about – we will pre-approve their domains and so requests for access from them should be pretty seamless, for others that we’ve not come across yet it will just be a matter of finding out more about their organisations and their reasons for wanting access and we will provide access really on a sort of need to have access basis. It will obviously smooth that process where MP’s are vouching for service providers. We will provide more information on that with the access invitations when we send them out.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

**WEM Procedure Updates (Alex Gillespie, AEMO)**

11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Alex Gillespie (AG) advised there would be three presentations on WEM Procedure updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dispatch Algorithm</li> <li>○ Capacity Credits</li> <li>○ Feedback for Certification of Reserve Capacity for the 2021 Reserve Capacity Cycle</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
----	--

**Dispatch Algorithm (Chris Wilson, AEMO)**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chris Wilson (CW) provided a high-level overview of the WEMDE Dispatch Engine Formulation which will ultimately be a component of the dispatch algorithm procedure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is not in its final state, but we are pretty comfortable that we’re the vast majority of the way there</li> <li>○ We will go into to more detail and will release it to participants in due course</li> <li>○ We will certify the document in the not too distant future and there will be some comms around that</li> <li>○ Procedure lays out the formulation that we are using for the WEM dispatch engine</li> <li>○ In terms of certification the approach that we are going to take is the same as is done in the NEM</li> <li>○ We will get this formulation certified against the WEM rules i.e. ensure it meets the requirements of the WEM rules</li> <li>○ We will then get our implementation – the actual dispatch engine certified against the formulation, thereby having a unique chain saying that yes, our implementation is a correct rule compliant implementation</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ultimately, we will publish this and the data format and intend to go to WRIG -IT in December with some discussion around what to expect in terms of engine data format – so keep an eye out for that if you are interested</li> <li>● Sets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Each dispatch interval has its own run – unlike some other markets we’re not optimising over a period of time, like a day or 6 hours etc.</li> <li>○ 6 market services – Energy and 5 ESS which are being co-optimised</li> <li>○ Set of facilities which will be all active Registered Facilities</li> <li>○ Going to stick with 10 tranches that we can set procedurally</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Variables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Key variable in this is the tranche quantity</li> <li>○ How much of a given market service is used from a particular tranche which is a pairing of quantity and price</li> <li>○ Different from the NEM and based on advice</li> <li>○ Instead of having a separate energy offer and consumption market it is one market where positive quantities represent injection and negative quantities represent withdrawal, for each of the ESS they only make positive quantities so they can be zero or positive or non-negative</li> <li>○ These are the core tranches that ultimately will be summed up for each Facility and will end up being the numbers that are the dispatch targets or the ESS enablement quantities for a Facility</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Largest contingency variable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Represents for any particular contingency</li> <li>○ Represents for any particular solve – what is the largest contingency that originates, potentially an individual Facility or a combination of Facilities due to a network or other constraint</li> </ul> </li> <li>● DFCM Binary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Makes WEMDE mixed integer linear program instead of just a standard linear program</li> <li>○ A variable can take a value of zero or one – represents the system conditions we are expecting, that is the size of the contingency and the amount of inertia on the system</li> <li>○ Together with those we can pull out a set of performance factors for a set of facilities</li> <li>○ If you need a brush up on how those performance factors will work for contingency raise see <a href="#">links</a> for previous TDOWG which presented these concepts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

- Constraint Violation Quantities (CVQ)
  - Have to exist so we can always get a feasible linear programming solution if you don't include these you end up with an in-feasible solution which is no good to anyone because it doesn't give you an answer, we always want an answer even if it is not strictly physically possible
  - CVQ and associated Constraint Violations penalties are the way that we represent these and the order in which we should violate these, e.g., ramp rates – facilities only have a certain ramp rates but if we end been short due to a sudden movement it might be that we need to pretend to ramp the facility a bit faster and it gets soaked up by regulation
  - Haven't finalised exact order but we're basing our implementation off the NEM's approach to this
  - The order will be published as part of this procedure or as a separate procedure
- Tie-Breaking Variables
  - In the event that we have two quantities for a market service that are the exact same price and there is no economic benefit of choosing one over the other
  - We split those according to the proportion of the tranches
  - We're using exactly the same implementation as the NEM based on the advice of consultants that this is the best way to do it
- Constraints:
  - Energy balance constraint – need to make sure the sum of the dispatch energy equals the sum of the demand on the system
  - EnergyDeficit and EnergySurplus are the CVQ so we can always make sure that this solves
  - Concept picked up from the NEM – normally on load demands (NOLDemand) some loads that may be scheduled are already included on our forecasts as default so this subs them out again so we don't double count them
- RW asked, with the constraint violation quantities, how material do you expect the increase in regulation to be because of this approach?
  - CW answered, immaterial. The CVQ don't have any impact, they are purely ways to get around the fact that there are certain circumstances where we couldn't physically solve the system in the absence of them, we would still need to use regulation, which is partly why regulation exists as a sort of shock absorber for the system
- Facility Contingency Constraint:
  - We are considering that the contingency default for a facility is the sum of its energy provision plus the sum of its regulation raise provision as it is entirely feasible that a facility is at the top of its Regulation Raise provision when it trips and therefore that is the contingency that we need to cater for
  - Each Contingency will be created for each facility – in initial model we're doing this for everything
- Defined Contingency:
  - Anything that we want to define in our system as individual or combinations thereof of facilities – could be any market but we would only use the raise market
- ESS Maximum Provision Percentage Constraint:
  - What is a secure level of provision - so you don't put all your eggs in the one basket
  - We'll come back to industry with more details when we run some of the numbers
  - Putting this in here gives us the capability to change those numbers if deemed appropriate
- ESS Requirement Constraint:
  - For everything except Contingency Raise and Energy you can set outside the model the requirement of the constraint e.g. regulation
- Question from RW in chat - are the items in the Defined Contingency variable the same as those used in the sets for Contingency Raise cost recovery runway method?
  - CW answered yes, so ultimately these defined contingencies can feed into the cost recovery calculation in settlements as a defined network constraint, but you will be able to see that this is a contingency constraint, and it will have a marginal value. It will have quantities associated with it so it can be included in that calculation. I can't talk to the exact detail of that, but the numbers will be there to make that calculation work.
- Note that there are two forms of ramp rates constraints – one for fast start facilities because they need a slightly different consideration
- ESS Enablement Min & Max Constraints
  - Picking up the NEM's trapezium approach for ESS if you are starting in the trapezium you are bounded by the minimum and maximum
  - These constraints take effect when you are providing that particular ESS
  - There's is good NEM document that can explain the ESS constraints that we will share
- UIGF Constraint
  - Basically, the engine knows if a semi scheduled facility is what they are actually capable of in terms of their forecast generation particularly if they are currently constrained

- This constraint just gives us a number so that we don't accidentally try send them to the full capability if we know they are not capable of it
- Pure Storage Constraints
- Spoken about in a TDOWG (maybe) March last year
  - These are opt-in constraints but if you opt-in the engine will make sure that you are not dispatched for a quantity that you can't fulfill based on the current available storage in the facility
  - These are opt-in but they do provide belts and braces for storage facilities if they are providing multiple services simultaneously
- Generic constraints
  - Effectively everything that comes out of constraint management - these will all be published with the full details of them
- Inflexibility Constraint's
  - In RTMS you have the capability to flag inflexibility, if you do so we will dispatch you to the sum of a single offered tranche
  - Obviously, this must reflect a verifiable physical restriction on the facility, and I suspect is something the regulator may take some interest in
  - This gives effect to that inflexibility flag, if used from an engine position you can set your ramp rates to zero and we will provide some advice in the future as to the preferred mechanism for showing this
- Tie-Breaking Constraint 1
  - The effect of these means that if you have multiple tranches offered at the same price and there is no economic benefit in picking one over the other, they will be distributed based on their relative sizes
- Objective Function
  - Effectively what makes it happen
  - The object of WEMDE is to minimise the cost of dispatched energy
- RW asked, what happens if the demand for the marginal tranche is really small? Is it still split? When you talk about tie breaking ...when you get into small quantities are you still going to split it?
  - CW answered sorry Bec, what do you mean, like a megawatt?
  - RW continued, you were just talking about tie-breaking and if you only need two megawatts from that tranche obviously it is probably not a realistic example because there's NINJAM but if it's getting to small quantities are you still going to split it?
  - CW responded, yes, because that's what the rules say. The rules are quite specific in how we split tie-breaks and the prioritisation of that and so yes even if it's a megawatt or even a kilowatt. Yes, we will split that.
- RoCoF Control Service Procurement Algorithm
  - 3 types of facilities in the terms of RoCoF – we...
- Question from Aditi Varma (AV) in chat – how does the Objective function deal with the rule of “maximising the value of Real Time energy”?
  - CW replied good question Aditi – because the signed convention effectively for quantity is that generation is positive and therefore load is negative to minimise the... if you have positive quantities of generation at positive prices you end up with a positive number and therefore you want to minimise the amount of that used subject to meeting the constraints. If you have load as positive prices that's negative and therefore you want to maximise the dispatch of that – once you move to negative prices obviously that flips. You can reformulate all of this as a maximisation problem and mathematically it comes out the same, it's just for the purpose of making this algorithm, minimisation made some of the constraints more sensible – practicable effectively but, you can show that this minimisation objective does meet the maximising the value of real time energy dispatch
- In terms of the RoCoF Control Service Procurement Algorithm, I'm probably not going to have enough time to go through it and give it justice and detail, so I'm going to suggest if there's a future WRIG where we can go into specifically more detail on this
- Dispatch and Pre-Dispatch
  - Haven't quite finalised this yet, probably still a few outstanding questions there
- Fast Start Inflexibility Profiles
  - Pretty much exactly the same as the NEM implementation so we can issue some documentation on that
- Intervention Constraints
  - Picking up the NEM approach
  - We can mark certain constraints as intervention constraints
  - This means that we have to do the intervention pricing approach
  - We take out the effect of the intervention constraint which is fairly straightforward and basically copies the NEM approach
- Input data format
  - This will be published as part of procedure as a supporting document once it's done

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Certification process about to commence shortly and we will be communicating with participants about the outcomes of that probably early 2022</li> <li>• Question from RW in chat – sorry for all the questions - just wondering how is the first cut of the limit advice and constraints library tracking? I recall it was originally planned for publication on October. This is really key info for market participants so is it possible for us to please see it soon (noting of course it could be subject to some amendments)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CW replied I don't know if Leon is online but that's probably a better one for him. We can take that one away Bec and get back to you</li> </ul> </li> <li>• AG asked Bec to confirm if the question was related to RCM or WEMDE and advised he would get back to her <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RW replied - just the WEMDE</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Question in chat from Patrick Peake (PP) – who will audit the engine? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CW replied we are planning to go to an RFQ shortly so we will be putting out for that</li> <li>○ MK added, there is a go to market happening shortly for this purpose and for some of the other items we need to do with respect to certifications and some of the other projects so that will be happening imminently</li> </ul> </li> <li>• AG commented that he might work with CW to bring a second session and dig a bit deeper into things they weren't able to cover today</li> </ul> <p>Any questions please contact <a href="mailto:WA.ETS@aemo.com.au">WA.ETS@aemo.com.au</a> email</p>
--	---

**Capacity Credit Allocations (Stuart MacDougall, AEMO)**

<p><b>See AEMO slide pack</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stuart MacDougall (SM) provided an update on Capacity Credit Allocations WEM Procedure to give some context prior to releasing it for consultation early next year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rules brought about by the reform have really simplified this process</li> <li>○ More akin to how we have energy bilaterals at the moment where it is done on a daily basis and done before the trading day</li> <li>○ We are mostly seeking feedback on the process we have introduced for a participant to be able to make a standing submission</li> <li>○ Main intention here is that although you can make allocations on a daily basis and you have to under the rules, we wanted to at least propose a mechanism that can help some participants have a standing submission that would be used to make those allocations every day</li> <li>○ Trying to make it easier for participants who may not have access to web services or want to log in every day</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CCA Process Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New image in the procedure simpler to reflect the simplified rules compared to current one – see slide</li> <li>○ Less steps a participant now takes</li> <li>○ Participant can withdraw so long as the window is still open</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CCA Standing Submission list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ultimately when the window opens for a particular trading day AEMO would take the template and make submissions for the participant - see slide on CCA Standing Submissions List for example</li> </ul> </li> <li>• AEMO intends to publish this procedure in January 2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Specifically seeking feedback on Standing Submission List process because although it's not required under the rules, we wanted to give the participants the option to not go in every day but there will be the option through web services or through the MPI itself to make submissions on a single day</li> </ul> </li> <li>• DG read comment from chat - having standing submission process is super helpful thanks for that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DG noted that actually EPWA did get some feedback in response to exposure draft for Tranche 5 that made the same observation that it would be very helpful to have a CCA standing submissions available for participants so this is a great development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--

**Feedback for Certification of Reserve Capacity for the 2021 Reserve Capacity Cycle (Rebecca Petchey, AEMO)**

<p><b>See AEMO slide pack</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebecca Petchey (RP) provided a brief overview on consultation feedback received for Certification of Reserve Capacity for the 2021 Reserve Capacity Cycle – see slide for AEMO's response to comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedure published as of 1 November and will only apply to the 2021 Reserve Capacity cycle which commences 1 December</li> <li>○ Received two submissions during the consultation period</li> <li>○ Did not amend the procedure as it would have caused inconsistencies and reduce clarity and it is only transitional</li> <li>○ Enduring version of the procedure is due to be released early next year for consultation around February</li> <li>○ This procedure is intended to bring in the new things that have changed in the rules in the last couple of months</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RP emphasised- we take a very firm stance on manifest errors and note there is a 2-month window to submit applications. We also run workshops throughout the year which should allow ample time correct manifest errors during this process</li> <li>○ Reminded participants that release 1 of the RCM reform project which included all of the changes to systems that were required to support the CRC process for the 2021 cycle went into production last night</li> <li>○ We're ready to open the CRC window next Wednesday 1 December</li> <li>○ Hosting a workshop on 9 December and we encourage ALL participants to come, not just new ones due to all the changes that have been made</li> <li>○ Invitations went out last week please contact us if you did not receive one</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AG gave an overview of upcoming publications and consultations:</li> <li>• Upcoming Publication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1 December – Indicative Facility Class and RCM Facility Class Assessment</li> <li>○ 1 December - Facility Sub-Metering</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Upcoming Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Early January – Capacity Credit Allocations</li> <li>○ Late January – RCM Constraints</li> <li>○ Late January – RCM Limit Advice</li> <li>○ Late January – Real-Time Market Submissions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Extending the Scope for Transitional Procedure Development (Dora Guzeleva, EPWA)</b>	
<b>14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DG gave an update on Extending the Scope for Transitional Procedure Development:</li> <li>• Currently the rules, in two different places, provide for exemptions from the formal procedure change process and AEMO has been actively using those including with respect to those procedures just presented</li> <li>• DG discussed some proposed changes to be including in Tranche 5 and advised that AEMO requested changes to current transitional clauses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clause 1.36.6(c) [Tranche 1]</li> <li>○ Clause 1.43.3(c) [Tranche 2 &amp; 3]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reason for these changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We have on a couple of occasions now changed rules that were made in Tranches 1, 2 &amp; 3 and that was done through Tranches 4A, 4B and now 5</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We're making changes to rules that would have the effect to impact also on the WEM Reform related WEM Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is causing issues for several procedures which are now outside the timeframes – the standard Procedure Change Process can take up to 6 months whereas the process AEMO undertakes under the exemption takes approximately 3 months</li> </ul> </li> <li>• EPWA believes this is a real issue because of the changes that were made to previous Tranches of reform rules</li> <li>• EPWA proposes to extend the exemptions with a couple of additional provisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ When AEMO is making changes to reform WEM procedures they need to publish them and invite submissions for at least 15 business days from the date of publication</li> <li>○ When AEMO or other parties publish the revised procedure they must also publish a summary of the issues raised in submissions and responses to the issues</li> </ul> </li> <li>• AEMO has been doing this but doing so quite after the fact. We propose that this be published at the same time as the final procedure is published</li> <li>• We also need to implement very similar rules for Tranche 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In Tranche 5 we are making a number of new provisions in the rules but also changes to existing ones, notably changes to registration rules, NCESS and similar things that would introduce new powers for WEM Reform procedures or make a change in the rules that may lead to additional changes to existing/already made procedures</li> <li>○ We propose to include these changes in the current transitional rules in Tranche 5 plus a specific rule related to Tranche 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Generator Performance Standards (Mike Chapman, Western Power)</b>	
<b>See Western Power slide pack</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mike Chapman provided an update on Generator Performance Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reaching the end of the year transition period for existing transmission connected generating systems</li> <li>○ Have received MP submissions from almost everyone</li> <li>○ If anyone has not yet started discussions with Western Power (WP) please get in touch with us ASAP</li> <li>○ Gave an overview of the GPS Timeline focussing on the final date – 31 January 2022</li> <li>○ Discussed GPS Extension Mechanism focussing on eligibility criteria</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- If anyone thinks they're not going to have their GPS submission finalised and registered and if you think you are not going to make that 31 January date – look at the eligibility criteria specifically:
  - Making reasonable progress
  - Reasonably require additional time
- If you're not going to meet that date, all is not lost - If you meet these two criteria WP must grant you an exemption but if your submission has not been submitted and is 100% blank, then we are probably not going to define that as reasonable progress being made
- MPs need to demonstrate that if you are asking for example a 4 or 6 months extension then;
  - We need to see what your timeline looks like; and
  - Why you need that time:
    - If you have consultants to engage or further testing to undertake, we need an indication of what that timeline looks like
    - If it looks like you need 2 months, but you ask for 6 months then you are probably only going to get 2 months
  - The intent is not to get a stick out
    - We do want to use the extension process where it is required and adjust deadlines where needed
  - Requests must be made at least 20 business days before 31 January 2022 - therefore, by 30 December 2021
  - We are expecting a last-minute chatter, request submission etc. so please help with resourcing and come to us early
  - The repercussions of not getting your submission in is that WP is obligated to refer a MP to the GPS Dispute Resolution Mechanism - please see slide
  - WEM Rules describes a requirement for GPS Guidelines
    - Relevant Generator Modification Guidelines
    - GPS Technical Requirement Guidelines
  - The intent is to publish guidelines after development by 1 July 2022
  - WP intends to present a further update on the Relevant Generator Modification at next WRIG
  - Whilst guidelines are not formally available please engage us for clarification if required
  - See slides for links for more information

Email enquiries to [system.analysis@westerpower.com.au](mailto:system.analysis@westerpower.com.au)

#### Next Steps (Dora Guzeleva, EPWA)

- DG gave an overview of the next steps:
- No WRIG for December
  - Next WRIG 9:30am Thursday 27 January 2022
  - Next WRIG-IT meetings scheduled 1:00pm Thursday 16 December 2021

Email enquiries to [wa.ets@aemo.com.au](mailto:wa.ets@aemo.com.au)

\*\*The next WRIG is the day after a public holiday - we might consider having the next WRIG first week in February 2022, we will confirm

Enjoy your Christmas break