Review of the regulatory framework for metering services – Full reference Group Meeting 7

20 July 2022 – Meeting notes

_____

The AEMC held a policy workshop for the *Review of the regulatory framework for metering* services on 20 July 2022. The workshop was held as a hybrid event, with stakeholders attending both in person and virtually via videoconference. The attendees of the meeting are listed in the **Appendix**.

At the start of the meeting, attendees were reminded to observe the requirements of the AEMC's competition protocol.

The workshop consisted of four sessions:

- Update on the Review's progress

- Installation process improvement working group 1: multiple-occupancy issues

- Installation process improvement working group 2: site remediation issues

- Services and data working group: exchange architecture for basic power quality data

AEMC presentation on the Review's progress

- The AEMC provided:

  o a timeline of upcoming Sub-reference Group and jurisdictional meetings

  o an expectation that the Review's draft report be published in late September

  o a summary of the high-level policy positions from the Directions paper as well as a summary of submissions that most stakeholders support a clear direction to accelerate deployment with suggestions of their own, and

  o an update on the progress of the installations and data workstreams since the pause of the Review and the next steps.

Working group for improving installations – multiple-occupancy issues

- The AEMC provided a recap of the issues and impacts on meter installations in multi-occupancy situations with shared-fusing, including:

  o the priority goals in the installations process for sites with shared fusing,

  o provided a recap of a few options for efficient meter replacement in these sites that were presented before the pause, and

  o the remaining feasible options based on stakeholder feedback.

- The AEMC stated that the focus of the discussion is on the logistics of the installations process with the assumption of no remediation issues in the 'one-in-all-in' process flow and its respective timeframes on market participants.

- Feedback from participants included:

- considerations around the movement of obligations on financially responsible market participants with the customer; functioning meters; jurisdictional limitations on putting old meters back onto the meter board.
- the proposed approach could provide improvements to the current situation.
- retailers may not have a significant incentive to appoint a single MC, and the proposed process isn't built for one party to do the planning and coordination
- some of the existing processes, such as the industry malfunction notice fields, may need to be adjusted
- suggestions of changes to the approach, including:
  - the original MC to inform other retailers on the shared fuse to play the coordinating role, with changes to NMI discovery required
  - a market participant to identify the shared fuse under the current 30 business replacement timeframe.

Working group for improving installations – workshop for site remediation

- The AEMC provided a recap of issues related to site remediation and its impacts, in particular that customers are responsible for site remediation but cannot be obliged to remediate a defect. This presents the industry with financial and effort/reward barriers to customers.
- The AEMC stated that the focus of the discussion is on how to overcome financial and effort/reward barriers, in particular whether cost socialisation was possible,
- Feedback from participants included:
  - There are arguments for and against cost-socialisation:
    - For: Stakeholders generally supported cost socialisation if the Governments paid for it.
      - Some noted that if there is a programmed roll-out, the governments should fund remediation costs, and relying on customers to pay for remediation costs could impede the acceleration.
    - Against: Customers individually own the assets supporting meters, and hence they should pay for it.
      - Cost socialisation could raise equity concerns with remediation costs of wealthy customers being shared with the other customers.
      - There was also said to be the risk of socialised remediation inflating costs.
- All stakeholders agreed that there was a need to support vulnerable customers to remediate financially. It would be more appropriate to socialise remediation costs where customers didn't request a meter themselves, but the meter was exchanged under an accelerated roll-out.

- Several participants highlighted that if costs were socialised, there was a need to ensure the costs of the remediation eligible for socialisation are clearly and precisely defined.
- Stakeholders had mixed views on whether funding arrangements for remediation would be sufficient to resolve the issues or whether a nominated party needed to undertake the remediation on behalf of the customers.
  - Those supporting a nominated party approach suggested that it would be better for the customers and the roll-out programme if the nominated party conducted remediations.
  - In contrast, others said that customers unwilling to undertake the remediation could be left with their existing legacy meter.

Working group for enabling services and data – workshop

- The AEMC provided an update on work progressed while the Review was paused:
  - A small working group of DNSPs and MCs were formed after the project paused to progress work on the basic power quality data service between DNSP and MC.
  - The working group set themselves two workstreams:
    - Basic power quality data specification
    - Basic power quality data exchange infrastructure
- The AEMC informed attendees that the working group agreed on the below specifications on basic power quality data:
  - Should be captured from all comms-enabled Type 4 small customer meters.
  - Should record voltage, current, and phase angle, for both export & import.
  - Should capture 5-minute data which is aligned to market time.
  - Should be delivered once a day at a minimum, every 6 hours (i.e., the prior 72 market intervals) was preferred.
  - To identify the meter, use NMI#, serial#, and each element.
  - Could allow access to other basic outcomes, like enquiry service and a multi-meter ping.
- Discussions at the working group meeting was focused on exchange architecture – how do we best transfer the data between parties:
  1. Point-to-point: A traditional point-to-point data link is a communications medium with exactly two endpoints and no data or packet formatting. The host computers at either end take full responsibility for formatting the data transmitted between them.
  2. AEMO's B2B e-Hub: The B2B e-Hub is an electronic information exchange platform that is provided, operated and maintained by AEMO to facilitate B2B Communications. It was established to enable participants to transact with each other quicker than the current FTP protocol if required.

3. Other or new architecture: Would we look to utilise other existing architectures, or do we need to pursue a new bespoke exchange architecture?

- Stakeholder feedback on the exchange architecture options collated around the following points:
    - It is likely not feasible to pursue a new exchange architecture for this purpose.
    - AEMO's B2B e-Hub could facilitate the power quality data outcomes.
        - A straw person model should be developed by the industry working group for input into the AEMC's draft report. It should include:
            - The utilisation of a shared market protocol or peer-to-peer functionalities.
            - Potential pros, cons, and net benefits
        - This also has implications for current governance arrangements, including the B2B working group and Information exchange committee.
    - The AEMC should note and not prevent other current commercial arrangements MCs and DNSPs are utilising today.
    - Different use cases by third parties, such as in near real-time, could be linked to this decision. This should be engaged from draft to final report.

Appendix

Stakeholders in attendance

Member	Organisation
Kate Goatley, Cameron Shields, Melissa Sutherland	ActewAGL
Lee Brown, Rosie Elkins, Satheesh Kumar, Lenard Bull, Nilesh Kevat	AEMO
Bethanie Adams, Dale Johansen, Simon Kidd	AER
Con Hristodoulidis	AGL
Robert Logiudice	Alinta
Aleks Huson	AMS-it
Alex Moran, Wayne Turner	Ausgrid
Justin Betlehem	AusNet Services
Lisa Hussey	Department of Public Works QLD

AEMC in attendance

Name	Position
Ed Chan	Director, Transmission and distribution networks
Jashan Singh	Senior Advisor, Transmission and distribution networks
Mitchell Grande	Advisor, Transmission and distribution networks
Lisa Fukuda	Advisor, Transmission and distribution networks

Dr Martin Gill	Dr Martin Gill
Nathan Oxley, Richard Mcindoe, Richard Newell	Edge Electrons
Jacqueline Crawshaw, Melissa McAuliffe	ECA
Travis Worsteling	Energy Australia
David Markham	Energy Council
Amanda Montenegro	Energy Market Matters
Lucy Moon, Victoria Baikie	Energy Networks
Chairmain Martin, Peter Wall, Christina Green	Energy Queensland
Rory Campbell	EWON
Jo Desilva	EWOSA
Richard Owens	Intellihub (representing)
David Lannan	Green Metering
Brendan Banfield	Gridsight
Greg Will	Horizon Power
Steve Refshauge	Industry
Nicholas Phillips	Itron
Opi Taumalolo	Landis+Gyr
Ben Lovell	Living energy

Emma Mills	Locality Energy
Jochen Sietas	Macquarie Bank
Alan Love	Meridian Energy
Prabath Kamalasena	Metlogic
Randall Brown	Momentum Energy
Larry Moore	NECA
Emily Gadaleta, Sophia Vincent, Alifur Rahman	Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, NSW
Sean Greenup, Aakash Sembey	Origin
Helen Vassos, Tim Ryan	PlusES
Stefanie Monaco	Red Energy/Lumo Energy
Justin Ward	Department for Energy and Mining
Bryn Williams	SAPN
Dean Davis	SATEC
Christian Mildner	Schreder Australia
Nitesh Khanna, Harry Kapahi	Secure Meters
Sue Morrison	Department of Treasury and Finance
Mark Atkinson	Telstra
Paul Greenwood	Vector

Wayne Farrell, David Sheppard	Yurika