

## RDIWG Meeting 20

<b>Location:</b>	IMO Board Room Level 3, Governor Stirling Building, 197 St Georges Terrace, Perth
<b>Date:</b>	22 March 2012
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	TBA

<b>Attendees</b>	
Allan Dawson	IMO (Chair)
Matt Pember	IMO
Brad Huppatz	Market Generator (proxy)
Corey Dykstra	Market Customer
Steve Gould	Market Customer
Andrew Sutherland	Market Generator
Andrew Stevens	Market Generator
Geoff Gaston	Market Generator
Phil Kelloway	System Management
Cameron Parrotte	System Management
John Rhodes	Market Customer
Paul Hynch	Office of Energy
Holly Cheung	ERA
Chin Koay	Market Generator
Janine Ripper	Observer
Martin Maticka	Observer
Fiona Edmonds	Observer
Jenny Laidlaw	Observer
<b>Apologies</b>	
Andrew Everett	Market Generator
Wana Yang	ERA

Item	Subject	Action Owner
1.	<b>Minutes from the previous meeting</b> The minutes from RDIWG Meeting 19 were accepted without amendment.	
2.	<b>Previous actions</b> <u>Action (20120206)</u> IMO to arrange for the rewrite of the rule associated with Issue 3 for clarity.	Completed

	<p><u>Update 20120322</u></p> <p>Mr Dawson advised that he had sought legal advice and the clause had been redrafted by Lavan Legal into more plain language.</p> <p><u>Action 20120206</u></p> <p>IMO to follow up on responses to Mr Dykstra's queries re: the IMO procedures.</p> <p><u>Update 20120322</u></p> <p>Mr Pember confirmed that the changes recommended by Mr Dykstra had been incorporated into the relevant IMO procedures.</p>	Completed
3.	<p><b>System Management Procedures Update</b></p> <p>Mr Parrotte provided an overview of the SMARTS Program of Work, advising that System Management were focussing on what was needed for 1 July 2012, as there were a few items due in July with an amber status, rather than looking ahead to what is due on 5 December.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte advised that the Dispatch engine was causing issues and extra resources had been deployed to work on resolving the issues.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte advised that all of the required project staff and SME's were now on board, including 27 full time staff, and additional part time staff.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte advised that the System Management Procedures were out for further consultation.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte summarised that most of the changes made were in relation to the Dispatch procedure, with amendments made to section 5.1 and 5.3 to clarify System Managements obligations on load forecasts.</p> <p>Mr Dykstra stated that section 2.2.2(b) of the Communications and Control Systems procedure was confusing. Mr Parrotte advised that similar feedback had been received from another party, and confirmed that the wording would be clarified.</p> <p>Mr Gould stated that section 2.2.1 was also confusing. Mr Parrotte advised that the intention of section 2.2.1 was what System Management deemed as the standard requirements for a Market Participant who had specific conditions imposed on them. Mr Dawson advised that the IMO could assist with redrafting the clause, and requested it be circulated to the RDIWG by the end of the week for consideration.</p> <p><b><u>Action 22032012:</u></b></p> <p><b>System Management / IMO to redraft clause 2.2.1 and circulate to RDIWG for review.</b></p> <p>In regards to section 2.1.1(a), Mr Parrotte stated the feedback received from Market Participants was that B2B was the preferred way to proceed. System Management will commence workshops in late April to determine what the Portal and B2B will look like. As of December B2B and AGC would be the acceptable methods of responding to Dispatch Instructions for facilities without exemptions.</p> <p>Mr Dawson queried if Market Participants would be ready by December, and asked System Management if there would be a degree of leeway for those who were not ready.</p> <p>Mr Stevens advised that B2B had always been the preferred option but it had not been mandatory until now.</p>	System Management / IMO

<p>My Dykstra agreed with Mr Dawson's request for the provision of a degree of flexibility.</p> <p>Mr Dawson suggested that, in order to ensure fairness, Market Participants should be provided with a reasonable lead-time regarding the implementation of the B2B solution.</p> <p>Mr Stevens advised that there wasn't any visibility at the moment on what the B2B was going to look like, and asked if System Management were going to insist that it was mandatory. Mr Stevens advised that 18 months was a realistic lead-time, and that if they were expected to be ready by December, they would need to see the specifications now.</p> <p>Mr Dawson advised that there were some organisations who would find it easy to accommodate the B2B by 5 December, but that some wouldn't, therefore a degree of flexibility is needed to be provided to those Market Participants who experience difficulties in meeting the deadline.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte confirmed that System Management would consider all of the feedback provided about introducing a degree of flexibility for the take up of B2B in December.</p> <p>Mr Huppertz advised that the feedback provided regarding B2B was that it was highly desirable, but it should not be mandatory.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte advised that System Management were initially proceeding with SMS and email notifications, along with the Portal, in order to communicate.</p> <p>Mr Dykstra queried the references to MPI, the portal, and the website within the procedure (notably section 2.11(c) and 2.2.1(a)) and requested the procedure be updated to ensure consistent use of terminology.</p> <p>Mr Kelloway advised that some investigation needed to be done to ensure that AGC covered the Balancing market. Mr Dykstra expressed concern over the lack of clarity in regards to the technology options that were available.</p> <p>Mr Rhodes expressed surprise at the reference to 24 x 7 monitoring for Demand Side Programs and obligations within section 2.5 of the procedure, and queried why it was needed, as this resulted in a mismatch between 24 x 7 and the Monday to Friday obligations for Dispatch.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte advised that System Management would review this section of the procedure.</p> <p>Mr Sutherland advised that they were eager to get to establish an operating agreement with System Management, and queried how defined the agreement was.</p> <p>Mr Kelloway advised that it was similar to the operating protocol, but there would be more to the agreement from a Dispatch point of view.</p> <p>Mr Sutherland advised that if it was not in the procedure then they needed to have further details on it.</p> <p>Mr Dawson advised that the transparency on outages and how Market Participants responded to outages was crucial and this would be looked at in the implementation of the outage planning review recommendations. This would be addressed further in the MAC meetings.</p> <p>Mr Sutherland queried clause 6.6.2 as it was confusing. Mr Parrotte advised that the wording needed to be updated to reflect the current</p>	
---	--

thinking.

Mr Dawson encouraged feedback on System Managements procedures whilst they were open for further consultation.

Mr Parrotte advised that section 2.1 of the Ancillary Services procedure had been amended to offer a minimum 20MW offer tranche size, as they believed that load following on AGC would have too large a dead band if they had to many units in load following. Mr Dawson expressed concern that this restriction was likely to restrict competition in the market, and suggested further discussion on the issue when Mr Truesdale was in Perth in April 2012. Mr Parrotte advised that this had been discussed with Mr Truesdale, who understood where System Management was coming from. Mr Dawson suggested that Market Participants provide clear feedback to System Management regarding the 20MW minimum, and that it still be discussed when Mr Truesdale is next in Perth.

Mr Parrotte reiterated that System Management welcomed feedback on its procedures.

Mr Huppatz queried the reference to the Corporations Act in section 12.4, stating that Verve did not fall under it.

Mr Kelloway advised that System Management would look into this further.

Mr Kelloway confirmed that the further consultation period closed on 29 March 2012, following which System Management would produce their final reports by the end of April 2012 and then send onto the IMO. Mr Dawson requested that reports be forwarded to the IMO as soon as they were ready rather than being sent through at the same time.

Mr Parrotte provided an overview of the System Management Communications and Testing plan, advising that another Generator forum was scheduled for 23 March where System Management would provide a progress report, along with feedback on any issues raised.

Mr Parrotte advised that E2E testing on System Managements systems would commence in June, and that the schedule was tight, which meant there was not a lot of time to perform testing with all Market Participants.

Mr Parrotte provided an overview of the one-minute Dispatch response issue that was raised at the previous generator forum, advising that a lot of work had been done to resolve it. Mr Parrotte confirmed that the best-case scenario would be five minutes, and the worst-case scenario would be four minutes for expected response to Dispatch Instructions. Mr Dawson summarised that System Management would be issuing Dispatch Instructions within the last 5 minutes of each trading period for the next trading period, and that Market Participants would have 120 seconds to respond within that window.

Mr Parrott highlighted various scenarios where Market Participants that are situated in the BMO close to the margin price may be dispatched intra interval. Mr Stevens expressed concern over the difference from the balancing concept initially tabled 18 months ago, and that Market Participants signed up for Dispatch instructions for succeeding intervals, not in real time. Mr Stevens stressed there were three things in discussion: Load Following, Balancing and Spinning Reserve. Mr Stevens suggested that they should possibly be looking at additional ancillary services rather than dispatching IPP's intra interval.

My Dykstra stated that they should know heading into the trading interval with certainty what was expected heading into the ½ hour, and that one

	<p>of the implications could be a high level of ancillary services. Market Participants need to build their business processes.</p> <p>Mr Dawson reiterated that Market Participants would be called upon in circumstances where system security was at risk, and that in most circumstances, if a Market Participant was in the BMO, they were expected to meet the load every ½ hour, even if it differed from the format load used to calculate the BMO.</p> <p>Mr Parrotte confirmed that System Management would only be issuing dispatch instructions to plant that were scheduled to move, except in the case where load was moving fast. In this instance, dispatch instructions would be issued within the ½ hour Trading Period.</p> <p>Mr Gaston stated that he had a problem with someone having to push buttons manually.</p> <p>Mr Dawson advised that the IMO Board had reviewed a draft statement regarding the IMO's position on compliance, which would be circulated next week.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>IMO Procedures Update</b></p> <p>Mr Pember advised that the IMO-SM Interface procedure was currently out for consultation, and that slight changes were required to the Balancing Facility Requirements procedure, notably section 3.2.1 that didn't give enough detail. A change would be made to describe the process.</p> <p>Mr Pember provided an overview of the MEP Communications plan, stating that a Settlements workshop was being organised to provide Market Participants with an overview of the updated PCS and constrained on/off.</p> <p><b>Action (20120322):</b></p> <p><b>M Pember to arrange for the distribution of the updated PCS to RDIWG members.</b></p> <p>Mr Pember advised that the upgrades being made to settlements would allow for a preliminary run so that if anything odd was found it could be rectified before going live.</p> <p>Mr Pember advised that a Market Operation Stakeholder Forum would be held on 3 April and would cover the information that had been provided at RDIWG Meeting 20.</p> <p>Mr Pember also advised that User Guides were currently being written for non-scheduled generators, and that group Balancing Scenario Testing Sessions would be held on 26 April, including examples utilising the WEMS and demonstrating the outputs.</p> <p>1 on 1 scenario testing would take place in May if requested. A RDIWG was tentatively scheduled for May, if required, and Parallel Market trials would commence on 11 June, dependent on System Management.</p> <p>Mr Pember advised that from 11 April Market Participants would be able to see all Balancing functionality in the Production system, but would not</p>	<p><b>M Pember</b></p>

	<p>be able to make any submissions.</p> <p>Mr Dawson explained that some Market Participants had suggested improvements to the system, and that the IMO would implement some of them in time for Market start in July. Mr Dawson advised that the IMO would consider any other ideas from Market Participants. Mr Dawson also suggested that the IMO was happy to take operators through 1 on 1 session's, or that they could organise group sessions, but stated that the information covered was dependent on how Market Participants were going to set up their trading. Participants need to tell the IMO what they want to see. Mr Pember advised this was part of the scenario training that would be held.</p> <p>Mr Sutherland requested a common document they could all use for their Operations Managers to roll out to their Operators.</p> <p>Mr Dawson advised that the IMO was happy to assist with the production of guides, but that Market Participants would need to translate them in relation to their own business processes.</p>	
--	---	--