

---

---

## Wholesale Electricity Market – Procedure Change Proposal

---

---

Procedure Change No: **PC\_2012\_10**

**Change requested by:**

<b>Name:</b>	Martin Maticka
<b>Phone:</b>	08-9254 4340
<b>Fax:</b>	08-9254 4399
<b>Email:</b>	Martin.Maticka@imowa.com.au
<b>Organisation:</b>	IMO
<b>Address:</b>	Level 17, 197 St Georges Terrace, Perth, WA 6000
<b>Date submitted:</b>	05 November 2012
<b>Procedure change title:</b>	Amendments to Market Procedure for IMS Interface
<b>Market Procedure affected:</b>	Market Procedure for IMS Interface

---

### Introduction

The Independent Market Operator (IMO) or System Management, as applicable, may initiate the Procedure Change Process by developing a Procedure Change Proposal. Rule Participants may notify the IMO or System Management, as applicable, where they consider an amendment or replacement of a Market Procedure would be appropriate.

If an Amending Rule requires the IMO or System Management to develop new Market Procedures or to amend or replace existing Market Procedures, then the IMO or System Management, as applicable, is responsible for the development, amendment, or replacement of Market Procedures so as to comply with the Amending Rule.

Market Procedures:

- (a) must:
  - i. be developed, amended or replaced in accordance with the process in the Market Rules;
  - ii. be consistent with the Wholesale Market Objectives; and
  - iii. be consistent with the Market Rules, the Electricity Industry Act and Regulations; and
- (b) may be amended or replaced in accordance with clause 2.10 and must be amended or replaced in accordance with clause 2.10 where a change is required to maintain consistency with Amending Rules.

The Wholesale Market Objectives are:

- (a) to promote the economically efficient, safe and reliable production and supply of electricity and electricity related services in the South West interconnected system;
- (b) to encourage competition among generators and retailers in the South West interconnected system, including by facilitating efficient entry of new competitors;
- (c) to avoid discrimination in that market against particular energy options and technologies, including sustainable energy options and technologies such as those that make use of renewable resources or that reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions;
- (d) to minimise the long-term cost of electricity supplied to customers from the South West interconnected system; and
- (e) to encourage the taking of measures to manage the amount of electricity used and when it is used.

---

---

## Details of Procedure Change Requested

---

---

### 1. Provide a reason for the proposed new, amended or replacement Market Procedure:

#### Background

To ensure transparency to the Market, the IMO introduced the new Market Procedure for IMS Interface (PC\_2012\_04). This new Market Procedure supported the transfer of information between the IMO and System Management by detailing the parameters that the IMO and System Management must use when providing each other information under the Market Rules. Since the introduction of PC\_2012\_04<sup>1</sup>, a number of issues have been raised by both the IMO and System Management and as a result, the IMO proposes to clarify and amend this Market Procedure to ensure transparency and improve overall integrity, and to address a number of minor technical inconsistencies in the practical implementation of the procedure.

The proposed changes have been developed collaboratively between the IMO and System Management.

For further information on the specific nature of these changes please refer to Appendix 1.

The IMO is seeking submissions regarding this proposal. The submission period is 20 Business Days from the publication of this Procedure Change Proposal. Submissions must be delivered to the IMO by **5:00pm on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012**.

The IMO prefers to receive submissions by email to [market.development@imowa.com.au](mailto:market.development@imowa.com.au) using the submission form available on the IMO website: <http://www.imowa.com.au/procedure-changes>

---

<sup>1</sup> For further details refer to the following webpage: [http://www.imowa.com.au/PC\\_2012\\_04](http://www.imowa.com.au/PC_2012_04)

Submissions may also be sent to the IMO by fax or post, addressed to:

Independent Market Operator  
Attn: Group Manager, Market Development  
PO Box 7096  
Cloisters Square, Perth, WA 6850  
Fax: (08) 9254 4399

---

## **2. Provide the wording of the Procedure**

The proposed amended Market Procedure for IMS Interface is provided as an attachment to this proposal.

---

## **3. Describe how the proposed changes to the Market Procedure would be consistent with the Market Rules, the Electricity Industry Act and Regulations**

The proposed amended Market Procedure for IMS Interface has been preliminarily reviewed, as a whole, by the IMO to ensure compliance of the Market Procedure with the relevant provisions in the:

- Market Rules
  - Electricity Industry Act; and
  - Regulations.
- 

## **4. Describe how the proposed changes to the Market Procedure would be consistent with the Wholesale Market Objectives**

The steps described in the proposed amended Market Procedure for IMS Interface specify the necessary technical details and standards required for System Management and the IMO to follow when providing each other with information.

The IMO considers that the steps are drafted in a way that does not change the operation of objectives of the Market Rules, but rather supplements the Market Rules by outlining the necessary processes to be followed by the IMO and System Management. As a result the IMO considers that the amended Market Procedure, as a whole, is consistent with the Wholesale Market Objectives.

## Appendix 1. Updates to IMS Interface Procedure

- Updates to the IMS has been drafted for the purposes of the end of the transitional period (5 December 2012)
- All quantities to be specified as non-negative where applicable.
- Start/end times specified as to whether the dates are inclusive or not, and whether it refers to trading day.
- Add index to procedure
- Add page numbers
- IMO to update IMS procedure with further details around the contingency/backup plans (Section 4.5)

**Table 1: Specific updates to IMS Interface Procedure**

Interface	Difference from Procedure	Reason for Deviation	Current System status	Market Impact	Agreed Action		
					SM	IMO	IMS Procedure
LOAD_FORECAST_BALANCING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS Procedure does not include ZONE_NAME field as a part of the file however this is being included in the file.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systems have been developed to a draft version of the IMS Procedure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO system was modified to accept files containing ZONE_NAME field, however information is not used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Impact – Removal of redundant field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SM system to remove field from file transfer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO system to no longer accept ZONE_NAME field in file</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to IMS Procedure</li> </ul>
LOAD_FORECAST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Files currently include “WEMS” within the ZONE_NAME field. The IMS procedure states that “SWIS” is the only valid value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systems have been developed to a draft version of the IMS Procedure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO systems were updated to accept files containing either “SWIS” or “WEMS”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to SM system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO system to only accept “WEMS”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS Procedure reflect “WEMS” as the only accepted value</li> </ul>
RELEVANT_DISPATCH_QUANTITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS Procedure does not include ZONE_NAME field as a part of the file however this is being included in the file.</li> <li>• IMS Procedure states CREATION_DATE field is mandatory however it is not being provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systems have been developed to a draft version of the IMS Procedure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO systems were updated to accept files containing ZONE_NAME field</li> <li>• IMO systems were updated to allow CREATION_DATE field to be optional.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Impact – Removal of redundant field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SM system to remove ZONE_NAME field from file</li> <li>• SM system to add CREATION_DATE field to file</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO systems to remove ZONE_NAME from XSD and make CREATION_DATE not null.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to IMS Procedure</li> </ul>
MF_DELIVERY_POINTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RES_TYPE must continue to include a type of CL until facility type DSP can be accepted by SM system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS Procedure removed type = CL prematurely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CL has continued to be transferred as required by SM.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to SM systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes to IMO systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS procedure updated to include RES_TYPE = CL</li> </ul>
VERVE_PORTFOLIO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• END_DATE field has value of 31 December 2099 added if there is no defined end date.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS Procedure incorrectly stated field as Not Null which SM developed to. This is a work around.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO systems updated such that 31/12/2099 date is sent where there is no end date.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SM systems to make END_DATE field nullable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMO systems to stop sending 31 December 2099 in lieu of NULL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMS procedure already removed NOT NULL for END_DATE file</li> </ul>

Interface	Difference from Procedure	Reason for Deviation	Current System status	Market Impact	Agreed Action		
					SM	IMO	IMS Procedure
ANC_SERV_MONTHLY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ANC_SERV_PRICE field values have always been NULL in IMO systems whilst the IMS procedure specifies Not Null</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS Procedure incorrectly stated Not Null field type.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO system allows field to be NULL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to SM system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to make ANC_SERV_PRICE nullable.</li> </ul>
RESOURCE_EOI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QUANTITY_EOIMW has not been specified as non-negative in IMS. The IMO systems is unable to handle negative values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are sending negative “plant load” values which causes problems with IMO systems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are manually ensuring that EOI values are not-negative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Impact – Prevents an accurate BMO from being produced by the IMO system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM system to verify that QUANTITY_EOIMW will be sent as a positive number</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to specify QUANTITY_EOIMW as non negative</li> </ul>
DISPATCH_INSTRUCTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INITIAL_MW field was included in the file despite being duplicate information (RESOURCE_EOI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field is Not Null, when SM cannot provide the value automatically.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are manually ensuring that values are populated with RESOURCE_EOI values from previous trading interval.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – Removal of redundant field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM to no longer manually populate INITIAL_MW field.</li> <li>No changes to SM system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO system to remove INITIAL_MW from XSD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to remove INITIAL_MW field</li> </ul>
DISPATCH_INSTRUCTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TARGET_MW field should be Nullable</li> <li>DISP_REASON_FLAG description should allow “Return to unrestricted output” or “U”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TARGET_MW value is irrelevant for NSGs returning to unrestrained output.</li> <li>Cancellation type isn’t technically correct for return to unconstrained output.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are going to continue to provide a “Target”, however this is only used for the Web Services reports, so no market impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM System to continue sending TARGET_MW of max capacity with DISP_REASON_FLAG = “U” where NSG is returning to unconstrained output.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO Systems to accept new DISP_REASON_FLAG = “U”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS to include DISP_REASON_FLAG = U to represent “return to unconstrained output”</li> </ul>
OPERATING_INSTRUCTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RESPONSE_TIME field was included in the IMS procedure despite not providing any useful information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This field serves no purpose other than for its Web service report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are manually ensuring that values are populated with START_TIME value effectively duplicating information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – Removal of redundant field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM system to stop sending RESPONSE_TIME in file</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems to no longer accept RESPONSE_TIME field within file</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to be updated to remove RESPONSE_TIME field</li> </ul>
LOAD_FOLLOWING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LFAS_TYPE should be Unique Key</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems currently only expecting one LFAS_TYPE which results in data being overwritten.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are manually ensuring information is not overwritten when multiple LFAS_TYPE are sent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM system to ensure that both LFAS_TYPE can be stored when received</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to update LFAS_TYPE field to be UK</li> </ul>
LOAD_FOLLOWING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LOAD_FOLLOWING file to be transferred half hourly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To mitigate risks should there be any technical issues/outage periods during current prescribed transfer times.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently, LOAD_FOLLOWING is being transferred within 15 minutes after LFAS gate closure (5:00pm, 11:00pm, 5:00am and 11:00am)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium Impact – Frequency of LFAS Merit Order transfer significantly increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM system to ensure that it will be able to handle LOAD_FOLLOWING files being sent after the end of every interval.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems to ensure LOAD_FOLLOWING is being transferred to SM after the end of each interval.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to be updated to reflect half hourly transfer of LOAD_FOLLOWING</li> </ul>
COMPLIANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>END_DATE, END_HOUR, END_INTERVAL must be Not NULL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance range must be complete when transferred to IMO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM are not currently transferring this information. Fix implemented at IMO to handle if Null values are provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM to confirm if and when files will be sent and the level of “completion” i.e. end date fields in subsequent file?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD</li> </ul>

Interface	Difference from Procedure	Reason for Deviation	Current System status	Market Impact	Agreed Action		
					SM	IMO	IMS Procedure
All Interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of fields in the IMS XSD have sizes that differ from the procedure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to be updated by comparing against current XSDs to ensure consistency with data types</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – ensure consistency between XSD and IMS procedure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM to ensure files transfers align with IMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure data types updated to ensure it reflects the XSD</li> </ul>
Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timeline included in the IMS is incorrect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – Diagram caused confusion hence was removed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to SM System</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to remove timeline removed from the IMS document</li> </ul>
MF_DELIVERY_POINTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reserve capacity status of “D” is being sent to SM despite not being a defined value in the IMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WEMS is pushing reserve capacity status of “D” where the facility has been deregistered</li> <li>SM should be checking the RTE Flag instead of the Reserve Capacity Status to check whether a facility is registered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO is manually changing the Reserve Capacity Status to ensure the SM system accepts the file.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – Misinterpretation of masterfile data has produced a incorrect list of facilities participating in energy market.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to accept FACILITY_STATUS of D</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO systems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS document to be updated to include FACILITY_STATUS = D</li> </ul>
MF_DELIVERY_POINTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RTE_MARKET field should be the field used by SM to identify registered facilities, i.e. they can participate in real time energy market.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently SM is incorrectly using the FACILITY_STATUS field which is not designed for that.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO has been performing workaround since 1 July 2012 for this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – Misinterpretation of masterfile data has produced a incorrect list of facilities participating in energy market.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to implement the change of their system to use correct field (RTE_MARKET)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems to revert workaround implementation after SM complete the changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMS procedure</li> </ul>
MT_PASA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INTERVAL_DATETIME does not apply to MT_PASA as it only reports weekly projections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – clarification between design and implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to ensure INTERVAL_DATE is sent in MT_PASA instead of INTERVAL_DATETIME</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems to ensure that it accepts INTERVAL_DATE in MT_PASA instead of INTERVAL_DATETIME</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS procedure to update INTERVAL_DATETIME to be INTERVAL_DATE</li> </ul>
All Interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further detail to be provided in acknowledgement files sent to SM.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to check whether SM will be able to receive acknowledgement receipt files with greater detail (line errors etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low Impact – assist in troubleshooting of file transfer errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Open:</b> Actions pending further investigation required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Open:</b> Actions pending further investigation required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Open:</b> Actions pending further investigation required</li> </ul>
All Interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All receipt files have been sent to the IMO with file names inconsistent with the IMS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>File receipts received from SM do not conform to the IMS Procedure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems unable to verify whether files have been received successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium Impact – IMO systems are unable to automatically verify whether a file transferred has been successfully received.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to deliver receipts for all files in the IMS in the correct format as prescribed in the IMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMS procedure</li> </ul>

Interface	Difference from Procedure	Reason for Deviation	Current System status	Market Impact	Agreed Action		
					SM	IMO	IMS Procedure
Specific Interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receipt files have not been received for the following files:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VERVE_PORTFOLIO</li> <li>BALANCING_MERIT_ORDER</li> <li>FORECAST_QUANTITIES</li> <li>LOAD_FOLLOWING</li> <li>BLT_POSITIONS</li> <li>RC_TEST_REQUEST</li> <li>RC_TEST_CANCELLATION</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>File receipts received from SM do not conform to the IMS Procedure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems unable to verify whether files have been received successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium Impact – IMO systems are unable to automatically verify whether a file transferred has been successfully received.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to deliver receipts for listed files in the correct format as prescribed in the IMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMS procedure</li> </ul>
Specific Interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorrect receipt files have been send for the following files:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MF_BA_CLASSES</li> <li>MF_DELIVERY_POINTS</li> <li>RES_PLAN_INTERVAL</li> <li>RES_PLAN_PART_INTERVAL</li> <li>DISPATCH_MERIT_ORDER</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>File receipts received from SM do not conform to the IMS Procedure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems unable to verify whether files have been received successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium Impact – IMO systems are unable to automatically verify whether a file transferred has been successfully received.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to deliver receipts for listed files in the correct format as prescribed in the IMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMS procedure</li> </ul>
Specific Interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following files defined in the IMS have not been sent to the IMO               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NON_SCHEDULED_GENERATION_FORECAST</li> <li>LOADWATCH_LOAD_FORECAST (only for hot season)</li> <li>LOADWATCH_TEMP_FORECAST (only for hot season)</li> <li>SM_COMMISSIONING_TEST</li> <li>DISPATCH_ADVISORY</li> <li>ST_PASA</li> <li>MT_PASA</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Files have either yet to be developed or not required to be transferred yet.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMO systems unable to verify whether files have been received successfully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium Impact – information required to be sent to the IMO have not been received through FTP (some have been sent through email).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SM systems to deliver files and receipts for listed files in the correct format as prescribed in the IMS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMO systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to IMS procedure</li> </ul>