

# STANDALONE POWER SYSTEMS

## PROCEDURE CONSULTATION

## PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant:*** Endeavour Energy

***Submission Date:*** 06/04/2022

# Table of Contents

- 1. Context ..... 3
- 2. Questions..... 3
- 3. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter ..... 4

## 1. Context

This template is to assist stakeholders in giving feedback about the options detailed in the issues paper associated with the Standalone Power Systems consultation.

The changes being proposed are because of NER rule changes which have occurred requiring changes to AEMO's Retail Electricity Market Procedures.

## 2. Questions

Section	Description	Participant Comments
3.3.2	Are there other advantages/disadvantages of any of the options that AEMO should have considered?	<p>We note that the objective is for a SAPS NMI to be '... identifiable and discoverable by market participants and AEMO'. We understand this objective is not only from a systems point of view but also a user point of view, therefore we suggest another criteria AEMO considers is the useability of the solution options. For example, if a user was to look at a NMI using the MSATS browser then based on the issues paper we believe the useability of each option to be (high means better usability):</p> <p>Option 1: Useability is medium: the user will have to look at the NMI Master screen and the TNI screen to determine if a NMI is within a SAPS</p> <p>Option 2: Useability is low: the user will have to look at the NMI Master screen and an AEMO Procedure (located somewhere else on AEMO's website) to determine if a NMI is within a SAPS</p>

Section	Description	Participant Comments
		<p>Option 3: Useability is high: the user only has to look at the NMI Master screen (assuming the name of the new field is intuitive)</p> <p>Note, it is common for participant's systems to replicate MSATS, therefore any useability benefit in MSATS also gets replicated in participant's systems.</p>
3.3.2	<p>Is there another option for identifying a SAPS NMI that AEMO should consider? Why?</p>	<p>We suggest that AEMO considers introducing a new value (eg SAPSGENR or SAPSBULK) for the NMI Classification field so that the NMI for the SAPS generation can easily be identifiable and distinguishable from NMIs that belong to customers within a SAPS. We believe this suggestion would complement any of the solution options presented.</p>
3.3.2	<p>Which of the three options for identifying a SAPS NMI do you prefer and why?</p>	<p>We prefer option 3. Our next preference is option 1 followed by option 2.</p> <p>We note that option 3 does not have any impact to the registration process/system and therefore would result in less on-going operational cost and option 3 provides a high level of useability. We acknowledge that option 3 requires a schema change but believe that in the long term this option will deliver better value.</p>

### 3. Other Issues Related to Consultation Subject Matter

Participant Comments