

**Quarterly Compliance Report**

**April – June 2007**

**August 2007**





© Commonwealth of Australia 2007

This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted by the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced without permission of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the Director Publishing, Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, PO Box 1199, Dickson ACT 2602.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Compliance monitoring strategy</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Compliance monitoring outcomes</b> .....	<b>3</b>
3.1	Targeted provisions .....	3
3.1.1	Distribution losses .....	3
3.1.2	Interruptible load .....	4
3.1.3	Routine testing of protection equipment .....	5
3.1.4	Metering installations .....	7
3.1.5	Dispute management systems .....	8
3.1.6	Upcoming compliance reviews .....	9
3.2	Jurisdictional derogations .....	10
3.3	Rebidding inquiries .....	10
3.3.1	Rebidding provisions .....	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Investigations - \$5000/MWh reports</b> .....	<b>11</b>
4.1	Investigation into the events of 12 June to 28 June 2007 .....	11
4.2	Forecast demand and prices .....	12
4.3	Offline and constrained plant .....	12
4.4	Generator offers and rebids .....	12
4.5	Assessment .....	13
	<b>Appendix A</b> .....	<b>14</b>
	<b>Appendix B</b> .....	<b>16</b>



# 1 Introduction

The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) is responsible for compliance monitoring, reporting and enforcement in the National Electricity Market (NEM).

Section 15 of the National Electricity Law requires the AER:

- (a) to monitor compliance by Registered Participants and other persons with this Law, the Regulations and the Rules; and
- (b) to investigate breaches or possible breaches of provisions of this Law, the Regulations or the Rules that are not offence provisions.

In carrying out its monitoring functions, the AER collects and analyses information from Registered Participants and the National Electricity Market Management Company (NEMMCO). The AER ensures that, to the extent practicable, monitoring:

- (1) is consistent over time;
- (2) does not discriminate unnecessarily between Registered Participants;
- (3) is cost effective for the AER, all Registered Participants and NEMMCO; and
- (4) information is published, or otherwise made available to the market, subject to any confidentiality requirements.

The purpose of this report is to summarise the results of the AER compliance monitoring and enforcement activities during the period April –June 2007. It provides an overview of the results of investigations conducted by the AER including special reports into significant market or power system events, which have been published separately, and the results of the AER’s targeted compliance program.

## 2 Compliance monitoring strategy

The AER monitors the operation and performance of the National Electricity Market (NEM), conducts special investigations in response to market outcomes and/or specific events and aims to encourage compliance by market participants.

The AER compliance monitoring program includes targeting a number of specific National Electricity Rules (NER) provisions each year. These provisions relate to areas in the NER where the AER's assessment of participants' obligations highlights a need for increased scrutiny. The AER has targeted 24 provisions for review in 2007. The AER assesses compliance with the targeted provisions through examining all, or a sample of, relevant market participants' behaviour. **Appendices A and B** summarise the provisions targeted as well as investigations and rebidding inquiries instigated during the previous 12 months.

The review process encourages market participants to maintain an ongoing compliance management focus. The AER also conducts a rolling program of reviews of participants' compliance strategies and plans. Those reviews are conducted cooperatively and involve one-on-one discussions with participants. The reviews provide the opportunity to engage participants and to discuss compliance strategies and critical challenges faced by participants in discharging their obligations under the NER.

The AER's approach to monitoring compliance relies, in the first instance, on comprehensive observation and reporting. During the compliance review process, the AER assesses the adequacy of compliance from the information provided by the Registered Participants and may review compliance with these obligations at regular intervals.

In this quarter, the AER focussed its compliance monitoring activities on the following areas: distributions loss factors, provision of interruptible load, testing and auditing of metering installations, adoption and implementation of Dispute Management Systems. The AER is continuing a rolling program of reviewing the protection and control system compliance programs for TNSPs.

The AER is keen to hear from participants and other interested parties on any matters of compliance, including with respect to the specific areas targeted or proposed to be targeted for review.

## 3 Compliance monitoring outcomes

### 3.1 Targeted provisions

In the April - June quarter, the AER targeted a range of provisions including the obligation imposed upon Distribution Network Service Providers (DNSPs) to determine and publish distribution loss factors (clause 3.6.3); the obligation imposed upon Market Customers to provide interruptible load (clause 4.3.5); NEMMCO's obligation to test and audit metering installations (clauses 7.6.1 and 7.6.3); and the obligation on NEMMCO and each Registered Participant to adopt and implement a dispute management system, or DMS (clause 8.2.3).

The AER also continued its ongoing review of Network Service Provider protection and control system compliance programs required under clause 5.7.4.

#### 3.1.1 Distribution losses

As electricity flows through the distribution network, energy is lost due to electrical resistance and the heating of conductors. Distribution loss factors describe the average electrical energy losses for electricity transmitted on a distribution network for the financial year in which they apply. They are used in the settlement process to make adjustments to the energy flowing through a distribution network connection point in a trading interval to account for electrical energy losses in that trading interval.

The AER sought information from Aurora regarding distribution losses with respect to its obligations under clause 3.6.3 of the NER.

Pursuant to clause 3.6.3(b1), the DNSP must calculate a site specific distribution loss factor for embedded networks (up to a capacity of 10MW or output of 40GWh per annum), provided that the Generator meets the DNSP's reasonable costs in performing the necessary calculations. The DNSP must calculate the loss factor on the same basis as for larger generating units (with a capacity of more than 10MW or output of more than 40GWh per annum).

Clauses 3.6.3(c) and 3.6.3(d) outline how DNSPs must assign each connection point on its distribution network, for example, to a transmission network connection point.

Under clause 3.6.3(g), a DNSP must determine distribution loss factors for all connection points on its distribution network in accordance with the methodology published by the Jurisdictional Regulator or, where the Jurisdictional Regulator has not published a methodology, the methodology published by the DNSP.

Clause 3.6.3(i) outlines DNSPs' yearly obligation to determine and publish the distribution loss factors to apply in the next financial year in accordance with clause 3.6.3(g).

In order to assess compliance with clause 3.6.3 of the NER, the AER requested the following information from Aurora:



- a list of Generators covered by clause 3.6.3(b1) and the details of the calculation for the site specific distribution loss factors for those Generators;
- a list of Aurora's assignments of each connection point on its distribution network made under clause 3.6.3(c) and (d);
- confirmation that the methodology applied by Aurora to calculate distribution loss factors for connection points on its distribution network is consistent with the methodology developed and published by OTTER, the Jurisdictional Regulator for Tasmania, pursuant to clause 3.6.3(g); and
- written confirmation of OTTER's approval of Aurora's distribution loss factors under clause 3.6.3(i).

### ***Review outcome***

Aurora's response was reviewed against the requirements of the NER. Aurora noted that it had not been requested by any Embedded Generator to calculate site-specific distribution loss factors in accordance with clause 3.6.3(b1).

Aurora provided a list of the assignment of each connection point on its distribution network. The assignment of those connection points are in accordance with clauses 3.6.3(c) and (d).

In accordance with clause 3.6.3(g)(2) of the NER, Aurora uses a methodology it developed to determine distribution loss factors. This methodology was submitted in September 2005 and was subsequently endorsed by OTTER.

Lastly, Aurora provided written confirmation of OTTER's approval of Aurora's distribution loss factors in the document *Approval of Distribution Factors for Electricity Consumers for 2007-08* in accordance with clause 3.6.3(i) of the NER.

### ***AER assessment***

Based on the information provided by Aurora, the AER is satisfied that the practices and procedures in place provide a reasonable assurance of Aurora's ongoing compliance with clause 3.6.3. The AER will continue to review the provisions of clause 3.6.3 with the remaining network service providers during the coming quarters.

#### **3.1.2 Interruptible load**

Interruptible loads are loads that can be disconnected, manually or automatically, to help NEMMCO restore or control power system frequency to cater for contingency events or supply shortages.

The AER sought information from one Queensland Market Customer regarding its obligations to provide interruptible load in accordance with clause 4.3.5 of the NER.

Clause 4.3.5(a) requires that all Market Customers with expected peak demands at connection points in excess of 10MW must provide interruptible load of the type described in S5.1.10 of schedule 5.1. The level of this automatic interruptible load must be a minimum of 60% of their expected demand, or such other level as is periodically

determined by the Reliability Panel, to be progressively disconnected following the occurrence of a power system under-frequency condition described in the Power System Security and Reliability Standards.

Under clause 4.3.5(b), Market Customers must provide their interruptible load in manageable blocks spread over a number of steps within under-frequency bands from 49.0 Hz down to 47.0 Hz as nominated by NEMMCO.

In order to assess compliance with clause 4.3.5 of the NER, the AER requested the following information:

- a list of all connection points with an expected peak demand in excess of 10MW and the level of expected peak demand at those connection points; and
- details of how the interruptible load is spread over a number of steps within under-frequency bands from 49.0 Hz to 47.0 Hz as required under clause 4.3.5(b).

### ***Review outcome***

The Queensland Market Customer's response was reviewed against the requirements of the NER. The participant provided the AER with a spreadsheet detailing its under-frequency load shedding schedule at the relevant connection points. In accordance with clause 4.3.5(a), the interruptible load represents more than 60 per cent of the participant's total demand.

The participant noted NEMMCO's current review of the under-frequency load shedding arrangement for the entire NEM. The participant expects changes to the load-shedding schedule will be required upon completion of the review.

### ***AER assessment***

Based on the information provided by the participant, the AER is satisfied that the practices and procedures in place provide a reasonable assurance of ongoing compliance with clause 4.3.5. The AER will continue to review these provisions with other market customers over the coming quarters.

### **3.1.3 Routine testing of protection equipment**

As part of a rolling review of all Transmission Network Service Providers, the AER sought information from Powerlink about its routine testing of protection equipment.

Under clause 5.7.4, a Network Service Provider (NSP) must institute and maintain a compliance program to ensure that facilities specified in the NER operate reliably and in accordance with their performance requirements under schedule 5.1 of the NER. The facilities covered are:

- protection systems;
- control systems for maintaining or enhancing power system stability;
- control systems for controlling voltage or reactive power; and

- control systems for load shedding.

In order to assess Powerlink's compliance with the requirements of clause 5.7.4 of the NER, the AER requested the following information:

- details of the compliance program instituted by Powerlink in accordance with clause 5.7.4(a1);
- the steps taken to monitor, test and provide a reasonable assurance of ongoing compliance of the various facilities in accordance with 5.7.4(a2); and
- how Powerlink assesses whether its compliance program is in accordance with good electricity industry practice.

### ***Review outcome***

Powerlink's response was reviewed against the requirements of the NER. Powerlink explained the separate roles undertaken by Asset Management (developing and monitoring compliance strategies) and Service Provision (carrying out maintenance and testing). Powerlink also outlined its Audit Policy for ensuring ongoing compliance.

The two main IT systems used by Powerlink to manage compliance under clause 5.7. – Systems Applications and Products in Data Processing (SAP) and Reliability Centered Maintenance II (RCM II) – were briefly described. “RCM is applied to identify the tasks and frequency of routine testing”, while “Maintenance of each individual asset is managed through SAP and includes identifying the testing task required, as well as frequency and scheduling of the identified task.”

Powerlink outlined several indicators it uses to assess whether its compliance program is in accordance with good electricity industry practice. These include: being the first transmission company to be recognised as a Project Management Organisation from the Australian Institute of Project Management; being an RCM facilitator; and utilising ITMOS (International Transmission Operations and Maintenance Study) for benchmarking, where Powerlink has consistently performed in the top quartile and has appropriate Quality Assurance accreditation throughout the business.

### ***AER assessment***

Based on the information provided by Powerlink, the AER is satisfied at this preliminary stage that the practices and procedures in place provide a reasonable assurance of ongoing compliance of Powerlink's various facilities in accordance with clause 5.7.4.

The AER will continue to review the provisions of clause 5.7.4 with the remaining network service providers over the coming quarters. In the future, the AER will perform audits of selected participants' routine testing of protection equipment to assess, in greater depth, their compliance with clause 5.7.4 of the NER.

### 3.1.4 Metering installations

To review compliance with clauses 7.6.1 and 7.6.3, the AER sought information from NEMMCO with regard to its testing and auditing of metering installations and data.

Clause 7.6.1 contains obligations relating to the testing of metering installations. Under that clause, a Registered Participant may request NEMMCO to arrange for the testing of any metering installation and NEMMCO must not refuse any reasonable request. The responsible person must ensure that NEMMCO has unrestrained access to the metering installation where NEMMCO agrees to comply with the responsible person's reasonable security and safety requirements.

Clause 7.6.3 imposes obligations on NEMMCO regarding the auditing of metering installations and data. It requires NEMMCO to conduct audits to determine the consistency between data held in a metering database and data held in the Registered Participant's metering installation, when requested to do so by the relevant Registered Participant. Clause 7.6.3 also requires NEMMCO to carry out periodic random audits of metering installations to confirm Registered Participants' compliance with the NER.

In order to assess NEMMCO's compliance with the requirements of clauses 7.6.1 and 7.6.3 of the NER, the AER requested the following information:

- details of request(s) made by Registered Participants that NEMMCO arrange for testing of metering installation(s) under clause 7.6.1, including details of whether or not those tests were conducted;
- details of requests made by Registered Participants that NEMMCO conduct audit(s) in accordance with clause 7.6.3, including details of whether or not such audit(s) were conducted;
- details of random audits of metering installations conducted by NEMMCO under clause 7.6.3; and
- confirmation that, in respect of tests and random audits conducted by NEMMCO under clauses 7.6.1 and 7.6.3 respectively, advance notice(s) were sent to the relevant Registered Participant(s).

#### ***Review outcome***

NEMMCO's response was reviewed against the requirements of the NER. NEMMCO has not received any requests to date from Registered Participants to arrange for testing of metering installation(s) under clause 7.6.1(b), nor has it received any requests to date from Registered Participants to conduct an audit of metering installation(s) under clause 7.6.3(a).

NEMMCO provided an outline of the procedure it follows for random audits, which it described as "a negative assurance audit whereby all non-conformances found by the auditors are reported." NEMMCO also provided a table of audit results from 1999/2000 to 2006/2007, which classified instances of non-conformance into the categories of "Procedural", "Major" and "Critical".

NEMMCO stated that it has provided at least 2 business days' notice to Registered Participants of its intention to carry out random audits, including details of the representative conducting the audit and the time frame(s) for the audit.

### ***AER assessment***

Based on the information provided by NEMMCO, the AER is satisfied that the practices and procedures in place provide a reasonable assurance of ongoing compliance by NEMMCO with its obligations under clause 7.6.1 and 7.6.3.

#### **3.1.5 Dispute management systems**

Dispute management systems (DMS) set out the procedures Registered Participants and NEMMCO follow to enable the settlement of disputes with other Registered Participants or NEMMCO, as the case may be, in an efficient and timely manner.

The AER sought information from various Registered Participants with regard to dispute management systems adopted and implemented under clause 8.2.3. Specifically, the AER wrote to six (6) Registered Participants in South Australia to determine compliance with clause 8.2.3.

Clause 8.2.3 requires Registered Participants and NEMMCO to adopt and implement a dispute management system, which must:

- be consistent with guidance notes of the Dispute Resolution Adviser relating to the form and content of a DMS;
- nominate a DMS Contact<sup>1</sup> to be the first point of contact for the notification of disputes;
- provide that the Registered Participant or NEMMCO (as the case may be) must respond to a request for information (that is relevant to the matters set out in clause 8.2.1(a)) from another Registered Participant within 5 business days of receiving the request;
- set out the procedures of the Registered Participant or NEMMCO (as the case may be) for responding to requests for information from other Registered Participants; and
- set out any requirements and procedures necessary to ensure that the Registered Participant or NEMMCO (as the case may be) is able to comply with the requirements and time limits set out in clause 8.2.4.

---

<sup>1</sup> A DMS Contact is defined in chapter 10 of the NER as a person appointed by a Registered Participant or NEMMCO pursuant to its DMS to be the first point of contact for the notification of disputes under clause 8.2.

In order to assess the six (6) South Australian participants' compliance with the requirements of clause 8.2.3 of the NER, the AER requested the following information:

- details of the DMS adopted and implemented by the Market Participant, including the procedures and processes implemented to ensure compliance with the requirements set out in clause 8.2.3.

### ***Review outcome***

The responses of six (6) Registered Participants from South Australia were reviewed against the requirements of the NER. Five (5) of the Registered Participants have nominated a DMS Contact as the first point of contact for the notification of disputes. One participant's obligations in relation to its DMS requirements are covered under jurisdictional requirements set out in Chapter 9. The AER is continuing to review this arrangement.

Three (3) of the Registered Participants explained how their respective DMS' are consistent with the guidance notes of the Adviser. Each of those participants' DMS' set out procedures for responding to requests for information from other Registered Participants, as well as the requirements and procedures to ensure compliance with the requirements and time limits prescribed in clause 8.2.4. Additionally, the DMS' of two (2) of these Registered Participants stipulate that any request for information must be responded to within two (2) days and five (5) days, respectively, which is in accordance with clause 8.2.3(b)(3). The DMS of the remaining Registered Participant indicates that best endeavours will be taken to respond to information requests within five (5) days but that, ultimately, assessments of each request will be made on a case-by-case basis.

Two Registered Participants did not provide a copy of their DMS. They do not have company-specific DMS', but instead rely on the model DMS that can be accessed on the AER website.

### ***AER assessment***

Based on the information provided by six (6) of the participants, and the AER's assessment of that information against the requirements in the NER, the AER is satisfied that the participants reviewed comply with their obligations with respect to clause 8.2.3 of the NER.

The AER invites participants to provide feedback and comments regarding DMS, including experience with other participants' dispute management systems. This would enable the AER to assess further market participants' compliance with clause 8.2.3 of the NER and the effectiveness of these DMS' in managing disputes between parties.

### **3.1.6 Upcoming compliance reviews**

In the next quarter, the AER proposes to continue to review Network Service Provider compliance with clause 5.7.4. Additionally, the AER will continue its review of compliance with the metering requirements of Chapter 7 of the NER.

On 7 December 2006, the AEMC approved a Rule change to establish arrangements for resolving the performance standards for Generators that were connected, or in the

process of connecting, at the date the current performance standards regime came into force in their region of the NEM. The National Generators Forum (NGF) and NEMMCO, in conjunction with the AER and AEMC, jointly determined a transition process to register the actual capability of all incumbent Generators and to ensure all compliance programs were in place for those Generators by 30 June 2007. Now that the transition is complete, the AER will begin to audit Generators' performance standards and compliance programs required under Chapter 4 of the NER.

## **3.2 Jurisdictional derogations**

Chapter 9 of the NER preserves certain jurisdiction-specific arrangements. These are known as jurisdictional derogations and exempt participants from compliance with specified provisions in the NER.

A series of chapter 9 derogations provide exemptions for Smelter Traders, Power Traders and Nominated Generators from complying with the NER:

- to the extent that there is any inconsistency between the NER and a contractual requirement under the relevant agreement; and
- any other specified exemption the jurisdictional derogations.

Power Traders must give notice to the AER of any act or omission which partly or wholly constitutes non-compliance with the NER. In accordance with clauses 9.4.4, 9.12.3 and 9.34.6 of the NER, the relevant participants have notified the AER that there were no matters of non-compliance for the June quarter.

### ***AER assessment***

The AER is satisfied that there were no instances where the actions of a participant classified as a Smelter Trader, Power Trader or Nominated Generator materially affected the efficient operation of the market during the quarter.

## **3.3 Rebidding inquiries**

### **3.3.1 Rebidding provisions**

The rebidding provisions of Clause 3.8.22(c) of the NER require Scheduled Generators and Market Participants to provide:

- (1) all rebids to NEMMCO electronically unless otherwise approved by NEMMCO;*
- (2) to NEMMCO, at the same time as the rebid is made:*
  - (i) a brief, verifiable and specific reason for the rebid; and*

*(ii) the time at which the event(s) or other occurrence(s) adduced by the Scheduled Generator or Market Participant as the reason for the rebid occurred;*

Clause 3.8.22(c) of the NER requires a Scheduled Generator or market participant to provide information to the AER to substantiate and verify the reason for a rebid<sup>2</sup>.

During the April - June quarter, the AER examined 134 rebids across 14 participants where the participant failed to provide a timestamp as part of the rebid reason in accordance with clause 3.8.22(c)(2)(ii). In almost all cases, the number of omissions per participant was extremely low. The AER is, however, continuing to review the rebid reasons of two participants, identified previously with respect to this obligation.

## **4 Investigations - \$5000/MWh reports**

The AER is required to publish a report covering the circumstances in which the spot price exceeded \$5000/MWh, pursuant to clause 3.13.7 (d) of the Rules. That report should:

- describe significant factors contributing to the spot price exceeding \$5000/MWh, including withdrawal of generation capacity and network availability;
- assess whether rebidding pursuant to clause 3.8.22 contributed to the spot price exceeding \$5000/MWh;
- identify the marginal scheduled generating units; and
- identify all units with offers for the trading interval equal to or greater than \$5000/MWh and compare these dispatch offers to relevant dispatch offers in previous trading intervals.

### **4.1 Investigation into the events of 12 June to 28 June 2007**

June 2007 saw some of the highest spot prices in the history of the NEM. Prices averaged \$274/MWh in New South Wales, \$216/MWh in Queensland, \$157/MWh in Victoria and \$111/MWh in South Australia. By comparison prices in June 2006 ranged from \$26/MWh to \$42/MWh. Annual prices for the 2006-07 financial year in New South Wales and Victoria were \$67/MWh and \$61/MWh respectively.

Between 12 June and 28 June 2007 there were 42 events where the spot price exceeded \$5000/MWh, of which 17 occurred in New South Wales, 13 in the Snowy and 12 in Queensland. The spot price exceeded \$9000/MWh four times, each occurring in New South Wales, the highest price reaching \$9936.37/MWh at 6pm on 13 June. The AER

---

<sup>2</sup> A rebid is defined in chapter 10 of the NER as a variation to a bid or offer made in accordance with clause 3.8.22.



examined these incidents and published a \$5000/MWh report in July 2007 detailing the events.

## **4.2 Forecast demand and prices**

The demand for electricity across the NEM was within three per cent of the peak daily winter demand last year on each day in June that recorded \$5000/MWh prices except for Saturday 16 June. On six (6) occasions in New South Wales, demand exceeded the 2006 New South Wales daily winter peak and new demand records were set on 19 and 27 June. A new record winter demand for Queensland was set on 20 June.

Under-forecasting of demand occurred in most trading intervals where prices spiked above \$5000/MWh. High price events were not always anticipated in forecasts. Changes in generator and network availability and demand all contributed to these variations.

## **4.3 Offline and constrained plant**

Drought contributed to tight supply conditions with hydro-generating capacity in the Snowy, Tasmania and Victoria and the availability of water for cooling in some coal-fired generators being constrained. Additional generator outages exacerbated these tight supply conditions in June 2007. Up to 20 per cent of New South Wales plant and up to 22 per cent of Queensland plant was offline during the extreme price events.

The water-constrained Tarong and Swanbank plant was unavailable throughout June. However, other plant was offline at various times throughout June due to maintenance and plants problems.

Available reserves during the high priced periods in New South Wales were less than the size of the largest New South Wales generator on 13 June and less than the two largest generators on 12, 14, 15 and 16 June.

In addition, some online plant was operating at a reduced capacity during the extreme price events in June. Capacity reductions were generally greater in New South Wales than Queensland. Online plant capability was reduced by between five and eight percent of overall New South Wales capacity over the 10 days when there were \$5000/MWh price events. Wet coal and flooding near the Hunter Valley coalmines contributed to these capacity reductions.

## **4.4 Generator offers and rebids**

Macquarie Generation continued its bidding strategy of pricing significant amounts of capacity at high prices between 5 pm and 7.30 pm throughout May and June. On average, Macquarie Generation priced almost 800 MW (around 20 per cent) of its capacity at above \$5000/MWh, compared to around 300 MW at earlier periods in the day.

## **4.5 Assessment**

Tight supply conditions combined with record demand led to shortages of electricity at normal prices on many days through June. Actual demand for a number of the high priced periods was considerably higher than forecast only a few hours earlier. Generator outages, network outages and generator limitations together with drought constrained hydro-generating capacity and some coal-fired capacity led to an extremely tight demand-supply balance. Macquarie Generation exacerbated the tight supply-demand balance by pricing capacity into higher price bands during evening peak periods throughout June. No breaches of the NEL were identified.

A separate report into the pricing events in June is available on the AER website.

## Appendix A

### Summary of AER targeted provisions, investigations

Quarter	Rule provision	Description	Participants targeted	Outcome
June 2006	3.7A	TNSP - Market information on planned network outages	7	Review complete
	3.8.7A(k)	Market ancillary service offers	1	Review complete
	3.15.16	Late settlement payment by market participants – NEMMCO	1	Reporting arrangement established
	4.8.12	System restart plan and local black system procedures – NEMMCO	1	Review complete
	4.3.4	TNSP– General obligation to assist NEMMCO in its power system security obligations following the events of 22 March 2006	1	Review complete
	5.7.4	TNSP - Routine testing of protection equipment– following the events of 24 February 2006	1	Review complete
September 2006	3.8.7A(k)	Market ancillary services offers	3	Review complete
	4.9.9B	Ancillary service plant changes	3	Review complete
	3.15.16	Settlements payment by market participants	14	Review complete
	4.8.12	System restart plan and local black system procedures	6	Review complete
	5.2.1	Obligations of Registered Participants– following the events of 25 May 2006	1	Review complete
December 2006	3.8.7A(k)	Market ancillary services offers	3	Review complete
	4.9.9B	Ancillary service plant changes	3	Review complete
	5.7.4	Routine testing of equipment by NSPs	1	Ongoing
March 2007	3.15.16	Settlements payment by market participants	2	Review complete
	5.7.4	Routine testing of equipment by NSPs	1	Review complete
June 2007	3.6.3	Distribution loss factors – calculation and assignment of connection points	1	Review complete
	4.3.5	Market Customer obligations – provision of interruptible load	1	Review complete
	5.7.4	Routine testing of protection equipment	1	Review complete
	7.6.1	Responsibility for testing – metering installations	1	Review complete
	7.6.3	Audits of metering data	1	Review complete
	8.2.3	Dispute management systems of Registered Participants	6	Review complete

<b>Investigations</b>				
20 July 2006		\$5000 report – no further action		Review complete
11 January 2007		\$5000 report – no further action		Review complete
16 January 2007		\$5000 report – no further action		Review complete
16 January 2007		Investigation into power system incident 16 January 2007 (Victoria)		Ongoing
23 January 2007		\$5000 report – no further action		Review complete
24 January 2007		\$5000 report – no further action		Review complete
12-28 June 2007		\$5000 report – no further action		Review complete

## Appendix B

### Summary of rebidding inquiries under clauses 3.8.22 and 3.8.19

Rebidding inquiries	Company	Date of event	Outcome
September 2006	Macquarie Generation	19 July 2006	Review complete
	Macquarie Generation	20 July 2006	Review complete
	Callide Power Trading	20 July 2006	Review complete
	Callide Power Trading	24 July 2006	Review complete
	National Grid Australia	18 August 2006	Review complete
	Tarong Energy	21 June 2006	Review complete
	Tarong Energy	24 August 2006	Review complete
December 2006	Alinta	Various	Review complete
	Delta Electricity	Various	Review complete
	Enertrade	Various	Review complete
	Hydro Tasmania	Various	Review complete
	Macquarie Generation	Various	Review complete
	Braemar	Various	Review complete
	VicPower	Various	Review complete
March 2007	Ecogen	Various	Review complete
	Enertrade	24 January 2007	Review complete
	Eraring Energy	Various	Review complete
	Flinders Power	Various	Review complete
	International Power	Various	Review complete
	LYMMCO	28 January 2007	Review complete
	Macquarie Generation	Various	Review complete
	Tarong Energy	23 January 2007	Review complete
	TRUenergy	Various	Review complete