

MINUTES OF CQTG MEETING 6

**Held on Thursday 15 August 2024, 10:00am – 11:17am
Online meeting**

Members present: Sheila Matthews (Chair), Graeme Ancell, Matt Copland, Brent Duder-Findlay, Barbara Elliston, Brad Henderson, Stuart Johnston (10:18am – end), Stuart MacDonald, Mike Moeahu, Rob Orange, Jon Spiller.

Apologies: Gareth Williams.

In attendance: Phillip Beardmore, Nasser Usman Faarooqui, Nyuk-Min Vong (Vong), Rob Mitchell.

Introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees and summarised the purpose of this online meeting, which was to provide Common Quality Technical Group (CQTG) members with an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft *Part 8 common quality information issues and options* paper.
- 1.2 This related to Action Item 5.5 from the fifth Common Quality Technical Group (CQTG) meeting held on 10 June 2024.

Summary of the key discussion points

- 1.3 Nasser introduced the paper and requested feedback from the CQTG. The key points from the CQTG's discussion included:
 - (a) Option 1 suggests creating a new document that would be incorporated by reference into the Code. However, it might be more accurate to view this as a method of implementation rather than a standalone option.
 - (b) Clarification that the focus of this paper is on determining what information should be shared, with whom, and how it should be provided. The paper intends to address these issues at a high level without delving into technical details at this stage.
 - (c) Information may be needed for dynamic load modelling at the transmission level, noting that dynamic load modelling is difficult and case- / situation-specific.
 - (d) Emphasis on the importance of using consistent terminology throughout the paper. Including a glossary may be beneficial.

- (e) Recommendation to be clear in the paper about the flow of information between parties, which can be in both directions. This will have implications on distribution system operators, so it needs to be clarified upfront.
 - (f) The paper should expand on the relevance of information for protection coordination.
 - (g) Highlighted the need to carefully manage trade-offs between requiring modelling information and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) not wanting to provide models that they consider contain confidential intellectual property (IP). Grid owner requirements should be able to be met with encrypted models, but the system operator may need access to unencrypted models for post-event investigations. It would be useful to have discussions with OEMs sooner rather than later.
 - (h) Recommendation to consider a Code requirement for OEM models to be put in escrow.
 - (i) Suggested exploring how this process is managed in Australia, emphasising the importance of timely information delivery.
 - (j) The CQTG recommended clarifying when Transpower, as a grid owner, and distributors require specific information. It may be beneficial to stagger the provision of information as the connection process proceeds.
 - (k) Advised that the Network Connections Technical Group (NCTG) is doing some work regarding the connection process for loads. This work will include reviewing the information required by distributors. The NCTG is liaising with Transpower to try and create consistency with Transpower's information requirements, in its role of a grid owner.
- 1.4 Transpower agreed to provide the Authority with further detail on when it, as a grid owner, needs certain information (eg, pre-commissioning of assets connecting to the grid; post commissioning of assets connecting to the grid).
- 1.5 The Authority agreed to consider all feedback and update the paper accordingly.
- 1.6 The meeting ended at 11.17am.

Confirming the CQTG has approved these meeting minutes are a true and correct record.

Dated this 17th day of October 2024



Sheila Matthews

Chair