

Table 1: Summary of Participant Feedback to POC Industry Test Strategy v0.2 from the ITWG 5th April Forum

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
1	AGL	Scope of Industry Testing – are there some off market transactions that should be included in testing – e.g., network billing?	It won't be part of formal industry testing, however, you can test this bilaterally if you choose to
2	AGL	Can you please clarify the difference between industry testing and market trials	Noted and updated in the Industry Test Strategy Document accordingly
3	Energy Australia	There needs to be a section in the Industry Test Strategy document for suspension and resumption i.e. when the pre-prod environment is down during testing	Noted: I have include a section around Suspension and Resumption under the defect management section 7
4	AGL	For B2B testing from June, please clarify the specific date for bi-lateral testing to commence	B2B is scheduled to commence in mid June timelines (updated into the Industry Test Strategy document). However, bi-lateral testing is outside the scope of this phase.
5	AGL	Dependencies – there is a dependency on having the R36 schema built / tested and installed in the AEMO environment prior to bi-lateral B2B testing	Schema R36 is a dependency for B2B and will be deployed into the pre-production environment in June. Timelines will be detailed in the Industry Test Plan (B2B).
6	AGL	Suggest you adjust in the industry test planning timeline for EN/MC to go to end April	Noted: Timelines updated
7	AGL	What is the approach / strategy for partnering of testing?	This will be discussed at the next ITWG forum, participants will be asked to assist in the development of the test pairing of test cases and partnering with the participants who will be engaged in the Market Trial.
8	AGL	Prioritisation of testing – can some criteria be defined here? E.g., based on volume and potential customer impact	Noted – Based on industry participant consensus it is deemed that both potential customer impact and volumes set the criteria for the prioritisation of industry testing. This will be included in the Phase 3 Market Trial Test Plan
9	AGL	Note that your production snapshot date is now in the past – this should have been communicated earlier!	The AEMO support hub communications unfortunately did not reach everyone. So there will be another refresh and this will be communicated (via email) in advance to both the ITWG and RWG working group once confirmation is received from AEMO technology Lead.
10	AGL	Entry criteria – full UAT will not be completed as an entry criteria for industry testing	Agree and as discussed in the ITWG forum 5 th April, there is a caveat to have at least the End to End testing completed internally as a flexible entry criteria and I have removed UAT from the equation.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
11	AGL	What is involved in B2B pre-testing / self-certification – when does this occur?	A draft version of the B2B accreditation guide articulates what is required for B2B self-certification.
12	AGL	What happens if exit criteria is not met given we have a fixed go-live date of 1-December?	This will be up for discussion between ITWG and the PoC Readiness group. Just to clarify and as an example, if there is a severity two defect and there is a work around going into production then that will be discussed in the escalation forum process the first been Readiness forum if unresolved POC Program Consultative Forum.
13	AGL	Section 9.2 mentions B2B testing as functionality becomes available. Is there a planned approach for this? (i.e., what functions when?)	See draft Phase 2 Industry Test Plan
14	AGL	9.3 Phase 3 doesn't seem to match to the industry testing timeline picture in section 3	Diagram and timeline have been updated
15	AGL	What happens in the period between test phases? Will data be reset? (we are not expecting a refresh)	There will be a data refresh prior to the commencement of Market Trial testing and not during the test execution
16	AGL	How will volume or stress testing be catered for?	AEMO will carry out Stress and Volume testing internally
17	AGL	Confirmation of the system refresh date prior to industry testing commence on mid – August so that participants can plan their own system refresh accordingly.	AEMO will confirm and communicate to all participants any data refresh from production into pre-production prior to mid-August.
18	AGL	Confirmation on HP QC SaaS readiness	AEMO has purchased the QC SaaS licences and they will be available prior to the commencement of phase 1 test execution
19	AGL	Confirmation on dates when Bi-Lateral testing can be commenced	This can be done at your own time outside of Industry testing as it is not in scope. AGL might like to partner up with another of your currently pairing participants.
20	People energy	Does existing participants need to do registration	Testing registration – registering intention to participate in industry testing – requirements will be detailed in the Test Plans. Participants will require a valid participant ID to access AEMO's pre-productions system so they may need to under go Registration and/or Accreditation processes.
21	People energy	For testing do we need to nominate MC and ENM	This will depend on the test scenario.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
22	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Point No. 6: Will the test data be defined by AEMO. Is there an agreed strategy to ensure all Participants are aligned to the MSATS Pre-Production data? When will the data strategy be released?	AEMO communications will go out to all participants prior to any data refresh so as to align to the MSATS pre-production data and with production environment data. This will be documented in the Industry Test Strategy under environments and will allow ample time for participants to also perform their own internal data refresh.
23	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Point No. 8 Participants may not all be creating the Test Case in HP QC SaaS tool. Each participant may be executing the Test cases from their own Testing tool and a copy of the test cases can be provided to AEMO for uploading to AEMO's instance of HP QC. AEMO will need to provide a test case pro-forma that can be used by all participants	All organisations will receive one free HP QC SaaS licence, the folder structure will be created for each individual participant and this will allow each participant to internally manage their own daily execution activities. Also, the test workbook will be used as the agreed basis for test case and test step development and will be uploaded into QC by AEMO.
24	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Assumption 8 to be updated to show that AEMO will upload the tests into HP QC SaaS via their standard template (see line 7)	Noted: AEMO will upload the test case from the workbook in HP QC SaaS. Agreed
25	Jemena/UE/AusNet	If a data alignment across participant application is required, AEMO must co-ordinate a process by which the data validation in participant's applications. It may be better to define a excel pro-forma to provide the test data	Data requirements will be defined as part of the scenario definition. Participants initiating test scenarios will be asked to identify the data required and update it in HP SaaS QC. Participants who can not align their data refreshes with AEMO's will need to align their data with their testing partners.
26	Jemena/UE/AusNet	The date AEMO provided for each participant to take a refresh is 30 March, 2017. There will be variances in the ability of each participant to meet this date due to insufficient lead time provided to take the cut (i.e.: date provided was when this document came out).	AEMO will communicate to all participants the data cut refresh from production at least a couple of weeks prior to provide time for participants to cut their internal production data at the same time and same date for alignment if possible. This is prior to phase one of Industry Testing.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
27	Jemena/UE/AusNet	<p>It will not be feasible for ensuring the test environment build to be carried out based on a specified date. Some DBs have already refreshed their Pre-Production environment based on an Internal Data Refresh schedule.</p> <p>A more pragmatic solution must be used to align data between applications of participants.</p>	The data refresh of the pre-production environment will be based on the communications with participants it is therefore, envisaged that there will be two production data cuts one in May and another prior to Market Trial.
28	Jemena/UE/AusNet	The Schema version R35 and R36 have been used in the document. Please clarify the correct version with the relevant Procedure.	The R35 is the updated B2M schema however, R36 is the new B2B schema.
29	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Are there multiple pre-production environments? Please confirm as per this reference in the document.	There is only ONE pre-prod environment and this has been communicated under the environment section 6 in the Industry Test Strategy.
30	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Point 17 - Test Summary Report. Is this a walkthrough of the TSR template to be used for market testing?	The test summary report will be developed as part of the test planning process. AEMO will share a draft format with the ITWG for their feedback.
31	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Non Functional testing was removed from the scope. Will the AEMO technical team provide confidence to the market participants that the environment will perform at a reasonable level based on the expected increase in messages that will be sent through service order processing?	AEMO will be performing their internal security, performance stress and volume testing. This statement has been re-instated in the Industry Test Strategy.
32	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Test Script development will be done by the participants in their own version of QC. An extract from this will be provided to AEMO for maintaining them centrally on provision of a standard template (see line 7)	The section under 5.1.1 Test Management repository tool, all participants will have a dedicated licence to HP QC the agreed scenarios and test cases/steps will be uploaded by AEMO. All participants will be able to execute using the set of tests assigned within the folder structure based on the ITWG agreed test calendar.
33	Jemena/UE/AusNet	<p>Point No: 4</p> <p>Is this a test report from the AEMO HPQC? It will be necessary to run central reporting only as >50 daily reports will be unmanageable.</p>	AEMO will generate the test daily report and circulate to testing participants.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
34	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Why is a Test Cycle completion report required? At the end of a phase, we will produce a TSR with the result from all the cycles covered in the phase.	Most cycles are either 2 or 3 weeks (period blocks) and a good best practice to assess at the end of each cycle as to the progress of testing.
35	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Last sentence on Page 28: It may not be practical to ensure the same cut of production data in participant applications. Also, conflict in the document: States prod cut for AEMO already taken, but on the 30th March - no participants advised to cut on the same date - see above.	AEMO recommend that participants align their data refreshes to make data alignment easier however it may not always be possible.
36	Jemena/UE/AusNet	There is mention in here that the data cut of the participants will be same as AEMO's pre-prod environment. This needs to be reword to say 'where possible' the environments will be in alignment.	Agree – has been reworded
37	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Status meetings to be attended by all testers. The format and manner in which this will be conducted needs to be clearly thought out as in excess of 100 people will not be workable.	Agree – this will be a topic for further discussion during test planning and we may need to adjust as testing progresses.
38	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Row No: 5 New Script preparation must not be linked to closure of defects and retests. Nor execution - testing is not necessarily suspended when a defect is found.	Agree and I have reworded accordingly, this is based on root cause analysis when a test script or step fails during test execution.
39	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Row 2 (in this page): Status meeting attendance must be only for affected participants.	Agree defect triage must be managed with the affected participants involved as this will be communicated to all participants anyway through the daily test reports.
40	Jemena/UE/AusNet	First sentence (Note) What date does this refer to?	I have reworded the first sentence completely and removed the word note.
41	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Please include that all releases must be applied after hours - we cannot lose daytime testing time especially if a post deploy problem occurs.	Will target out of hour releases where outages are required – however it will be dependent on a case by cases. Urgent fixes (blocking test execution) may occur during business hours
42	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Clarify if R35 is in reference CATS procedure.	R35 is a reference to the B2M schema
43	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Section 1.2 This should be modified to show CATS R35 & B2B R36	There is no section 1.2

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
44	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Too lower level of details related to technical documentation. Please remove and specify in the test plan	Agree
45	Jemena/UE/AusNet	The heading of "INDUSTRY TEST EXECUTION APPROACH" is not appropriate for this section. The section describes Test Management activities	Noted,
46	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Please remove Participants internal testing completed, including both End to End and UAT test results reviewed.	In the entry criteria I have removed the UAT as it is quite possible that this testing phase will be carried out in parallel to End to End test execution by many participants.
47	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Entry criteria Point 1: The data cut alignment between participant applications has not been agreed. This criterion should refer to a strategy to manage the data synchronisation between applications.	Where possible AEMO will have support for managing data synchronisation between applications for Market Trial testing
48	Jemena/UE/AusNet	11th bullet point: Please provide a copy of the Entry Criteria Checklist	This will be included as part of the Test Plans
49	Jemena/UE/AusNet	4th bullet point: Where is the "Acceptance Criteria" defined?	Removed as it was a repeat of the above exit criteria.
50	Jemena/UE/AusNet	5th and 6th bullet point: What is the format for Final report?	The format for the Test Summary Report will be shared in a draft form with the ITWG for review and feedback.
51	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Please remove GO LIVE recommendation signed-off. NOTE that Industry testing provides input into the Industry Go/No Go decision. It is recommended to separate Exit criteria based on testing partnerships. Also in general all test execution reporting must be done based on testing partnerships,	Agree - GO LIVE recommendation has been removed. Agree test pairing is critical to market trial testing.
52	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Who will link the tests to the requirements in HP QC SaaS? What requirements documentation to link to, will be provided in HPQC? How will this be agreed and signed off?	Requirements will not be linked in HP SaaS QC.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
53	Jemena/UE/AusNet	5th bullet point: Real time update into AEMO HP QC is not practical.	All participants will have access to the QC for Power of Choice and agree that real time may be difficult I am therefore, rewording to as soon as you can. We will ask participants to update prior to status meetings.
54	Jemena/UE/AusNet	6th bullet point: What is "functional area". Has a list of allowed functional areas been defined for testing categorisation?	I have removed and reworded. If functional areas are required this can be included in the Market Trial Test Plan.
55	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Is the defect triage different to the stand-up mentioned in section 6.3?	The defect triage will occur in the daily status meetings (or stand up meeting)
56	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Statuses of "Rejected" and "Deferred" should be removed. If there is a dispute on the validity of the defect, it must be discussed and closed. Neither Rejected nor deferred are valid statuses. Use defect sub statuses to close defects that are duplicates, user error, data, environment, etc.	If there is a defect raised it can be rejected during the triage based on incorrect data alignment or any other root cause analysis. The deferred means it still is a defect however, not part of the current test cycle or waiting on a set of test cases to be executed prior to the defect been fixed.
57	Jemena/UE/AusNet	The defect management process need to provide more clarity on Who raises the defects? Who assigns the defects the participant that needs to fix the defect? What is the process to mark the defects as "Test Ready" if multiple parties are involved in the defect resolution? Will there need to be more than one defect raise if the issue is with two (or three) participants? What happens if there is a dispute on a defect? What are the SLAs on defect resolution?	Defect management section updated
60	Jemena/UE/AusNet	It is better to maintain just one classification (either Severity or Priority) to manage the defects in AEMO HPQC. The individual participants may have different severity/priority for the defects. This could lead to confusion. Participants may decide to use their internal business severity and prioritisation to manage defects based their organisational requirements.	Industry Standards and Best Practice has both business priority and system severity.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
61	Jemena/UE/AusNet	<p>Appendix A Defect Classification</p> <p>We would recommend using only defect severities. It will be over complicated to use severities and priorities for Industry testing. How will the Severity be determined? What if different participants believe Severity is different?</p>	In line with Test best practice and standards defect severity is relating to system impact whereas, priority is relating to the business impact. Therefore, both priority and severity classification statuses will stay in line with consensus and industry best practices.
62	ActewAGL Distribution	Section 2.2 clarification on the pre-prod environment availability for 3 April. Is this the same MSATS environment that will be available for industry testing in August?	<p>Please refer to the MSATS release schedule for details on the r35 B2M schema release for April (link below). There will be a pre-production MSAT release for the r36 B2B schema around August - details are expected to be released in late March.</p> <p>https://www.aemo.com.au/-/media/Files/Electricity/NEM/IT-Systems-and-Change/2016/MSATS-4688-Release-Schedule--December-2017.zip</p>
63	Aurora Energy	#1: Objective(s) of testing. There was concern raised when it was suggested there may not be a separate Test Plan for the B2B Connectivity / functionality testing (hope I have that right) and it lead me to thinking about the overall objective of testing vs the objectives of the test phases which I'm suggesting should be tied together in the overarching POC Test Strategy.	There will be a separate Test Plan for B2B and Market Trial.
64	Aurora Energy	The AEMO PoC Industry Test Strategy section 4.1 details 'Industry testing objectives' and the Industry Test Plans (6.1) confirms test phase objectives will be documented in the Industry Test Plans.	The Test Strategy details the overarching broader objections and the test plans it more focused on the test execution objectives.
65	Endeavour Energy	May a participant utilise the Pre-Production Environment for individual business testing during the formal test cycles?	Yes you can, however, we will need to ensure that NMI ranges identified for formal testing cycles are not compromised.
66	Endeavour Energy	Will the Pre-Production Environment be available to participants for testing between test cycles, e.g. between the 3 cycles of Industry Testing?	The period between cycles is primarily for deploying and re-testing software updates so the pre-production environment may not always be available.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
67	Endeavour Energy	Are participants only allowed to test as per the POC ITWG test plan or may they test B2B and B2M functionality independently or with other B2B participants?	Participants may test independently or with other B2B participants
68	Endeavour Energy	In regard to Data Baselines, larger companies may have many back-end systems that must be snapshotted from production and restored to the test environment at the times specified by the test plan in order to complete back-end end to end testing during the cycles. Is it the plan to always refresh to the same baseline, i.e. everyone snapshots as of 1/7/2017 00:00:00hrs and each refresh restores this baseline, or alternatively, will each refresh be against a new baseline date? Can this area of the strategy be expanded upon?	There will be two data refreshes and this will use two different snapshots – the details will be documented in the Test Plans and circulated via email to the ITWG, RWG and through the business as usual processes through AEMO's support hub,
69	Endeavour Energy	There is no milestone for Phase 2 execution	Updated
70	Endeavour Energy	Advise when the dates will be firmed up where they are indicated as 'mid Aug', 'mid - November' etc,	The commencement of Market Trial is scheduled for mid-August 21 st is the official locked in date. As for the end date for Market Trial testing it will most likely be the first week of November. These will be firmed up in the Test Plans
71	Endeavour Energy	It's not clear when the testing for Pack 3 will be conducted. Suggest adding relevant milestones for Pack 3	The milestones for phase 3 are documented section 3.3 Milestones for the Industry Test Strategy.
72	Endeavour Energy	Is the test calendar referred to in this section different to the milestone date listed in Table 1?	Yes there will be a separate Test Calendar as part of the Test Planning activities in the Workbook managed by the AEMO internal testing team.
73	Endeavour Energy	Where is the B2B LVI in this diagram?	B2B is the phase 2 from June through to beginning of August (subject to data refresh in the pre-production environment prior to Market Trial testing. This is displayed in the diagram.
74	Endeavour Energy	Do we need to obtain new participant ID's for Pre-Production - see dot point 3.	If you are taking on a new role yes you will need to obtain a new participant ID. All existing participants will already have participant ID in the pre-production environment.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
75	Endeavour Energy	What does dot point 4 mean? Please clarify this statement.	This has been reworded for clarity.
76	Endeavour Energy	Include meter churn in the section titled Industry operational capability verification and validation	The scope section has been re-written. The detailed scope will be in the Market Trial Test Plan.
77	Energy Australia	Section 2.3.5 Added Performance, Volume and Security Testing to out of scope.	AEMO will conduct non-functional testing which will include performance, stress and volume and security testing.
78	Energy Australia	Key Milestone section Can we have actual dates in this section rather than term such as “Mid-April” and “End of June” Can you include key dates for Environment Refresh and any Environment Planned Outages Include the Industry Test Summary Report as a milestone with a date Figure 2. Overview diagram. Phase 3 is shown with 2 parts? Shouldn't this just be called "Phase 3: Market Trials Execution"	AEMO must align to the development activity dates and they are fluid so closer to the time we can confirm actual dates. This will be communicated during the ITWG forum meeting and via email to the POC ITWG. AEMO can confirm the key date and outage period for the first phase. However, for market trial we will know closer to the date as to when an outage will occur. Agree and have included the Test Summary Report as a milestone. The overview diagram has been updated and is all part of Market Trial Execution even though is shown in two parts as many participants will be testing for the first time the EN/MC and B2B in Market Trial and might want to testing in the first cycle connectivity, schema validations, transactional data testing.
79	Energy Australia	Test Entry and Exit Criteria Section needs to also reference Phase 3 Industry Market Trials Removed the following line in the Entry Criteria “, including both End to End and UAT test results reviewed.”	Agree I have updated the section 7.1.1 Entry Criteria and 7.1.2 Exit Criteria to to remove the UAT from the entry criteria as most likely many participants will be running this in parallel.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
80	Energy Australia	Under section 7.2.1 Test Status - Not Started” in the Test Status section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Started – Test will commence but may have a predecessor
81	Energy Australia	Daily Process section Times need to be updated according to suggestion made in the meeting. Morning review 10 -10.30 ? Afternoon review 3.30 – 4? AEST	The times of meetings will be different in the different phases and hence will be detailed in the test plans.
82	Energy Australia	Defect Triage section Need to mention what time will defect triage occur. Is in it the morning or afternoon meeting? Or is it a third meeting?	The times of meetings will be different in the different phases and hence will be detailed in the test plans
83	Energy Australia	Inclusion Scope Removed “Transition and cutover process testing supporting the preproduction readiness activities and tasks”	Agree and has been removed from the scope inclusions section
84	Energy Australia	Test Phase Overview section Mention if test cycles will be used in Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 2 wording to mention “...targeted testing of B2B functionality”	I have reworded this sub section accordingly.
85	Energy Australia	Definition of industry testing” section. Seeing that you have this section, you should also mention the definition of ‘Industry Market Trial testing’. Else try and combined the two.	Agree I have reworded and elaborated on the Industry Market Trial Phase 3.
86	Energy Australia	Risks & Issues section moved up after Dependencies section. Also can we have a table with the current testing risks and issues from the Program Register?	We have included a link to the program register
87	Energy Australia	Scope and Objectives sections were repeated with different information in both. Sections combined and moved up the document.	There is a defined broad scope and objective for the Industry and Market Trial Test Strategy and then a lower level for the testing phases.



















ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
88	Energy Australia	Minor changes to heading titles (i.e. Sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3). The word Industry Strategy and Industry Testing was over used in titles.	Noted.
89	Energy Australia	Where there is only one section under a Heading 2 then a Heading 3 is not required (egg. Section 2.8.1)	Noted.

Table 2: Summary of Participant Feedback to POC Industry Test Plan (EN/MC) v0.3

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
1.	Active Stream	Is all market/industry testing to be conducted with counterparts from other organisations, or is there a test harness (responder?) that can be used? If so what processes will the responder support?	There is no MSATS B2M responder, so B2M industry testing will involve counter parties. For parts of the B2B testing, participants will be able to use the B2B responder.
2.	AGL	Do we have any objectives in terms of test coverage? I.e., we would like to test every transaction at least once. Ideally we would also like to test “High priority” transactions with all parties. High priority may be defined as transactions covering 80% of our transaction volume.	This is an industry objective so you comment as AGL wanting to test High priority transactions with all related participants which you cleared stated as transactions covering 80% of our transaction volume can suffice for the overall objective if there are no objections.
3.	AGL	If it is possible to provide End to end business process as test scenario rather than transaction oriented test scenarios.	EN/MC scenarios are functional, Market Trial will include business process end to end scenarios.
4.	ActewAGL Distribution	We ensure that there is a field for participant / testing counterparties so this can be used as a search criteria or sorting field through industry testing.	This will be included in the workbook and HP SaaS will have this functionality.
5.	Jemena/UE/AusNet	Customer Details Notification needs to be removed since expansion of life support information has been removed from the latest B2B.	Whilst there is minimal changes to CDN per say, we have added email address field and therefore, we still have to test this function.
6.	Agility	In section 5.5 of the test plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can we have some guidance on when the industry cycles are scheduled to take place? (I.e. cycle 1,2 & 3) each of 3 weeks duration. 	Updated

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
		This is not made clear in the Test plan and Strategy – are these 3 cycles all expected to be executed between now and the end of June?	
7.	Agility	<p>Section 3.2</p> <p>And related to this – is development on the changes for all the following functionality expected to be ready for industry testing in May and June?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change requests (CR) validations and configuration – changes to mandatory/optional fields, objection codes, initiating parties, notified parties, objecting parties. - Changes to meter register status codes, NMI status codes, read type codes. - Changes to reports (C1 and C7 reports). <input type="checkbox"/> Embedded Network (EN) and NMI ranges screen changes - axeML schema changes 	AEMO can confirm that the following changes are implemented in the EN/MC modules and workbook contains the test scenarios.
8.	Aurora Energy	The Industry Test Plans to confirm test phase objectives.	This will be documented at a phase level in the test plan document
9.	Aurora Energy	<p>In the context of the EN/MC Test Plan (and associated execution) + the B2B Test Plan (and associated execution) = A</p> <p>Objective of ‘A’ above is to de-risk ‘B’.</p> <p>Objective of A therefore is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - De-risk B by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Having appropriate coverage of functionality o Proving a number of participants have connectivity o Finding defects that would slow down or halt B <p>Objective A can be completed by a subset of NEM participants.</p> <p>Objective of B is prove the majority of NEM participants are ready / market compliant / can interact with AEMO eHub (B2M) and each other (B2B)</p>	This will be clarified in the Test plan for each phase of testing as full functionality for B2B will be ready for market trial. Phase one is EN.MC B2M and phase 2 is more on schema validation and connectivity testing.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
		<p>Objective B can only be successfully achieved if the majority of NEM participants participate in the testing.</p> <p>Maybe stating the obvious but it may help to better clarify what we are trying to achieve out of each level of testing?</p>	
10.	Aurora Energy	#2 – leading on from #1 is there somewhere where we can look or be informed of registration against the 3 test phases above?	AEMO has a consolidated registration excel spreadsheet list that details all participants' registration for each phase. This is currently work in progress as registration are been emailed through.
11.	Aurora Energy	<p>#3 – setup of folder structure in HP SaaS QC. The approach may be worked through in more detail in subsequent test planning meetings within POC ITWG.</p> <p>However I'd like to suggest that rather than organising the workbook structure (bearing in mind I haven't used HP QC since 2011) just by NEM participant, that it is grouped by jurisdiction and by groups that will conduct E2E together (that have registered – i.e. not every combination). Something like this as an example:</p>	AEMO will provide the ITWG working group a first cut of the QC folder structure and as a group we can discuss any alternation that would make sense and workable for industry testing. This is a good starting point to the QC SaaS folder structure.

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
		 PoC  1 - MC_EN  2 - B2B  NSW  QLD  SA  TAS  TN - AE - Metering Dynamics  TN - ERM - Metering Dynamics  VIC  3 - Market Trial  NSW  QLD  SA  TAS  TN - AE - Metering Dynamics  TN - ERM - Metering Dynamics  VIC	
12.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would be advantageous to provide a mapping between the CATS&WIGS tab and the scenario options by including a Reference on the CATS & WIGS page and the associated reference on the Scenario options page. - Some of the scenarios include OBJ and COM steps do not include the FRMP directly. Although the FRMP is not included in the affected parties, notifications will be sent to the FRMP as per the notification rules. 	<p>Agree: Mapping included in the workbook Noted.</p> <p>All tests are aligned with the browser. If participants wish to repeat the scenarios for the xml base they can do so, This point (browser/xml) is noted for development of the Market Trial workbook.</p>

ITEM	RESPONDENT	PARTICIPANT COMMENT	AEMO RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the tests are aligned to the MSATS browser. Perhaps an indication which are browser based and which are xml based. 	