



CMM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

MEETING NOTE

Tuesday 3 February 2022 (2-4pm AEDT)

Chair: Neil Gibbs

Attendees: Anthony Rossiter (Powerlink), Marghanita Johnson (AAC), Marilynne Crestias (CEIG), Shevy Moss Feiglin (AGL), Con Van Kemenade (Enel Green Power), Rachele Williams (ARENA), Brian Spak (ECA) Dan Hamel (Ark Energy), Laura Walsh (Ausnet), Andrew Richards (EUAA), Robert Pane (Intergen), Matthew Dickie (RWE), Dev Tayal (Tesla), Manas Choudhury (Edify), Bill Jackson (Electranet), David Heard (ECA), Sarah-Jane Derby (Origin), David Calder (Alinta), Jess Hunt (ESB), James Hyatt (ESB), Tom Meares (ESB), Tom Walker (ESB), Suzanne Falvi (ESB), Kirsten Hall (ESB), Tom Livingstone (ESB), Arista Kontos (ESB), Tom Gibson (OnLine Power)

Apologies: David Havyatt (NICE), Gordon Leslie (Monash Uni)

Time	Topic	Key points/action items
2:00	Introductions	
2:20	Role of the technical working group	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is important to decide on scope early with the following being noted:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Broader consideration of cost sharing between consumers and generators is not in scope.○ Some models were not directly aligned with the intended outcomes of the CMM. Transmission investment is outside scope.○ Important to focus on achieving the least cost outcome for consumers, i.e. minimising the size of the pie.○ Objective is to accommodate jurisdictional differences and secure their support
2:35	How we will work together	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respectful, open-minded discussion where everyone should feel free to question things• Transparency regarding the perspective people bring to the table – acknowledge people have vested interests. Alongside this, look at the bigger picture, leave narrow interests aside, and focus on market benefits



		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A willingness to progress a solution to this issue (finally)
3:00	Overview of submissions received on alternative models	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ESB advised that a number of alternative models have been received – this is a welcome development• Interestingly, some models do not address Transmission Access Reform. It's not yet clear how these will be addressed in this process• ACTION – ESB asked about the criteria to assess these models. ESB to send around draft assessment criteria for TWG comment for discussion at next meeting.
3:15	Plan for how we will work with these options	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreed it is important to fully flesh out all of the models so that we can properly compare them. Public seminar to do this transparently through presentations on alternate models from the proponents (where possible).• Discussion on ability to undertake quantitative analysis on alternate models. Agreement that it would be complex to quantitatively assess, especially given that these alternative models are not detailed to the point where they are able to be modelled properly. Noted useful to have generic example for all alternate models to use to demonstrate difference in outcomes. (e.g. the idea of a small number of scenarios being used to qualitatively explore each of the models)
3:20	Open Q&A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The question 'are we clear on the problem?' was raised. The ESB response is that the CMM Objectives have been established and published. These help inform the evaluation criteria, which will be shared as a draft with the TWG for comment.• A few questions about when a call will be made on whether or not there is more than one model?• Raised that it would be good to hear the perspectives of storage providers, for whom congestion may be an opportunity.• Discussion on how the ESB will take forward models – noted that this is a work in progress
3:40	Immediate priorities and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ACTION – ESB to create a forward agenda of meetings and put time into members' diaries. This to include a meeting before the public seminar.
4:00	Thanks and Close	