



CMM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP – COMBINED TWG MEETING NOTES

Thursday 1 September 2022 (2-4pm AEST)

Chair: Neil Gibbs (Online Power)

Attendees: Arista Kontos (ESB), Amanda Sinden (ESB), Anthea Harris (ESB), Ben Davis (ESB), Brian Spak (ECA), Bill Jackson (ElectraNet), Connie Liang (Epuron), Con Van Kemenade (UPC), Dan Mascarenhas (Alinta), David Heard (Finncorn), David Swift (ESB), Eli Pack (AEMO), Jonathan Myrtle (Hydro Tasmania), Jess Hunt (ESB), Matthew Dickie (RWE), Simon Corbel (Clean Energy Investment Group), Robert Pane (Intergen), Shevy Moss-Feiglin (AGL), Tom Gibson (Online Power), Tom Livingstone (ESB).

Time	Topic	Key points/action items
2:00	Welcome, objectives & agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anthea Harris opened the session and provided an overview of the session agenda.
2:05	Overview of working papers – Congestion Zones & Connection Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An overview of each of the papers sent to the TWG was provided to those in attendance.• Further discussion of the content to be captured in the next TWG session.
2:15	Treatment of pre-existing generators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The ESB provided an overview of the issue at hand – both investment timeframe models will involve grandfathering.• It was noted that it is likely that reform would confer an advantage on incumbent generators that would cause them to remain in the market long than they otherwise would.• Preliminary options were provided to support efficient retirement decisions.• A series of questions were presented to the TWG to support ESB thinking which were captured in MURAL.• The TWG members also raised several questions and noted:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The new party coming is would likely face the ‘full’ congestion. They may also increase congestion on everybody else. Do you reflect the full cost of congestion to all connections or just the new connecting party?○ Members were keen to hear more about the interactive mapping tool and the associated indicative hosting capacities how those capacities will be broken into zones, what they



		<p>represent and then how the traffic light system would overlay on those zones? and what those signals would then mean to the connecting participant?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was presumed that hydrogen production would be similar to ‘charging batteries’ assuming they are highly price sensitive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ESB noted that they are considering how storage is treated in both the investment and operational timeframe. Storage would likely include batteries, pumped hydro, hydrogen storage and generation. We would like to treat them efficiently whether connected at different connection points, or behind the meter. ○ Will the modelling being include as part of NERA scope?
2:45	Governance Arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESB provided a straw-person for discussion that covered off the roles and responsibilities of several actors. • The TWG were asked to support this thinking by allocating responsibility across several identified role. This was captured in the MURAL. • Additional points raised by the TWG included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted that this would apply to only the shared network (open access). ○ Raised a question if an existing generator (example solar farm) adds a wind farm but doesn’t change its network capacity – how will this type of scenario be treated? The generation profile change but it will likely impact the hosting capacity of the region. ○ What are the likely impacts on the IRP rule change is there are projects being delivered on different timelines? ○ Is there a role for CFD to play the same but behind the meter? ○ On the ISP and efficient level of consumption. Is this developed by AEMO or provided by the reliability panel? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The level of congestion is an output of the ISP. It is derived and created by this modelling.
3:00	Integration with Jurisdictional schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESB provided a summary of how the current proposed models would integrate with jurisdictional schemes. • Attention was paid to how certain models would co-exist with the emerging REZ schemes e.g. NSW, QLD.
3:30	Next steps	
3:30	Meeting close	