CMM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday 13 October 2022 (2-4pm AEST)

| Item | Торіс |
|------|---|
| 1 | Welcome, objectives and agenda |
| 2 | Approach to Directions Paper – working paper for discussion |
| 3 | Mural exercise - Calibrating the scheme to balance the interests of new entrants and incumbents. |
| | Previous TWG discussions indicated that a significant portion of the group supported grandfathering, however, when we proposed a model that included grandfathering, it received little support. Would the following measures change WG members perspectives? |
| | Queue positions are limited in duration – eg 10 years. |
| | 1. Incumbents are allocated queue positions for less than their full capacity |
| | 2. Incumbents do not receive free queue positions, instead they must purchase |
| | 3. Queue positions expire in accordance with the generators notice of closure |
| | The amount of congestion faced by priority queue position holders gradually increases over time, in line with the efficient level of congestion in the power system. |
| 4 | Mural exercise – Options to reduce congestion impact of projects |
| | Should the ESB introduce measures to recognise generator-funded shared transmission within the access regime? |
| | 2. Should the ESB introduce measures to recognise generator-funded storage within the access regime? |
| | 3. Should generators have the option to accept reduced access in return for a reduced congestion fee? |

| 5 | Mural exercise – Interactions with the connections process |
|---|--|
| | What criteria should a connection applicant be required to meet in order to qualify to receive an offer for a connection fee/queue position? |
| | 2. How should we manage multiple simultaneous connections? |
| | 3. Should use it or lose it provisions apply? How long should the right apply for before it expires? |
| 6 | Mural exercise – treatment of out-of-merit generators and scheduled load |
| | Previous TWG sessions have analysed the potential wealth transfers arising in the energy market as a result of the introduction of the CRM, which would not be incentivised in today's market. We have consolidated the design choices to respond to this issue. We encourage the TWG to reflect on these options and provide feedback on: |
| | 1. Should similar solutions apply for both generation and scheduled load? |
| | 2. What are the pros/cons of the design choices? |
| | 3. What are the most preferable standalone or combination options to address this issue? |
| 7 | Next steps |