



# TAR TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

## MEETING NOTES

*Thursday 29 June 2023 (2pm – 4pm AEST)*

**Chair:** Neil Gibbs (Online Power)

**Attendees:** Adeel Mahmood; Amanda Sinden; Angus Phillips; Ben Skinner; Bill Jackson; Cameron Potter; Charbel Antoun; Charbel Lahoud; Christina Green; Claire Rozyn; Con Van Kemenade; Dan Mascarenhas; Dave Smith; David Osmond; David Swift; Declan Kelly; Eli Pack; Geoff Burges; Greg Williams; Huan Duong; Ian Christmas; Jack San; James Kocenda; Joel Gilmore; Jonathan Upson; Kate Degen; Luke Middleton; Manas Choudhury; Marilynne Crestias; Martin Hemphill; Matthew Christian; Matthew Dickie; Miyuru Ediriweera; Morgan Rossiter; Neil Gibbs; Owen Pascoe; Panos Priftakis; Paul Austin; Peter Brook; Rahul Victor; Ramon Sa; Robert Pane; Ronny Schnapp; Stephen Wallace; Stuart Norgrove; Teaghan Wilson; Tom Gibson; Tom Livingstone; Tom Meares; Tom Walker; Verity Watson; Victoria Mollard.

Time	Topic	Key points/action items
2:00	Welcome, objectives & agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Neil opened the session and welcomed the group.</li><li>• Neil also welcomed new joiners from the Enhanced Information Working Group who were invited to this session to hear about the progress on the rule change.</li><li>• Neil undertook an Acknowledgement of Country.</li><li>• Neil covered the key agenda items and passed to the ESB project team for the first agenda item.</li></ul>
2:05	Summary of Submissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ESB project team introduced an overview of the submissions received. In total there were 28 submissions. Outlined that the intent of this agenda item was to collate and share general themes and key points of feedback.</li><li>• The submissions were broadly supportive of the case for change. There was support or acceptance for the CRM but there were differing views for priority access.</li><li>• TAR TWG members asked:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ How did stakeholders that preferred first-come, first-served method justify their choice?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ ESB noted this was based on the level of complexity – an auction process created</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>



		<p>additional challenges for coordination and potentially delays for connections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What's the thinking on NEO changes? Was there any commentary from stakeholders on emissions objectives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ESB project team noted that it mostly featured in terms of the grandfathering arrangements i.e. Out of 11 submissions commenting on the treatment of legacy generators, c.1/3 recommended excluding thermal generators from the highest priority.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>2:30</b></p>	<p>Visualisation of the prototype for TAR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The ESB project team provided a demonstration of the visualisation of the seven-node two region one FCAS model that has been used to simulate scenarios for priority access and the CRM. Two prototype models have been developed.</li> <li>● TWG members asked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has your work on these models given you a reasonable degree of confidence that they can be scaled successfully to the NEM level and implemented by AEMO? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ESB noted the approach to take incremental steps towards proving the scalability of the prototype. Test cases for the full NEM CRM prototype were previously demonstrated to TWG members on 23 May 2023. Priority access has also been applied in the test cases in the full NEM prototype but these have not yet been published.</li> <li>▪ This stepped approach is designed to build confidence levels. There is an ongoing focused piece of work to test this further i.e. to test whether the reform objectives can be achieved via implementation of priority access into AEMO's systems.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ What insights did you gain from the dashboard in terms of the operation of the CRM, that you weren't previously aware of? Are there any interesting tests/cases that we should examine when looking at it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ESB noted insights regarding the implementation of priority access levels via separated bid price floors and their impact on counter-price flows etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Note that key insights are shared in the Power BI visualisation dashboard. Two test cases were previously shared in the consultation paper.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ What rationale was used for CRM bidding (especially for those units to charge)?           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The ESB responded that the assumed bidding strategy for the CRM was for plant to bid the opportunity cost. In the case of batteries – there would be a value of charge and discharge and separate bids/offers are entered for these.</li> <li>▪ CRM adjustments are traded at the CRM price, so the dispatch outcomes for a battery will depend on its location and CRM price.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ In reference to implementation, from work done on the CRM, is it implementable?           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ESB noted that the CRM has been tested in the NEMDE prototype and showed viability. But there is more extensive testing required to confirm its implementation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>3:00</b></p>	<p>Update on Enhanced Information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ESB project team provided:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A short update on the Board's final decision on enhanced locational information (ELI).</li> <li>○ A short overview of the feedback received and the input data likely to be used to produce the first ELI report.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• TWG members noted that:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One of the concerns is there have been developers working on a project, working towards financial close and then AEMO reports that states a high-level curtailment. It is possible to have the inclusion of a disclaimer that helps project proponents through the financial inputs.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In some instances, it would be detrimental as it does not consider bidding strategies for different projects. It will hold true for a financial model.</li> <li>▪ It could be noted as an early-stage tool vs. detailed analysis undertaken by a project proponent.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Timing with the Transmission Annual Planning Reports (TAPRs) is important – commenting on value in aligning in how the TAPRs represent the differences.</li> <li>○ It seems that the proposed update is to just repackage the same information as today, in which case developers may</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



		<p>land on the same result as what we have today rather than solving for inefficient locational signals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is there a possibility to provide indicative constraint equations for new transmission and interconnectors prior to energisation to inform the feasibility analysis of developers earlier? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are differences in the information provided in RIT-T. Relatively minor changes in the network like new generators connecting would render any indicative constraints incorrect.</li> <li>▪ It would duplicate substantial amounts of work while producing inaccurate results. Propose instead to increase consistency in RIT-T on calculating this information to make it more viable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The ESB project team noted the next steps were to publish the update paper and share the link with the Enhanced Information Working Group.</li> <li>○ <i>Note link for reference: <a href="https://www.datocms-assets.com/32572/1688514855-enhanced-locational-information-final-decision-paper.pdf">https://www.datocms-assets.com/32572/1688514855-enhanced-locational-information-final-decision-paper.pdf</a></i></li> </ul>
<b>3:30</b>	Process going forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The ESB project team provided an overview of the next steps. It is likely the TAR TWG forum will be continued on a monthly basis. Coordination of the TWG will be led by the AEMC under the Energy Advisory Panel.</li> <li>● The ESB thanked members for inputs and insights. Appreciate the time provided by members.</li> </ul>
<b>4:00</b>	Meeting Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The ESB project team provided thanks for the participation within this forum and acknowledged key contributions.</li> </ul>