



Minutes

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Meeting Title: | Evolution of the Pilbara Networks Rules Working Group (Workstream 2 - HTR) |
| Date: | 9 May 2024 |
| Time: | 9:30 AM – 11:30 AM |
| Location: | Online, via TEAMS |

| Attendees | Company | Comment |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Dora Guzeleva | Chair, Energy Policy WA | |
| Nik Walker | APA | Proxy for Anthony Ravi |
| Njabulo Mlilo | BHP | |
| Rebecca White | BHP | |
| Lekshmi Jaya Mohan | BP | |
| Anthony Guevarra | CITIC Pacific Mining | |
| Melinda Anderson | Economic Regulation Authority | |
| David Stephens | Horizon Power | |
| Gemma Hamilton | ISOC | |
| Timothy Edwards | Metro Power Company | |
| Noel Michelson | Rio Tinto | |
| Scott Hiscock | Woodside | |
| Shervin Fani | Woodside | |
| Rudi Strobel | Yindjibarndi Energy Corporation | |
| Tamara Brooker | Yindjibarndi Energy Corporation | |
| Brad Smart | Energy Policy WA | |
| Stephanie Hemsley | Energy Policy WA | |
| Thomas Marcinkowski | Energy Policy WA | |
| Tom Coates | Energy Policy WA | |
| Ajith Sreenivasan | RBP | |
| Eija Samson | RBP | |
| James Seidelin | RBP | |
| Tim Robinson | RBP | |

| Item | Subject | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| 1 | <p>Welcome</p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting with an Acknowledgement of Country.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>Meeting Apologies and Attendance</p> <p>The Chair noted the attendance as listed above.</p> | |
| 3 | <p>Competition Law Statement and Agenda</p> <p>The Chair noted the Competition Law Statement, and reminded members of their obligations and encouraged them to bring any Competition Law issues to her attention as they may arise.</p> <p>The Chair provided an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives.</p> | |
| 4 | <p>Workshop on the ‘HTR Long List’</p> <p>The Chair introduced this Item with reference to the ‘Overview’ worksheet in the meeting workbook, emphasising the listed workshop outcomes.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the Harmonised Technical Rules (HTR) Long List had been presented to the Pilbara Advisory Committee (PAC) on 18 April 2024.</p> <p>The Chair noted that APA has recently provided a submission to Energy Policy WA (EPWA) outlining potential HTR issues and gaps. She noted that the APA submission has not been reflected in the consolidated long list, and instead invited APA to suggest amendments to the list during the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair invited comments or questions on the overview provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Walker noted that any minimum technical standard for the Northwest Interconnected System (NWIS) needs to set expectations for customers as well as energy producing systems and network equipment, particularly in respect of dynamic voltage and frequency scenarios. Mr Michelson asked if individual Network Service Providers (NSPs) were still expected to have their own technical rules if there was a minimum technical standard for all parties in the HTR. <p>The Chair emphasised that the policy intent for the HTR is to provide a single, comprehensive set of minimum standards for all parties. She noted that it was standard practice that a user of network services could still negotiate different standards with an NSP in an access agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Stephens clarified that a mechanism for a negotiated alternative standard to the minimum standard is not presently provided for within the HTR, as is done with the non-reference service in the rules for the South-West Interconnected System (SWIS). Members discussed how best to allocate resourcing to progress the issues in the list. There was agreement to allocate an Issue Lead for each individual issue with interested parties nominating to provide support. <p>The Chair facilitated a discussion on Issues 1 to 46 in the ‘Work Plan Under Development’ worksheet in the meeting workbook. An updated copy of the workbook to reflect meeting outcomes was circulated and finalised with members on 21 May and will be published alongside these Minutes.</p> <p>Key highlights of discussions on Issues 1 to 46 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members agreed to merge Issues 3 and 36, as it would be useful to determine the requirements for energy producing systems to ride | |



| Item | Subject | Action |
|------|---|-------------|
| | <p>through multiple consecutive power system disturbances and help consideration of a 'credible contingencies' definition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Members agreed that, where it was necessary to review definitions within the HTR, there might be precedents that can be drawn upon in the SWIS. In particular, the Chair suggested consideration of definitions being developed for the SWIS in the current Power System Security and Reliability (PSSR) Standards Review may be helpful. | |
| | <p>Action: Circulate PSSR Standards Review materials to EPNRWG HTR workstream participants.</p> | EPWA |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mr Stephens suggested testing how definitions from other instruments would work in the HTR before adopting them (such as definitions for recovery times and frequency bands), rather than accepting those definitions wholesale.Members agreed that Issues 3 and 36 can be merged.Mr Stephens noted that Issue 5 was substantive and modelling would be required to address it. He suggested that the first step should be to develop a scope for the modelling rather than developing options.Mr Fani (with reference to a review of the target frequency recovery times proposed in Issue 5) noted that some equipment that was previously islanded is very old and may not be able to withstand wider variations.Members agreed that Issues 5, 12, 15, 17, 19 and 34 can be merged and addressed collectively as they all require complementary modelling and studies.Mr Stephens commented on Issue 8 that the concept of considering Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) a load when charging and a generator when dispatched could be improved upon, including the introduction of specific requirements.Ms Mohan noted that the Kwinana BESS in the SWIS has highlighted several issues that may not be covered in the WEM Rules in respect of the treatment of BESS.Members agreed that Issues 8, 9 and 12 can be merged.Mr Stephens suggested (with reference to aspects of Issue 13) that there may be an opportunity to address HTR gaps by leveraging existing provisions within NSP's own technical rules.Members agreed with a suggestion by the Chair that, as a principle, if any issue in the list was already addressed by an NSP's existing technical rules, the working group should explore whether, and to what extent, that technical rule can be introduced into the HTR.Members agreed that Issues 13 and 37 can be merged.Mr Stephens and Ms Mohan agreed that there is a modelling and analysis component to Issue 16 and suggested that a modelling scope will be required.Mr Stephens suggested that Issue 18 may not require further studies, as some other issues, and may be categorised as a simple rather than substantive issue. | |



| Item | Subject | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr Stephens suggested that Issue 20 should be reviewed in the governance workstream at first but may need to return to this workstream to develop supporting technical requirements in the HTR.• Members similarly agreed that Issue 21 should commence in the governance workstream but may return to this workstream.• Mr Walker suggested that Issue 23 be treated as a substantive issue, noting that requirements for reactive power capability vary based upon technology. He noted that there is a greater obligation, and therefore capital cost, for synchronous generation.• Mr Stephens suggested that the working group would benefit from a briefing on how BESS is treated in WEM to inform the consideration of Issue 23.• Members agreed to merge Issues 24 and 25 and discussed leveraging the PSSR Standards Review and Appendix 12 of the WEM Rules (respectively) to assist in developing outcomes for both issues.• Mr Stephens suggested categorising Issue 26 as a technical issue rather than a governance issue as it is more concerned with requirements, rather than actual monitoring for compliance.• Mr Stephens suggested that Issue 28 should be a high priority as fault levels have already been rising on both networks in the Dampier area because of extra generation being added. He also suggested that Issue 28 is a substantive issue because, at interconnection points between network operators, it is not easy to determine who is responsible for managing fault levels or what the minimum standards were for fault level management.• Mr Fani suggested that Issue 30 is a high priority as the HTR needs to be updated to reflect what is already in the PNR.• Mr Stephens noted the potential for Issue 31 to be a relatively 'simple' issue and should be categorised as a technical issue. He suggested that the issue may be addressed in the short term with derogations, but ultimately, a long-term solution may require modelling.• Members agreed to merge Issues 32 and 33.• Members sought clarification on the description, rationale and justification of Issue 35 (relating to requirements on NSPs to enact special protection schemes to manage network congestion and instability).• Mr Mlilo suggested that Issue 35 was a network planning issue that may require modelling.• Mr Mlilo agreed with the Chair's suggestion that Issue 35 should be categorised as a technical issue (rather than governance).• Mr Fani queried whether the periodic testing obligation proposed in Issue 38 would be appropriate for older plants which are always operated in the same way unless they are subject to a material change and requested further justification of the issue, before work on the issue is progressed. | |

The Chair requested the Issue Lead (Mr Mlilo) to develop further clarity on issue definition, rationale and justification for Issues 35 and 38, and to report back at the next workstream meeting.



| Item | Subject | Action |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | <p>Action: Issue Lead (for Issues 35 and 38) to elaborate on issue definition, rationale and justification for discussion at the 11 July 2024 EPNRWG meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members agreed Issue 38 should be categorised as a technical issue. <p>The Chair suggested that Issue 39 ('alignment of HTR with SWIS and other networks'), to the extent that it is practicable to do so, be adopted as a guiding principle, rather than a discreet issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members agreed to merge Issues 41 and 42. | <p>BHP</p> |
| <p>8</p> | <p>Next Steps</p> <p>The Chair advised that EPWA would update the workbook to reflect meeting outcomes and circulate to members.</p> <p>The Chair requested that members review the updated workbook and nominate any Issue they would like to be involved in as a support to the Issue Lead.</p> <p>The Chair requested Issue Leads for 'high priority, simple issues' develop options or proposals for consideration at the next workstream meeting.</p> <p>The Chair requested that Issue Leads for 'high priority, substantive issues' provide a progress report at the next workstream meeting.</p> <p>Action: EPWA to update the workbook to reflect meeting outcomes and circulate to members by close of business Friday 10 May 2024.</p> <p>Action: Members to review the updated workbook and provide feedback (including nominations to support Issue Leads) by close of business Tuesday 14 May 2024.</p> <p>Action: Issue Leads for high priority simple issues (Issues 4 and 18), to develop options or proposals for resolving the issues and present those to the next HTR workstream meeting on 11 July 2024. Supporting meeting materials should be provided to EPWA by close of business 1 July 2024.</p> <p>Action: Issue Leads for high priority substantive issues to provide a progress report outlining potential solutions or, where relevant, further scoping of the issue at the 11 July 2024 HTR workstream meeting. Supporting meeting materials should be provided to EPWA by close of business 1 July 2024.</p> <p>The Chair closed the meeting.</p> | <p>EPWA</p> <p>All</p> <p>Issue Leads</p> <p>Issue Leads</p> |

The meeting closed at 11:39am.