



Minutes

MEETING TITLE Market Advisory Committee

MEETING NO 78

DATE Thursday 12 February 2015

TIME 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

LOCATION Level 17, 197 St Georges Terrace, Perth

Attendees	Class	Comment
Allan Dawson	Chair	
Kate Ryan	Compulsory – IMO	
Dean Sharafi	Compulsory – System Management	
Matthew Cronin	Compulsory – Western Power	
Will Bargmann	Compulsory – Synergy	(3:00 PM – 4:00 PM)
Shane Cremin	Discretionary – Generator	
Andrew Stevens	Discretionary – Generator	
Michael Zammit	Discretionary – Customer	
Geoff Gaston	Discretionary – Customer	
Peter Huxtable	Discretionary – Contestable Customers	
Simon Middleton	Minister's Appointee – Observer	
Elizabeth Walters	Economic Regulation Authority (ERA) – Observer	
Ray Challen	Minister's Appointee – Small Use Consumers Representative	

Apologies	Class	Comment
Steve Gould	Discretionary – Customer	

Also in attendance	From	Comment
Mike Davidson	System Management	Observer
Richard Wilson	EnerNOC	Observer (2:15 PM – 4:00 PM)
Wendy Ng	ERM Power	Observer

Also in attendance	From	Comment
Chris Campbell	Alinta Energy	Observer
Martin Maticka	IMO	Observer
Greg Ruthven	IMO	Observer
Jenny Laidlaw	IMO	Observer
Neetika Kapani	IMO	Observer
Laura Koziol	IMO	Observer and Minutes
Marc Hettler	IMO	Observer
Alex Penter	IMO	Observer
Chris Wilson	IMO	Observer
Paul Tetley	IMO	Presenter
Mark Katsikandarakis	IMO	Presenter
Erin Stone	IMO	Presenter

Item	Subject	Action
1.	<p>WELCOME</p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting at 2:00 PM and welcomed members to the 78th meeting of the Market Advisory Committee (MAC).</p>	
2.	<p>MEETING APOLOGIES / ATTENDANCE</p> <p>The following apologies were received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Gould (Discretionary – Customer) <p>The following presenters and observers were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Davidson (Observer – System Management) • Richard Wilson (Observer – EnerNOC) • Wendy Ng (Observer – ERM Power) • Chris Campbell (Observer – Alinta Energy) • Martin Maticka (Observer – IMO) • Greg Ruthven (Observer – IMO) • Jenny Laidlaw (Observer – IMO) • Neetika Kapani (Observer – IMO) • Laura Koziol (Observer and Minutes – IMO) • Marc Hettler (Observer – IMO) • Alex Penter (Observer – IMO) • Chris Wilson (Observer – IMO) • Paul Tetley (Presenter – IMO) • Mark Katsikandarakis (Presenter – IMO) 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erin Stone (Presenter – IMO) 	
3.	<p>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</p> <p>The minutes of MAC Meeting No. 77, held on 3 December 2014, were circulated to members prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to publish the minutes of Meeting No. 77 on the Market Web Site as final.</i></p>	IMO
4.	<p>ACTIONS ARISING</p> <p>The Chair invited Ms Kate Ryan to update the MAC on the current action items. Ms Ryan noted that the items marked as complete would be taken as read and provided the following update on the open actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Items 37, 51, 55 and 56: Ms Ryan noted that these items were scheduled to be discussed at various points during the MAC meeting. Action Item 47: Ms Ryan noted that this item remained open. Action Item 57: Ms Ryan noted that this item was scheduled for the March MAC meeting. Action Item 58: Ms Ryan noted that this item would be deferred to the March MAC meeting as the presenter could not make the February meeting. 	
4.1	<p>ACTION ITEM 37: ACCURACY OF BALANCING PRICES</p> <p>The Chair introduced Mr Mark Katsikandarakis to provide an overview of the analysis and recommendations presented in the discussion paper. The following key points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair questioned whether there was value in having two Provisional Balancing Prices. Mr Katsikandarakis clarified that the Provisional Balancing Price would only be calculated once for each Trading Interval. The daily provisional RDQ value would only be used to calculate the Provisional Balancing Price for those Trading Intervals where there is a missing end of interval RDQ value. Mr Andrew Stevens noted his support of the proposed approach to reduce the time taken to publish the Provisional Balancing Price and final Balancing Prices. However, he identified that the outcomes started getting better in September 2014 but there was no identifiable reason as to why. Mr Stevens therefore suggested that the IMO should assess whether the difference between the Provisional Balancing Price and final Balancing Price in 12 months. Mr Shane Cremin asked if there were any significant system changes required. Mr Katsikandarakis said the proposal was primarily rescheduling the events so there were no significant system changes required. MAC members agreed that the IMO should progress the proposed recommendations. <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to develop a pre Rule Change Proposal to expedite the determination of Provisional Balancing Prices and final Balancing Prices for discussion at an upcoming MAC meeting.</i></p>	IMO

Item	Subject	Action
4.2	<p>ACTION ITEM 58: 2014 MARKET AUDIT PRESENTATION</p> <p>The Chair noted that the presenter, Ms Kylie O’Keefe, could not be present and therefore deferred the action item to an upcoming MAC meeting.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to present the outcomes of the 2014 Market Audit at an upcoming MAC meeting.</i></p>	IMO
4.3	<p>ACTION ITEM 55: CONSTRAINED NETWORK ACCESS UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair introduced Mr Matthew Cronin to provide an update on Western Power’s Competing Applications Group (CAG) process and the development of the Network Constraint Tool.</p> <p>Mr Cronin noted that Western Power was working with the IMO and Public Utilities Office (PUO) to understand how best to progress CAGs, in particular if a constrained grid regime was recommended by the Electricity Market Review (EMR).</p> <p>The Chair questioned whether Western Power still planned to make conditional preliminary access offers to CAG participants in February 2015 as previously indicated. Mr Cronin noted that Western Power was still working on the terms and conditions of the offers but that February was unlikely.</p>	
4.4	<p>ACTION ITEM 56: LFAS UPDATE: AUXILLARY LOAD FORECASTING ERROR</p> <p>The Chair introduced Mr Dean Sharafi to provide an update on the work that System Management had undertaken to date to correct auxiliary load forecasting errors. The following key points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Sharafi noted that System Management was investigating the system changes required to move to a persistence forecast of the auxiliary load and that the project is expected to be completed by June 2015. The Chair clarified whether the date was for the completion of the investigation or the implementation of a solution. Mr Sharafi clarified that the implementation would be completed by June 2015 and that the timing was primarily due to resourcing constraints. At the Chair’s request Mr Sharafi agreed that System Management would provide an update at an upcoming MAC meeting. <p>Mr Sharafi also provided an update on System Management’s progress with respect to action item 57, to investigate options to sculpt the LFAS Requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Sharafi noted that Ernst and Young had been engaged to undertake the investigations. The Chair asked what the consultant was expected to achieve. Mr Sharafi noted that the work would result in recommendations for System Management to implement. Mr Sharafi provided the Chair with a copy of the scope of work. The Chair asked MAC members if they would find it useful to see the scope of work. MAC members agreed that it would be useful. Mr Sharafi agreed to remove the confidential information and provide the IMO with a copy to circulate to MAC members. 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Cremin asked what access Ernst and Young had to data for this investigation. Mr Sharafi said they had the past year of LFAS measurement data which is the same information that informed the five-yearly Ancillary Services review and the one minute LFAS data. Mr Cremin noted that it appeared to be undertaking a significant amount of work in the electricity market for various stakeholders and in particular Western Power and clarified that he was interested to see what information was being used and for what purposes. Mr Stevens asked when the outcomes of this work would be shared with MAC members. Mr Sharafi responded that System Management would present the outcomes at the March MAC meeting as provided for under action item 57. <p><i>Action Point: System Management to provide an update on its progress in correcting auxiliary load forecasting errors in the Real Time Dispatch Engine at an upcoming meeting prior to June 2015.</i></p> <p><i>Action Point: System Management to provide the IMO with an excerpt of the scope of work to investigate options to sculpt the LFAS Requirement and the IMO to circulate that excerpt to MAC members.</i></p>	<p>System Management</p> <p>System Management / IMO</p>
5.1	<p>RULE CHANGE OVERVIEW</p> <p>Ms Ryan provided an overview of the Rule Change Proposals currently in progress and the IMO's work on upcoming Rule Change Proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair clarified that the Rule Change Proposals which the Minister recently rejected due to the EMR would need to be submitted again into the formal rule change process to be considered. The Chair also noted that the timeframes for a number of other Rule Change Proposals have been extended on the basis of their dependency on the EMR outcomes and can be resumed when appropriate. Mr Cremin sought for clarification on the IT implementation timeline for the Rule Change Proposal: Removal of Resource Plans and Dispatchable Loads (RC_2014_06). Ms Jenny Laidlaw clarified that the implementation timeline would be considered in the Draft Rule Change Report and noted that Market Participant's submissions would be taken into account when determining the proposed commencement date. 	
5.2	<p>PRE RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL: MANAGING MARKET INFORMATION (RC_2014_09)</p> <p>The Chair introduced Ms Erin Stone to provide an overview of the pre Rule Change Proposal and examples of the initial assessments that the IMO has completed to date. The following key points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair clarified that the IMO's intent is to conduct a number of workshops for interested stakeholders to work through the status of each piece of information during the period that the IMO consults on the Rule Change Proposal and associated Procedure Change Proposal. Mr Stevens asked for an excel spreadsheet version so that interested 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>stakeholders could search and filter the list. Ms Stone agreed to circulate a copy of the excel spreadsheet to MAC members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Geoff Gaston asked whether the IMO would hold the workshops before it progresses the Rule Change Proposal and Procedure Change Proposal. The Chair clarified that the rule and procedure changes set the assessment framework that needs to be used to assess the information so it is appropriate to progress them in parallel and noted that if the workshops identify areas for improvements, these can be included in the Draft and Final Rule Change Reports. • Mr Gaston asked for an example where the IMO would need to exercise judgement with respect to an appropriate balance between the detriment and the bettering of the Wholesale Market Objectives caused by release of a piece of information. Ms Stone noted that a number of examples presented had reflected such a judgement call. The Chair noted that the circulation of the list in excel format would help stakeholders identify where these judgements had been made. Ms Stone agreed and noted that these pieces of information are likely to be the items discussed in some detail at the stakeholder workshops. • Mr Gaston asked how this Rule Change Proposal would be affected by the EMR. The Chair clarified that this proposal changed the assessment framework that the IMO uses to determine whether the information should be treated as confidential. Ms Stone clarified that if the Market Rules were substantially changed, the proposed assessment framework would remain and it would only be the list of confidential information that would change. Ms Ryan added that the development of a usable framework would make the assessment of any new rules much easier. • The Chair reiterated that the IMO had proposed a process in the Market Rules and Market Procedure to allow a stakeholder to request the IMO to reassess the status of a piece of information. • Mr Chris Campbell asked whether a request for reassessment would only apply to the person who requested it. Ms Stone said that an assessment would result in a determination of the status of a piece of information that would apply generally to that information and to all participants (not just the person requesting the assessment). Mr Campbell noted that some information may have varying degrees of confidentiality for different Market Participants and asked whether the IMO intended to determine the status on the basis of the majority. The Chair responded that it was not a voting system but that the IMO would take those reasons into consideration in its assessment. • The Chair noted that similar issues needed to be resolved when designing the Gas Services Information Rules and that the IMO worked with stakeholders to get an understanding of the reason behind the confidentiality of that information. He stated that the IMO was able to resolve the issues through mechanisms such as delays in the release of that information even where only one person had provided evidence of the potential detriment of the release. Ms Stone noted that the IMO had proposed similar conditions in the Rule 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Change Proposal such as aggregation, delays and omitting some information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Simon Middleton asked how the IMO would assess the status of the information with respect to the Wholesale Market Objectives. In particular he noted that the release of all information would increase efficiency of the market. The Chair noted that efficiency was only one test. Ms Stone also noted that each piece of information needed to be considered on its merits. Mr Middleton noted that it would be difficult for the IMO to compare the societal benefit to the detriment to an individual. The Chair agreed and reiterated that it was therefore crucial that participants articulate the reasons for that information being confidential so that the IMO can make a fully informed decision. • The Chair clarified that the IMO had also proposed a reassessment process and Ms Ryan noted that the IMO's decision was proposed to remain a Reviewable Decision. • Mr Will Bargmann asked if the IMO also intended to release third party information or whether it was only information from Market Participants. The Chair clarified that the proposed framework only related to market related information required to be provided under the Market Rules. Mr Bargmann asked if that included third party and contractual information. The Chair stated that the IMO did not have visibility over Market Participant contracts and could not answer that question. • Mr Bargmann questioned whether the IMO had the statutory authority to disclose confidential information from a third party. The Chair noted that if there were such provisions in a contract it is unlikely that the information could be shared with the IMO or System Management under the current framework. • Mr Cremin noted that this Rule Change Proposal only established a procedure under which the IMO could determine whether information is confidential and reiterated that the process had already resulted in information that was public that should be treated as confidential. Mr Cremin noted that the process would result in the strengthened protections for participants. • Mr Bargmann noted that the Rule Change Proposal reflected the IMO's intention to release confidential third party information where it is in the public interest. Mr Stevens noted that if Mr Bargmann was concerned about specific pieces of information he could provide that information to the IMO to consider when making its decision. Mr Bargmann disagreed stating that the way that the provisions were drafted, that the IMO would have regard to a number of circumstances meant that the IMO would override any other prohibition of release. Mr Cremin noted that the wording could be changed if it was a problem but that the process as a whole was robust. The Chair requested that Mr Bargmann to clearly articulate the problem between the old and new frameworks and suggested changes in writing. Ms Stone noted that the IMO proposed to retain the requirement for any confidential information to continue to be treated as confidential information by parties to whom it may be 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>disclosed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Chris Campbell noted Alinta Energy's concern that information previously considered confidential could now be released. Mr Campbell also noted his concern that information provided in the past of which participants had no record could be released. The Chair invited Mr Campbell to articulate his concerns in writing. Mr Cronin suggested that the IMO should continue to treat all information previously provided as confidential, as confidential. Ms Ryan noted that this was not consistent with the intention of this process. The Chair noted that the IMO could investigate an option to cover historical confidential information on a case-by-case basis. Mr Bargmann asked if the IMO had changed its position on releasing information that is prohibited by law. Ms Ryan clarified that the IMO is required to comply with relevant laws. Mr Bargmann reiterated his point that the way the provisions were currently drafted, that the IMO would have regard to a number of circumstances meant that the IMO could override a law that prohibits disclosure. Ms Ryan considered that it was a matter of interpretation of the drafting and was not the intention. Ms Stone clarified that the proposed Amending Rules needed to be read with the procedure which provided further advice on the application of the principles in proposed in the Market Rules. Ms Stone noted that the IMO would consider the appropriate placement of such prescription and welcomed suggested drafting changes from Mr Bargmann through the Rule Change Process. Mr Peter Huxtable clarified the process for reassessment of information. The Chair clarified that any person could request a reassessment under the framework and that the decision and the reasons would be published by the IMO. Mr Ryan added that the reassessment was also a Reviewable Decision. <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to consider feedback provided by MAC members at the meeting and submit the Rule Change Proposal: Managing Market Information (RC_2014_09) into the formal process and progress it under the Standard Rule Change Process.</i></p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to establish a series workshops to provide interested stakeholders with the opportunity to discuss the IMO's initial proposed confidentiality list.</i></p>	<p>IMO</p> <p>IMO</p>
5.3	<p>PRE RULE CHANGE PROPOSAL: REMOVAL OF MARKET OPERATION MARKET PROCEDURES (RC_2015_01)</p> <p>The Chair introduced Mr Paul Tetley to provide an overview of the pre Rule Change Proposal.</p> <p>The Chair enquired as to the timeframes associated with the removal of the three Market Procedures. Mr Tetley stated the process would take approximately three months and noted that the associated changes to Market Procedures would be discussed at the IMO Procedures Working Group in March 2015.</p> <p>MAC members agreed for the IMO to progress the Rule Change Proposal into the formal process.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<i>Action Point: The IMO to submit the Rule Change Proposal: Removal of Market Operations Market Procedures (RC_2015_01) into the formal process and progress it under the Standard Rule Change Process.</i>	IMO
9.1	<p>PROCEDURE CHANGE OVERVIEW</p> <p>Ms Ryan provided an overview of the Procedure Change Proposals currently underway and noted that Procedure Change Proposals: Changes to the Market Procedure: Certification of Reserve Capacity (PC_2013_06) and Changes to Market Procedure: Performance Monitoring (PC_2013_09) had been adjusted to reflect the rejection of the two Rule Change Proposals.</p>	
10.1	<p>WORKING GROUP OVERVIEW AND MEMBERSHIP UPDATES</p> <p>Ms Ryan noted that the next IMO Procedure Change and Development Working Group (IMOPWG) meeting was scheduled for March 2015.</p> <p>Ms Ryan also noted that there were no changes to the membership of the Working Groups.</p>	
11.1	<p>GENERAL BUSINESS: SYSTEM RESTART SERVICES</p> <p>The Chair invited Mr Sharafi to provide an overview of the status of System Restart Services. The following points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Sharafi noted that the current System Restart Services contracts for the north metropolitan and south metropolitan regions expire in June 2016 and that System Management had started the respective procurement process for these regions as well as the south country region. Mr Sharafi outlined the following timeline for the process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ request for expression of interest closes in March 2015; ◦ invitations for tender in April 2015; ◦ tender responses in May 2015; ◦ awarding of contracts by the end of June 2015; and ◦ services commencing 1 June 2016. • Mr Sharafi noted that the requirements for System Restart Services would be discussed further at System Management's next 'Generator Forum' in February 2015. Mr Stevens sought clarification from Mr Sharafi whether the IMO would be invited to attend the Generators Forum on the basis that the IMO had not been represented at the previous forum where it could have contributed to the issues related to the market. The Chair noted that the IMO would like to attend the generators forum if invited. Mr Sharafi agreed to provide the IMO with further information. • Mr Stevens asked whether the services were being procured a year in advance on the basis that it would provide the participant awarded the contract with enough time to prove their capability. Mr Sharafi noted that this would allow time to establish System Restart Services in the south country region. The Chair asked if this was the first time System Management was procuring System Restart Services in the south country region. Mr Sharafi clarified that it wasn't the first time but that there was no existing provider in that region. 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Gaston asked how long the contract was for. Mr Sharafi answered that he believed that it was three years. <p><i>Action Point: System Management to invite the IMO the Generator Forum to be held in February 2015.</i></p>	System Management
11.2	<p>GENERAL BUSINESS: SYSTEM MANGEMENT DISPATCH SYSTEMS UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair invited Mr Sharafi to provide an update on the status of System Management dispatch systems. The following points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Stevens noted that he had requested this item to be added to the agenda and that he had provided System Management with his questions on the issue prior the meeting. In particular, Mr Stevens sought clarification on the status of the B2B web service and asked why it was still not available to Market Participants. Mr Stevens emphasised that the System Management Automated Real-Time System (SMARTS) had not delivered an automated B2B solution as outlined in the scope of work published by System Management. Mr Sharafi clarified that the deliverables of SMARTS did not meet the initial project scope due to reduced funding. Mr Sharafi also noted that the B2B web services had been intended to be developed only for Facilities without SCADA capability. The Chair queried which solutions other Market Participants were using. Mr Sharafi clarified that Bluewaters Power was the only Market Participant that had expressed an interest in the B2B solution and that other Market Participants were using the SCADA driven Automatic Balancing Control instead. Mr Sharafi also noted that Facilities providing LFAS used Automatic Generation Control which was similar, but allowed System Management to control the Facility. The Chair sought clarification whether the data which should be provided through the B2B web service was otherwise available. Mr Sharafi clarified that the information was delivered via SCADA to the IMO and therefore available to Market Participants. The Chair noted that it was unlikely that a B2B solution would be implemented in the circumstances that there was only one participant requesting the service and the uncertainty with respect to the EMR outcomes. MAC members agreed. Mr Stevens asked Mr Sharafi how many Facilities in the SWIS with a generating capacity over 10 MW did not have SCADA connections. Mr Sharafi noted that to his knowledge there were no Scheduled Generators that did not have SCADA. Mr Stevens noted that the B2B solution was written into Market Procedure and would need to be written out if it would not be delivered. Mr Sharafi committed to implement a B2B web service for Bluewaters' Facilities. Mr Stevens responded that his experience indicated System Management was not currently able to deliver the service. 	

Item	Subject	Action
11.3	<p>GENERAL BUSINESS: RECENT OUTAGES DISCUSSION</p> <p>The Chair read the e-mail Mr Steve Gould had sent to the MAC members prior the meeting in which Mr Gould highlighted the extent of the recent Outages of 'base load' Facilities. The following key points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair noted that a number of the Outages in question have, in part, been due to unfortunate events such as bushfires and the collapse of one of the Muja Facilities' water tower. The Chair also noted that the IMO had developed the Rule Change Proposal: Incentives for Availability of Scheduled Generators (RC_2013_09), but that this Rule Change Proposal was rejected by the Minister. Mr Stevens noted that the proposal had merit and should be resubmitted into the process notwithstanding the outcomes of the EMR. Mr Michael Zammit agreed, noting that it was of an operational and not of strategic nature. The Chair emphasised that the rejection had been only due to the overall policy to implement no changes during the EMR* and that the Rule Change Proposal would be resubmitted, when appropriate. <p>*Clarification post meeting – in the rejection of RC_2013_09 the Minister stated:</p> <p>"I consider that the Rule Change Proposal is inconsistent with the Market Objectives. In forming this assessment, I have taken into account that the costs to implement the amendments may not be recovered in light of possible reforms emanating from the Electricity Market Review.</p> <p>My decision also takes into account that components of the Rule Change Proposal encompass changes relating to Reserve Capacity certification and that the 2014 Reserve Capacity Cycle has recently been deferred by way of Ministerial Direction."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Gaston noted his view remained that the refund recycling regime proposed under the Rule Change Proposal: Changes to the Reserve Capacity Price and the Dynamic Reserve Capacity Refunds Regime (RC_2013_20) should be distributed to Market Customers instead of Market Generators. Mr Campbell noted that the market operated effectively and reacted to the high level of Outages with higher prices. Mr Cremin noted that the spare capacity in the market did not appear to be very reliable or cheap and sought clarification on the status of the Synergy generation fleet. Mr Bargmann clarified that there were no systemic issues with the Synergy fleet but that the plants were old and therefore Forced Outages are an inherent risk. Mr Cronin sought for clarification if, in terms of achieving the Wholesale Market Objectives, sometimes the benefit of competition would outweigh efficiency. The Chair clarified that there was no weighting of the Wholesale Market Objectives but that there was a natural tension between them. Mr Cremin also noted that most markets were struggling with incentives for the retirement of old, inefficient plant. The Chair agreed 	



Item	Subject	Action
	<p>with this observation and noted the significant impediments associated with retirement, including those that are not directly related to the electricity market.</p> <p><i>Action Point: The IMO to resubmit the Rule Change Proposal: Incentives to Improve Availability of Scheduled Generators as a priority following the outcomes of the EMR if appropriate.</i></p>	IMO
11.4	GENERAL BUSINESS: MAC MEMBERSHIP The Chair noted that Mr Cronin had replaced Mr Shane Dureya as Western Power's representative on the MAC.	
11.5	GENERAL BUSINESS: MAC ANNUAL REVIEW The Chair noted that the IMO was in the process of undertaking the annual review of the composition of the MAC and that the outcomes of this process would be announced on 23 February 2015.	
CLOSED: The Chair declared the meeting closed at 4:00 PM.		