

Minutes

Meeting Title:	Market Advisory Committee (MAC)
Date:	3 September 2019
Time:	9:30 AM – 11:00 AM
Location:	Training Room No. 1, Albert Facey House 469 Wellington Street, Perth

Attendees	Class	Comment
Stephen Eliot	Chair	
Matthew Martin	Minister's Appointee – Small-Use Consumer Representative	
Martin Maticka	Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO)	
Dean Sharafi	System Management	
Noel Schubert	Economic Regulation Authority (ERA) Observer	Proxy for Sara O'Connor
Daniel Kurz	Market Generators	
Andrew Stevens	Market Generators	
Patrick Peake	Market Customers	
Geoff Gaston	Market Customers	
Tim McLeod	Market Customers	
Chayan Gunendran	Market Customers	
Geoff Down	Contestable Customers	Proxy for Peter Huxtable

Apologies	Class	Comment
Sara O'Connor	ERA Observer	
Peter Huxtable	Contestable Customers	
Wendy Ng	Market Generators	
Jacinda Papps	Market Generators	

Also in Attendance	From	Comment
Kate Ryan	Energy Transformation Implementation Unit (ETIU)	Presenter to 9:55 AM
Aden Barker	ETIU	Presenter to 9:55 AM

Jenny Laidlaw	RCP Support	Minutes
Dimitri Lorenzo	Bluewaters Power	Observer
Scott Davis	Australian Energy Council	Observer
Erin Stone	Point Economics	Observer
Ian Porter	Sustainable Energy Now	Observer
Richard Cheng	RCP Support	Observer
Natalie Robins	RCP Support	Observer
Sandra Ng Wing Lit	RCP Support	Observer

Item	Subject	Action
1	<p>Welcome</p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting at 9:30 AM and welcomed members and observers to the 3 September 2019 MAC meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Meeting Apologies/Attendance</p> <p>The Chair noted the attendance as listed above.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of Meeting 2019_07_29</p> <p>Draft minutes of the MAC meeting held on 29 July 2019 were circulated on 19 August 2019. The MAC accepted the minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Action: RCP Support to publish the minutes of the 29 July 2019 MAC meeting on the Rule Change Panel's (Panel's) website as final.</p>	RCP Support
4	<p>Action Items</p> <p>The Chair noted that the agenda item reference listed for action items 15/2019 and 16/2019 should be agenda item 8(b) rather than agenda item 9.</p> <p>All action items were closed and taken as read.</p>	
5	<p>MAC Market Rules Issues List (Issues List) Update</p> <p>The MAC noted the recent updates to the Issues List.</p> <p><u>Issue 52 (Multiple generating units on a single line constituting the largest credible contingency):</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that the agenda item reference listed for issue 52 should be agenda item 8(b) rather than agenda item 9.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p><u>Issue 55 (Conflict between Relevant Level Methodology and the early and conditional certification of Intermittent Generators):</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that Mr Martin Maticka had provided an amendment to RCP Support on the comments he made regarding this issue at the 30 April 2019 MAC meeting. The amendment was circulated to MAC members with the draft minutes of the 29 July 2019 meeting and was also provided in the Issues List.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the issue could be addressed as a standalone Rule Change Proposal or, at the ERA's discretion, as part of the Rule Change Proposal being developed by the ERA to replace the Relevant Level Methodology (RC_2019_03).</p> <p>In response to a query from the Chair, Mr Noel Schubert advised that the ERA was not currently considering this particular issue; but was considering other feedback provided by AEMO in relation to RC_2019_03 and what further work it should undertake before it submits the Rule Change Proposal. Ms Jenny Laidlaw noted that the ERA suggested addressing the issue as part of RC_2019_03 at the 30 April 2019 MAC meeting.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that the MAC wait for the ERA to decide whether it wanted to address the issue as part of RC_2019_03. If the ERA decided not to include the issue in RC_2019_03, then RCP Support would bring the issue back to the MAC for further discussion on how it should be dealt with.</p>	
	<p><u>Issue 15/34 (Criteria for approval of extension outages):</u></p> <p>The MAC agreed to close issue 15/34 following the publication of the Final Rule Change Report for Rule Change Proposal: Outage Planning Phase 2 – Outage Process Refinements (RC_2013_15), because the Amending Rules for RC_2013_15, which commence on 1 February 2020, will resolve the issue.</p>	
	<p><u>Issue 56 (Issues with Reserve Capacity Testing):</u></p> <p>In response to a question from the Chair, Mr Patrick Peake advised that Perth Energy's development of a Pre-Rule Change Proposal to address issue 56 will be delayed for two months due to staff unavailability.</p>	
	<p>Action: The ERA to advise the MAC whether it intends to address the conflict between the Relevant Level Methodology and the early and conditional certification of Intermittent Generators as part of Rule Change Proposal: Method used for the assignment of Certified Reserve Capacity for Intermittent Generators (RC_2019_03).</p>	<p>ERA</p>

Item	Subject	Action
6	<p>Update on the Energy Transformation Strategy (ETS)</p> <p>Ms Kate Ryan provided the following updates on the ETS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Energy Transformation Taskforce (Taskforce) had met five times and published eight information papers relating to the Foundation Regulatory Frameworks work stream. The Taskforce had approved the four demand scenarios that will form the basis of modelling for the first Whole of System Plan (WOSP) and published an information paper on those scenarios. <p>The four scenarios were the same as those presented at the 12 July 2019 Industry Forum for the WOSP. Stakeholders were invited to contact ETIU if they wanted to have a one-on-one session with ETIU about the WOSP assumptions or modelling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Taskforce was receiving regular progress updates on the Distributed Energy Resources (DER) Roadmap, which was due to be delivered to the Minister by Christmas 2019. <p>On 30 July 2019, ETIU held a workshop on the DER Roadmap, which was attended by about 70 stakeholders. The workshop provided good insights and ideas about the importance and priority of certain DER elements.</p> <p>While ETIU intended to hold further stakeholder workshops on the DER Roadmap, it was not yet clear what the topics of those workshops would be. ETIU intended to identify any DER issues that require additional consultation before the finalisation of the DER Roadmap and may hold the next DER workshop in October 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Taskforce was considering how to implement constrained access and had given in principle approval to the use of Capacity Credit rights to allocate Capacity Credits in a constrained access environment. This proposal was presented briefly at the first Transformation Design and Operation Working Group (TDOWG) meeting; and is to grandfather Capacity Credits for existing generators for a period of time and to lock in a Capacity Credit right for new generators to provide some investment certainty into the future. <p>The proposal is to apply to all generators and has the benefit of dealing with part of the transitional issue of moving to a constrained access environment for incumbent generators. The detailed design would be presented at a future TDOWG meeting.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ETIU intended to commence one-on-one discussions with stakeholders on the transition to constrained access towards the end of September 2019. The purpose of the initial discussions was to gain an understanding of stakeholder issues so that the Taskforce could take these into account. The Taskforce was to meet for the sixth time on 20 September 2019 to discuss foundation settings for settlements in the Wholesale Electricity Market (WEM) and various elements of the DER Roadmap. An information paper on WEM settlements was expected to be published shortly after this meeting. <p>Mr Geoff Gaston asked how detailed the WOSP price and cost forecasts were expected to be. Ms Ryan replied that the dispatch modelling for the WOSP was expected to produce forecasts of wholesale costs such as balancing prices, capacity prices, and essential system service costs for each scenario. Retail tariffs were neither an explicit input nor an explicit output.</p> <p>Mr Ian Porter considered that because the retail tariff structure will dictate consumer behaviour, which in turn will affect generation requirements, the absence of tariff structures in the scenarios could be a problem. Ms Ryan replied that the four scenarios demonstrate different customer behaviours which in part will be driven by theoretically or potentially different tariff scenarios. Rather than prescribe specific tariffs, the scenarios prescribed the customer behaviours that would follow (e.g. how much DER and demand growth resulted). In this way the scenarios captured a range of potential tariff inputs without explicitly defining what those inputs were.</p> <p>In response to a question from Mr Daniel Kurz, Ms Ryan advised that the work of the three ETIU work streams was progressing well. The Taskforce was proving to be an efficient and effective decision-making body, as indicated by the publication of information papers, and Ms Ryan was confident that the mechanisms were now in place to meet the overall program timelines.</p> <p>Mr Aden Barker provided the following updates on the TDOWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first TDOWG meeting was held on 12 August 2019 and had 45 attendees. Mr Barker noted the future TDOWG meetings were likely to be held at an alternative venue, with both AEMO and Western Power offering the use of their facilities. The next TDOWG meeting was scheduled for 9 September 2019. The meeting agenda was to include 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>WEM settlement, outage planning, an update on the changes to the Reserve Capacity Mechanism (RCM) to support constrained access, and a brief update on the proposed WEM Regulation changes relating to the Minister’s temporary rule-making powers and the publication of Amending Rules.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third TDOWG meeting was scheduled for 27 September 2019 and was to focus on the RCM changes to support constrained access. ETIU intends to hold one-on-one meetings and small workshops over the four weeks following the TDOWG meeting. • ETIU would also present on non-frequency essential system services (formally labelled locational essential system services) at the 27 September 2019 meeting. • ETIU had commenced work on drafting instructions for the proposed changes to the Technical Rules change management process and would be publishing more information for stakeholder comment in due course. • ETIU was happy to meet with individual stakeholders to discuss the detail provided in the published information papers and how it would be translated to more detailed market design and rule drafting. 	
	<p>Ms Ryan noted that the PUO and ETIU are moving from the Department of Treasury into a new sub-department of the Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety on 5 September 2019. This would result in a change of website domain to “energy.wa.gov.au”, with a corresponding change to email addresses. An email containing the relevant email and website details would be sent to all stakeholders on the ETIU and PUO email lists.</p>	
	<p>Mr Barker noted that several of the papers previously published by the Taskforce contained links to other Taskforce papers or to papers previously published by the PUO. ETIU was planning to update these links to ensure they remained stable and current with the new website. Ms Ryan asked MAC members to notify ETIU if they found any broken links in Taskforce publications.</p>	
	<p>In response to a question from Ms Laidlaw, Mr Matthew Martin advised that the PUO hoped to be able to send final drafts of the RCM pricing rule changes to the Minister for approval by the end of September 2019, with the intent that the new rules take effect from 1 October 2019 or shortly thereafter. The PUO had met with various stakeholders regarding the rule changes and intended to provide updated drafts to those stakeholders for comment before preparing the final version for the Minister.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Martin noted that the intent was to implement the RCM pricing changes from the 2019 Reserve Capacity Cycle, rather than the 2020 Reserve Capacity Cycle as previously discussed. However, the PUO did not expect AEMO would extend any RCM processes for the 2019 Reserve Capacity Cycle, apart from delaying the publication of the Reserve Capacity Price until after the Minister's changes were made.</p> <p>Mr Martin noted that some of the standalone provisions, such as the proposed notice of closure provisions, would take effect as soon as the new rules were made. However, other changes would commence later, such as those relating to settlement changes for the 2021 Capacity Year onwards.</p>	
7	AEMO Procedure Change Working Group (APCWG) Update	
	The MAC noted the update on AEMO's Market Procedures.	
8(a)	Overview of Rule Change Proposals	
	<p>The Chair noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Amending Rules for Rule Change Proposal: Full Runway Allocation of Spinning Reserve Costs (RC_2018_06) commenced on 1 September 2019; • the Minister had extended the deadline for making his decision on Rule Change Proposal: ERA Access to market information and SRMC investigation process (RC_2018_05) until 20 September 2019; • RCP Support was holding a MAC workshop to discuss Rule Change Proposal: Implementation of a 30-Minute Balancing Gate Closure (RC_2017_02) on 6 September 2019; and had circulated the slide packs for the workshop on 2 September 2019. <p>Ms Laidlaw noted that the proposed workshop for Rule Change Proposal: Administrative Improvements to the Outage Process (RC_2014_03) would be held in late September 2019.</p> <p>The MAC noted the overview of Rule Change Proposals.</p>	
8(b)	North Country Spinning Reserve Issue	
	<p>The Chair noted the meeting paper for this agenda item contained a summary of the views provided by MAC members in response to action item 15/2019 (MAC members to send RCP Support their views on the North Country Spinning Reserve issue (and specifically their views on the three options presented by AEMO at the 29 July 2019 MAC meeting)). The Chair sought the views of the MAC on the feedback received.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Kurz reiterated his view that while option 2 appeared to provide the more holistic resolution of the issue, option 3 may be the preferable solution given the likely timeframe to implement option 2. Mr Kurz recognised that option 3 may not provide the lowest energy price outcome, but considered this reflected the fact that providing secure, reliable energy has a cost associated with it (although an assessment should be made of whether that cost was acceptable). Mr Peake supported the views expressed by Mr Kurz.</p>	
	<p>Mr Dean Sharafi noted that AEMO was seeking the opinion of MAC members on which whether it would progress with option 2 or 3 in the Rule Change Proposal. Mr Sharafi considered that, while option 2 deals with the problem holistically, option 3 would provide a good start to deal with the problem, and would be quick to implement because it would not affect many AEMO IT systems.</p>	
	<p>Mr Gaston agreed that option 2 seemed the most correct, efficient option, but considered the priority was to guard against excessively high ancillary service costs and the perverse outcome of windfall profits to the generators that were causing the problem. Mr Gaston considered that if option 3, including the removal of constrained off compensation, could be implemented faster (ideally before the new generators commenced operations) then that option should be progressed.</p>	
	<p>Mr Maticka asked the Chair to summarise the MAC's position for the benefit of the minutes, noting that AEMO would also be seeking some level of endorsement from an energy policy viewpoint from Mr Martin. Mr Martin noted that he had not considered the issue in depth but, if the intention was to implement a solution as soon as possible, option 3 seemed to be a more cost efficient, effective outcome than implementing something more material in advance of the major market reforms.</p>	
	<p>Mr Maticka requested clarification on whether the guidance from the MAC was that AEMO should develop a Rule Change Proposal for option 3 or that AEMO should consider both options; noting that while some members had expressed support for option 3 it was not clear that this view was unanimous.</p>	
	<p>The Chair noted that irrespective of which Rule Change Proposal was submitted, the Panel was likely to need to consider both options. In response to a question from the Chair, attendees expressed support for the progression of option 3, but noted that no Synergy or Alinta Energy representatives were present at the meeting and that these participants had not</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>provided a response for action item 15/2019. No attendee expressed a preference for AEMO to progress option 2.</p> <p>The Chair asked AEMO whether and when it could develop a Rule Change Proposal to implement option 3. Mr Maticka replied that AEMO would need to find a resource to undertake the work but hoped to present a Pre-Rule Change Proposal to the MAC at its 26 November 2019 meeting.</p> <p>Mr Schubert supported the development of a Rule Change Proposal for option 3 but noted that there may be an opportunity to compare the economics of the two options as an extension to the work being undertaken to determine the margin values for the 2020/21 Financial Year. Mr Maticka advised that AEMO would not undertake an analysis of this type until after November 2019, to avoid risking the delivery of its margin values proposal to the ERA by 30 November 2019. However, AEMO would be happy to support another party that wished to undertake that work.</p> <p>Ms Laidlaw noted that the margin values modelling would require assumptions about the whether the two generators would be allowed to form the largest contingency, and that these assumptions could have a material impact on Spinning Reserve costs. Ms Laidlaw suggested that it may be possible for the ERA to determine margin values that are conditional on the outcome of a Rule Change Proposal.</p> <p>There was some discussion about the Spinning Reserve cost impacts of using an incorrect assumption about the size of the largest contingency to determine the margin values; whether the ERA had previously issued a conditional margin values determination; and how difficult it would be to modify the margin values model to use a different assumption about the treatment of the two new generators.</p> <p>Mr Maticka noted that AEMO supported the development of a Rule Change Proposal to implement option 3.</p>	AEMO
	<p>Action: AEMO to develop a Pre-Rule Change Proposal for AEMO's 'option 3' to address the North Country Spinning Reserve issue (as discussed at the 29 July 2019 MAC meeting), which includes the removal of constrained off payments when the relevant generators are constrained down to reduce the Spinning Reserve requirement, for presentation at the 26 November 2019 MAC meeting.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
9	<p>Rule Change Panel and RCP Support KPIs for 2018/19</p> <p>The Chair led a discussion of the questions raised in the report titled 'Rule Change Panel and RCP Support KPIs for 2018/19' (report). The following points were discussed.</p> <p><u>Approach to deciding whether to progress a Rule Change Proposal:</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that some respondents to the Panel's 2018/19 stakeholder satisfaction survey (survey) suggested that the Panel had decided to progress some underdeveloped Rule Change Proposals that should not have been progressed.</p> <p>The Chair asked the MAC if it had any concerns about the approach used by the Panel to decide whether to progress Rule Change Proposals. Mr Kurz replied that Bluewaters Power had no such concerns and was supportive of the approach used by the Panel.</p> <p><u>Structure and content of rule change reports:</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that the Panel had modified the structure of its rule change reports over the previous year, and now included the decision and a summary of the reasons for the decision at the front of the report.</p> <p>Mr Martin considered the explanation of the reasons for a decision was sometimes fairly short and it was left to the reader to work back through the earlier documents to piece together the Panel's reasoning for its decisions. Mr Martin noted that the current rule change reports could not be read as standalone documents, and considered they occasionally appeared slightly too dismissive of stakeholder concerns, as it was not clear where those concerns had been addressed.</p> <p>The Chair noted that including all the relevant details in each rule change report would allow the reports to be read as standalone documents but materially increase their size and complexity. The Chair asked attendees which structure they would prefer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Sharafi preferred a structure that provided links to the minutes or submissions in the reports, and minimised cross-referencing within the body of reports to make them more readable. • Mr Kurz, Mr Maticka, Mr Andrew Stevens and Mr Peake expressed a preference for concise reports with appropriate links to the relevant historical documents; agreed that a reader should be expected to have read the relevant historical documents (e.g. a person reading a Final Rule Change Report should be expected to have read the 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>relevant Rule Change Proposal and Draft Rule Change Report); and suggested that the Panel list and provide links to any documents it assumes the reader has previously read at the start of each report.</p> <p><u>Splitting of Rule Change Proposals:</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that the Panel had received legal advice that it was unable to split a Rule Change Proposal it receives into multiple Rule Change Proposals for separate progression.</p> <p>Mr Martin asked whether the prohibition on splitting a Rule Change Proposal was in the WEM Regulations or the Market Rules. The Chair replied that he thought the prohibition came from the Market Rules, which only allowed the Panel to accept, accept in an amended form or reject a Rule Change Proposal.</p> <p>Mr Kurz asked whether the proponent of a Rule Change Proposal, if it decided that it wanted to reduce the scope of that proposal, could withdraw the proposal and submit a new one. Mr Maticka replied that the proponent of a Rule Change Proposal had no control over the progression of that proposal once it was submitted.</p> <p>Mr Maticka suggested that the practical solution was to use the informal Pre-Rule Change Proposal process where the MAC discusses proposals before their formal submission and considers whether the issues raised should be addressed together or separately. The Chair considered this approach had worked well with some of the more recent Rule Change Proposals, such as Rule Change Proposal: Removal of constrained off compensation for Outages of network equipment (RC_2018_07).</p> <p>Ms Laidlaw considered that in some cases it may be efficient to combine issues in a single Rule Change Proposal, if this reduced the overheads associated with multiple changes to the same IT systems and processes. Mr Maticka agreed that bundling changes could reduce implementation costs but did not consider that issues should be combined for this reason, because of the risk that consideration of the more complex changes might delay the progression of the other changes.</p> <p><u>MAC meetings:</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that some survey respondents considered that the MAC occasionally lacked a sense of purpose and direction, and that the Chair needed to take more accountability in ensuring that MAC discussions were valuable and less of a 'talk-fest'.</p> <p>The Chair noted that to date he had allowed discussions to continue because not all attendees had the same views on what</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>matters were of interest, and because it sometimes takes time for a person to express their thoughts clearly. However, the Chair was willing to take steps to more tightly control MAC discussions, such as cutting short or setting time limits for discussions. The Chair sought the views of MAC members as to what types of actions he should take.</p> <p>Mr Kurz did not think the MAC should adopt a strict rule on this matter because at times the MAC discussion is very valuable. Mr Kurz suggested that the Chair monitor discussions to assess whether they are useful, and if a discussion is no longer useful ask the participants to summarise their positions and seek to wrap up the discussion.</p> <p>Mr Maticka suggested that the Chair should intervene when the discussion shifts off-topic or becomes repetitive. Mr Gaston suggested that the Chair act to tighten the discussion where this is necessary to keep the discussion moving.</p> <p>Mr Sharafi considered that some participants may have valuable opinions but be less inclined to talk than others, so it was beneficial to the MAC meeting to request opinions and ensure that all the opinions are heard. As an example, Mr Sharafi noted that Dr Steve Gould, a previous MAC member, had not spoken often but had very valuable opinions on many things. Mr Gaston did not consider that members should be explicitly asked for their opinions, because in many cases a member may not have an opinion of a specific issue. Mr Kurz agreed, noting that some issues had no impact on Market Generators. Mr Maticka considered that members should offer opinions that reflect the interests of the class they represent at the MAC.</p> <p>Mr Martin considered that it was often hard to understand the contribution made by members versus observers. Mr Martin did not suggest that MAC observers should not be allowed to speak but questioned the point of MAC membership if anyone is permitted to attend a MAC meeting and participate in the discussion.</p> <p>Mr Stevens noted that observers, if permitted to attend a MAC meeting, have always been entitled to fully participate in the discussion. Mr Kurz noted that while the MAC was supposed to be representational of industry, some parties that are affected by issues discussed at the MAC may not be fully represented by the MAC members.</p> <p>Mr Martin suggested that an imbalance of one industry group (e.g. generators) at a meeting might influence the tone of the discussion and provide a distorted picture of the MAC's position on an issue. Mr Stevens suggested that rule change reports should document the numbers of MAC members that supported</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>or opposed each of the proposal considered by the MAC. The Chair noted that the Panel did not base its decisions on the popularity of the Rule Change Proposal.</p> <p>The Chair acknowledged Mr Martin's point but noted that the MAC is an advisory committee and what the Panel wanted was advice from the market. The Chair preferred to allow observers to speak as this gives the Panel the benefit of their advice. The MAC meeting minutes provide the Panel with a detailed record of the advice received and the sources of that advice.</p> <p>Mr Peake agreed with the Chair's position, considering that one of the strengths of the group was that all attendees were allowed to speak, and that observers often provided good ideas that could strengthen the Panel's decisions. Mr Stevens agreed that the input of observers was often very valuable and considered that the Chair could always intervene if observers acted as a lobby group or dominated the meeting discussion.</p> <p>The Chair reminded observers that they were required to request permission from the Chair to attend a MAC meeting.</p> <p><u>MAC meeting papers:</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that some survey respondents had raised concerns about the late provision of MAC meeting papers. The Chair advised that he had taken the approach that if a late paper is provided on an issue, and the issue is sufficiently important that the MAC should consider it, or does not require extensive effort to assess, then the MAC should have the opportunity to discuss the issue. The Chair noted that if the MAC decides it has not had enough preparation time to discuss an issue then the issue can be deferred to a later meeting; but considered it was better for the MAC, rather than the Chair, to make such decisions.</p> <p>Mr Kurz considered this was another matter for which a hard and fast rule could potentially lead to perverse outcomes. Mr Sharafi agreed, noting that the slides for AEMO's 29 July 2019 presentation on the North Country Spinning Reserve issue were provided to RCP Support after the meeting papers were circulated. Mr Sharafi thanked the Chair for accepting the slides and scheduling the discussion of what was an important issue.</p> <p>Mr Sharafi also thanked the Chair for giving MAC members additional time to provide their feedback on the North Country Spinning Reserve issue after the 29 July 2019 meeting. Mr Kurz, Mr Peake and Mr Maticka all supported the concept of allowing the discussion of late papers while allowing MAC members to</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>request additional time to consider the issues and provide their feedback.</p> <p>The Chair also considered, and the MAC agreed, that it was preferable for ETIU to provide up-to-date verbal updates on ETS progress at each MAC meeting than to require them to provide a written summary in the MAC meeting papers that was prepared a week in advance of the meeting.</p> <p><u>Prioritisation of Rule Change Proposals:</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that the Gas Advisory Board (GAB) had not yet discussed the Panel's framework for Rule Change Proposal Prioritisation and Scheduling (framework).</p> <p>RCP Support had reviewed the framework in preparation for its discussion at the 26 September 2019 GAB meeting and considered that changes could be made to make the framework more robust and easier for the Panel, RCP Support, the MAC and the GAB to use. RCP Support intended to discuss the proposed revisions with the GAB and the Panel before bringing them back to the MAC before the end of 2019.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the framework included a set of questions to be asked when considering the urgency rating for a Rule Change Proposal. On some occasions the MAC had been asked to recommend an urgency rating for a Rule Change Proposal without considering those questions.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the survey responses included comments that there appears to be a lack of clarity about the Panel's priorities. The Chair sought the views of the MAC on whether the priorities of the Panel were unclear and whether there was a better way for the Panel to communicate with stakeholders regarding its priorities.</p> <p>In response to a question from Mr Stevens, the Chair confirmed that the Panel's priorities were informed by the urgency ratings provided by the MAC. Mr Stevens considered that it would be strange for the MAC to have concerns with the Panel's priorities because it was largely responsible for setting those priorities.</p> <p>Mr Martin considered it might be useful to provide a Gantt chart indicating the expected timeframes for processing each Rule Change Proposal. This would allow stakeholders to understand the sequence in which Rule Change Proposals with the same urgency rating were likely to be progressed.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the RCP Support work program (which listed the expected timeframes for each Rule Change Proposal) was updated regularly, usually at least every 1-2 weeks.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Tim McLeod asked if would be worthwhile to publish the RCP Support work program in the MAC meeting papers. The Chair expressed concern that stakeholders might rely on dates in the published work program that are subsequently modified.</p> <p>Mr Kurz considered this would not be a problem if it was clarified that the work program was indicative and subject to change.</p> <p>Ms Laidlaw noted that some dates could be published with a greater level of certainty than others. Mr McLeod considered that some transparency was better than no transparency at all.</p>	
	<p><u>Other matters:</u></p>	
	<p>Mr Sharafi suggested that when a Rule Change Proposal touches on policy matters there should be discussions with the PUO and ETIU prior to the discussion at the MAC.</p>	
	<p>Mr Martin considered that the GAB was unlikely provide much comment on the framework given that only two Rule Change Proposals for the Gas Services Information (GSI) Rules had been processed since the Panel commenced operations.</p>	
	<p>Mr Martin and Mr Maticka considered that the Panel should allocate resources to a Rule Change Proposal for the GSI Rules rather than making it compete for resources with Rule Change Proposals for the Market Rules.</p>	
	<p>The Chair noted that the response rate for the survey was around 8% and encouraged stakeholders to participate in future surveys conducted by the Panel. The Chair also invited stakeholders to contact him at any time if they had any concerns or suggestions about the operations of the Panel and RCP Support.</p>	
10	Revised MAC Schedule for 2020	
	<p>The MAC raised no concerns with the revised MAC meeting schedule for 2020. The Chair asked MAC members to reserve the proposed meeting dates in their calendars for 2020.</p>	
	<p>Several members noted that they had not received a meeting invitation for this MAC meeting. The Chair agreed to ensure that Outlook meeting invitations were issued to members for future MAC meetings.</p>	
11	General Business	
	<p>Mr Kurz noted that Bluewaters Power had found it difficult to update and test its systems in time for the recent changes to the Energy Price Limits, due to the limited time provided by AEMO to undertake this work.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	Mr Martin and Mr Schubert encouraged MAC members and observers to register for the 2019 Energy in WA Conference, which will be held on 18-19 September 2019.	

The meeting closed at 11:00 AM.