RCP Rule Change Panel
Market Advisory Committee

Minutes

Meeting Title:	Market Advisory Committee (**MAC**)
Date:	15 October 2019
Time:	9:30 AM – 11:30 AM
Location:	Training Room No. 2, Albert Facey House 469 Wellington Street, Perth

Attendees	Class	Comment
Stephen Eliot	Chair	
Matthew Martin	Minister's Appointee – Small-Use Consumer Representative	
Mark Katsikandarakis	Australian Energy Market Operator (**AEMO**)	Proxy for Martin Maticka
Teresa Smit	System Management	Proxy for Dean Sharafi
Sara O'Connor	Economic Regulation Authority (**ERA**) Observer	
Andrew Everett	Synergy	
Shane Duryea	Network Operator	Proxy for Margaret Pyrchla
Dimitri Lorenzo	Market Generators	Proxy for Daniel Kurz
Jacinda Papps	Market Generators	
Wendy Ng	Market Generators	To 11:20 AM
Erin Stone	Market Customers	Proxy for Patrick Peake
Geoff Gaston	Market Customers	
Tim McLeod	Market Customers	
Chayan Gunendran	Market Customers	
Peter Huxtable	Contestable Customers	

Apologies	Class	Comment
Martin Maticka	AEMO	
Dean Sharafi	System Management	
Patrick Peake	Market Customers	

Margaret Pyrchla	Network Operator	
Daniel Kurz	Market Generators	
Andrew Stevens	Market Generators	

Also in Attendance	From	Comment
Kate Ryan	Energy Transformation Implementation Unit (**ETIU**)	Presenter to 11:05 AM
Miles Jupp	ETIU	Presenter to 11:05 AM
Matthew Fairclough	AEMO	Presenter to 11:20 AM
Jenny Laidlaw	RCP Support	Minutes
Noel Schubert	ERA	Observer to 11:20 AM
Kei Sukmadjaja	Western Power	Observer
Kim Phan	ETIU	Observer to 10:35 AM
Julius Susanto	AEMO	Observer to 11:20 AM
Richard Cheng	RCP Support	Observer
Natalie Robins	RCP Support	Observer
Sandra Ng Wing Lit	RCP Support	Observer

Item	Subject	Action
1	**Welcome** The Chair opened the meeting at 9:30 AM and welcomed members and observers to the 15 October 2019 MAC meeting.	
2	**Meeting Apologies/Attendance** The Chair noted the attendance as listed above.	
3(a)	**Minutes of Meeting 2019_09_03** Draft minutes of the MAC meeting held on 3 September 2019 were circulated on 11 September 2019. The MAC accepted the minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting. **Action: RCP Support to publish the minutes of the 3 September 2019 MAC meeting on the Rule Change Panel's (Panel's) website as final.**	**RCP Support**

Item	Subject	Action
3(b)	**Minutes of Workshop 2019_09_06 re RC_2017_02** Draft minutes of the MAC workshop held on 6 September 2019 to discuss Rule Change Proposal: Implementation of 30-Minute Balancing Gate Closure (RC_2017_02) were circulated on 25 September 2019. The Chair noted that a revised draft showing suggested tracked changes on pages 12 and 14 was distributed in the meeting papers. The Chair invited comments or questions on the draft minutes, while noting they were to be discussed further at the second MAC workshop for RC_2017_02 that was scheduled for 18 October 2019. The MAC raised no questions or concerns about the draft minutes.	
4	**Action Items** The closed action item was taken as read. **Action 19/2019:** The Chair advised that the ERA was still considering the matter. Ms Sara O'Connor added that the ERA was in the middle of working through a number of questions raised by AEMO regarding the Pre-Rule Change Proposal. **Action 20/2019:** The Chair noted that AEMO would provide an update on the North Country Spinning Reserve issue under agenda item 8(b).	
5	**MAC Market Rules Issues List (Issues List) Update** The MAC noted the recent updates to the Issues List. The Chair noted that RCP Support had deferred the annual review of the Issues List, which was due to be held at this meeting, until the November 2019 MAC meeting. <u>Outage Issues for Potential Inclusion on the Issues List</u> The Chair noted that the paper for this agenda item included seven outage-related issues that were raised by stakeholders during consultation on Rule Change Proposals: Outage Planning Phase 2 – Outage Process Refinements (RC_2013_15) and Administrative Improvements to the Outage Process (RC_2014_03), but did not fall within the scope of those proposals. The Chair sought the views of the MAC on what should be done with these issues. Ms Jenny Laidlaw provided an overview of the seven outage issues. The MAC agreed that the following issues should be added to the Issues List and placed on hold until the relevant outcomes of the Energy Transformation Strategy (**ETS**) are	

Item	Subject	Action

known (i.e. the regulatory changes for the Foundation Regulatory Frameworks workstream):

- identification of services subject to outage scheduling;
- outage scheduling for dual-fuel Scheduled Generators;
- Ancillary Service outage scheduling anomalies;
- outage scheduling obligations for Interruptible Loads;
- direction of Self-Scheduling Outage Facilities; and
- outage scheduling obligations for non-intermittent Non-Scheduled Generators.

Ms Wendy Ng asked why the Ancillary Service outage scheduling anomalies issue had been raised. Ms Laidlaw replied that the main concern raised related to Interruptible Loads that provided Spinning Reserve Service under an Ancillary Service Contract. While such Facilities were required to be included on the Equipment List, it was not clear who was responsible for scheduling outages for the Facility with System Management.

Ms Laidlaw noted that Alinta had raised the sixth issue, “Coordination of network and generator outages”. Mrs Jacinda Papps advised that recently there were numerous Planned Outages affecting the Generator Interim Access (**GIA**) Facilities, and questioned whether those Planned Outages were coordinated or planned in a way that optimised overall market outcomes.

Mrs Papps considered the issue more of a philosophical question to discuss before the development of any Rule Change Proposal, but suggested that over time, particularly once three or more GIA generators were commissioned, the need for greater coordination would increase.

However, Mrs Papps noted that Alinta had observed a recent improvement in ‘on the day’ GIA impacts. The MAC supported Mrs Papps’ suggestion to not include the issue on the Issues List at this time.

6(a) **Update on the ETS**

Ms Kate Ryan provided the following updates on the ETS.

- The Energy Transformation Taskforce (**Taskforce**) was to meet for the seventh time on 18 October 2019. The Taskforce would receive updates on the Whole of System Plan (**WOSP**), the development of a Capacity Credit Rights proposal (to support the implementation of constrained access), and a stocktake of the projects, pilots and trials underway in Western Australia and other states that are

Item	Subject	Action
	providing information to assist development of the Distributed Energy Resources (**DER**) Roadmap. • ETIU expected to circulate a paper on the Capacity Credit Rights proposal shortly, for discussion at the next meeting of the Transformation Design and Operation Working Group (**TDOWG**). • Since its commencement, the Taskforce had published ten information papers, nine relating to elements of the wholesale market reform, and one relating to the WOSP. • The TDOWG was meeting on roughly a monthly basis, with the next meeting scheduled for 22 October 2019. ETIU was also meeting regularly with Western Power and AEMO on most aspects of the work program. • The Program Implementation Coordination Group, which comprised senior representatives from the Taskforce, AEMO and Western Power, met for the fourth time the previous week. The Strategic Consultative Group was scheduled to meet for the second time later in October 2019. • The next Industry Forum would discuss the DER Roadmap and provide a chance for ETIU to report on what it had learnt from the previous workshop, provide an update on the development of the roadmap and seek further feedback from stakeholders. Details of the forum, which was scheduled for 29 October 2019, would be emailed to stakeholders shortly. • ETIU had held over 100 one-on-one meetings with stakeholders, mostly in relation to the WOSP and DER integration. ETIU expected to hold more such meetings, which it believed has proved a very effective way of engaging with the sector. Mrs Papps considered that the recent decision not to implement 5-minute settlement on 1 October 2022 was very sensible, and asked what process would be used to decide the new implementation date. Ms Ryan replied that ETIU was working with AEMO on what was required to implement 5-minute settlement, with the intention of providing the Taskforce with another decision point before the end of 2019. Depending on how far the work progresses, this would produce either a revised implementation date or a process for determining the date. The revised implementation date would be some period beyond October 2022. In response to a question from Mrs Papps, Ms Ryan confirmed that ETIU was considered several options for implementing	

Item	Subject	Action
	5-minute settlement and considered it likely that the Taskforce would be able to provide more details, including a firm target implementation date, by the end of 2019. Ms Ng asked whether the Taskforce was expected to make any decisions about constrained network access and Capacity Credit allocations at its 18 October 2019 meeting. Ms Ryan replied that the Taskforce would only receive an update at this meeting. The next decision on these matters would be around the design of the Capacity Credit Rights proposal. ETIU was working on the detailed design for Capacity Credit Rights with the aim of receiving Taskforce approval by the end of 2019. Ms Ryan expected that prior to this decision the matter would be discussed at two TDOWG meetings as well one-on-one consultations with each affected Market Generator.	
6(b)	**Update on the WOSP** Mr Miles Jupp provided an update on the modelling methodology, inputs and assumptions developed for the WOSP. A copy of the presentation (updated from the earlier version that was circulated in the meeting papers) is available on the Panel's website. The following points were discussed: • Ms Ng noted Mr Jupp's comment that he had spoken to potential developers and lenders about their likely cost of capital and expected rates of return, and asked how their expectations compared with the relevant assumptions in the latest draft determination of the Benchmark Reserve Capacity Price (**BRCP**). Ms Ng indicated that the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (**WACC**) used in the draft determination was around 3.35-3.36%. Mr Jupp replied that ETIU had been looking at expected internal rates of return (**IRRs**) under various circumstances. The expected IRRs were generally under 10% for new renewable Facilities with an off-take agreement. However, risk premiums were added for Facilities that used fossil fuels, with the highest risk premiums applied to coal plant, and some lenders noting that funding coal plant into the future could become very expensive. The risk premiums for gas plant were lower, around 10-15% based on comparisons with new gas plant being built in the National Electricity Market. Mr Jupp noted that expected IRRs were dropping, and an investor was often prepared to accept much lower terms if a project fitted its risk profile. Ms Ng considered that a disconnect between the BRCP and the assumptions made	

Item	Subject	Action
	by investors could prevent any further generation from being built. • In response to a question from Mr Chayan Gunendran, Mr Jupp confirmed that the least cost expansion modelling would consider the curtailment or management of DER. Mr Jupp explained that the demand assumptions for the four scenarios had been adjusted to reflect different assumptions about the uptake and usage of solar PV and batteries. Mr Gunendran considered that the least cost solution could involve curtailing or managing DER. Mr Jupp noted that one of the major outputs of the WOSP was to drive policy and decisions about the management of DER. Several options existed to deal with DER, and the aim was to identify the best options in terms of lowest system cost. Mr Jupp invited stakeholders to contact him if they wished to discuss any aspects of the WOSP on a one-on-one basis.	
7	**AEMO Procedure Change Working Group (APCWG) Update** Mr Mark Katsikandarakis advised that the next APCWG meeting would be held on 21 October 2019 and would deal with a minor administrative change to the Market Procedure: Prudential Requirements to correct an error in the documented Credit Limit calculation. The MAC noted the update on AEMO's Market Procedures.	
8(a)	**Overview of Rule Change Proposals** The Chair noted that: • the proposed workshop for RC_2014_03 was scheduled for 25 October 2019, not 24 October 2019 as shown in the meeting papers; • the Draft Rule Change Report for Rule Change Proposal: Managing Market Information (RC_2014_09) was due to be published on 18 October 2019; and • the second workshop for RC_2017_02 was scheduled for 18 October 2019. The MAC noted the overview of Rule Change Proposals.	
8(b)	**North Country Spinning Reserve Issue** Mr Matthew Fairclough provided an update on AEMO's action item 20/2019: *"AEMO to develop a Pre-Rule Change Proposal for AEMO's 'option 3' to address the North Country Spinning Reserve issue*	

Item	Subject	Action

(as discussed at the 29 July 2019 MAC meeting), which is to include 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."

A copy of AEMO's presentation is available in the meeting papers.

The following points were discussed:

- Mr Fairclough noted that the connection of the two new GIA generators (Yandin and Warradarge) would increase the potential size of the largest single contingency to 730 MW. Mr Fairclough noted that the Network Operator has an obligation to reduce the maximum size of this entire contingency such that when System Management has sufficient Spinning Reserve the contingency will not require under frequency load shedding.
- In response to a question from Ms Laidlaw, Mr Fairclough clarified that while curtailment of the GIA generators to reduce the size of the contingency may increase the Balancing Price, it would not be expected to result in the payment of additional constrained on compensation.
- Ms Ng noted that an unconstrained network access regime still applied in the SWIS and questioned why NewGen Neerabup should not receive constrained off compensation if it was constrained off.
- Ms Laidlaw sought clarification on whether NewGen Neerabup was part of the combined single contingency under system normal conditions, noting that AEMO had previously advised that a network outage was needed for NewGen Neerabup to form part of the single contingency. Mr Shane Duryea confirmed the NewGen Neerabup would be part of the combined single contingency under system normal conditions.
- Mr Fairclough explained how the current dispatch rules would determine the order in which the GIA generators and Newgen Neerabup would be constrained if there was a need to reduce the size of the contingency. Ms Laidlaw noted that the default dispatch order could be modified through the rule change process to account for these situations in a more appropriate way.

  Mrs Papps noted that a 180 MW limit on the output of the GIA generators would significantly reduce the low-cost energy that these generators could provide to the market. Ms Laidlaw agreed that option 2 was likely to be a more

Item	Subject	Action

efficient option, but noted the MAC had been under the impression that option 2 was not achievable in the required timeframe. While this no longer appeared to be the case, option 2 may still not be viable, or else not viable within the required timeframe, so option 3 was still of interest, possibly as a short-term solution.

Mr Fairclough advised that option 3 would probably take longer to implement and be at least as difficult to implement as option 2. Mr Fairclough acknowledged that the dispatch rules could be amended but did not think that AEMO would suggest such changes in a Rule Change Proposal.

- In response to a question from Mr Noel Schubert, Mr Fairclough reconfirmed that AEMO's modelling had taken into account the local loads and other factors that would tend to reduce the impact of the contingency.
- Mr Fairclough provided an overview of AEMO's proposed changes to the full runway Spinning Reserve cost allocation method. Mr Fairclough confirmed that NewGen Neerabup and the two new GIA generators would be part of the same contingency group, and that NewGen Neerabup was likely to incur greatly increased Spinning Reserve costs as a result.

  Ms Laidlaw considered that this might be problematic and asked if any other GIA generators were expected to be sharing a single contingency with other generators, noting that the GIA program had now closed and so the location of all the GIA generators was known. Mr Duryea replied that he did not think any other GIA generators would be sharing a single contingency in this way.
- There was some discussion about the guidelines for contingency group definition, and whether the Eastern Goldfields generators should be assigned to a single contingency group given that the loss of the relevant transmission line would cause a Load Rejection Reserve event rather than a Spinning Reserve event.
- Ms Laidlaw noted that RCP Support had considered a contingency-based version of the full runway cost allocation method as part of its work on Rule Change Proposal: Full Runway Allocation of Spinning Reserve Costs (RC_2018_06). RCP Support had rejected the idea on the grounds that it would impose an unacceptable financial burden on NewGen Neerabup.

  However, Ms Laidlaw considered it was possible to modify AEMO's proposed method to avoid this problem, and

Item	Subject	Action

suggested that AEMO and RCP Support discuss that option further.

- Mr Fairclough confirmed that AEMO proposed to determine the contingency groups on a dynamic basis (i.e. separately for each Trading Interval). Ms Laidlaw considered that using dynamic contingency groups was likely to be a more complex and expensive option than using static contingency groups, and questioned the necessity for dynamic contingency groups given the purpose of the cost allocation mechanism. Mr Mark Katsikandarakis agreed that using static contingency groups could result in a simpler implementation.
- There was some discussion about the likely impact of the new GIA generators on the Balancing Price and the frequency of NewGen Neerabup's operation.
- Mr Fairclough suggested that, in a situation where a Scheduled Generator (such as NewGen Neerabup) was part of a contingency that might need to be limited, then the Scheduled Generator might be prevented from operating at its full output, which in turn could affect its eligibility for Capacity Credits.

  There was some discussion about whether the current certification process for GIA generators took security constraints into account, and whether the reduction of existing generators' Capacity Credits due to the effects of GIA generators was an intended outcome.

The Chair noted that there was general agreement at the previous MAC meeting that AEMO should develop a Pre-Rule Change Proposal based on option 3 for discussion at the November 2019 MAC meeting. The Chair questioned whether the MAC had changed its view following AEMO's update.

Mr Schubert considered that option 2 was generally the preferred option, and the MAC had chosen option 3 only because it was considered more implementable. Mr Geoff Gaston considered that AEMO had steered the MAC to option 3 on the basis that it was the faster option, and that his preference was by far for option 2. Other MAC members also expressed a preference for option 2.

Ms Laidlaw asked whether AEMO would start work on the 5-7 month implementation of option 2 before the publication of a Final Rule Change Report, as this would affect whether the changes could be implemented before the GIA generators commenced operation and before the 2020/21 margin values took effect. Mr Katsikandarakis replied that AEMO would need

Item	Subject	Action
	to consider this further. However, if there was general endorsement for option 2, then AEMO could hopefully prepare a Pre-Rule Change Proposal for the November 2019 MAC meeting, which would contain more accurate advice on the implementation timeframes.	
	Ms Laidlaw noted that, when the Panel was considering Rule Change Proposal: Removal of constrained off compensation for Outages of network equipment (RC_2018_07), it had sought to avoid changes that could be seen to breach the perceived rights of generators with ‘firm’ network access.	
	Ms Laidlaw and Mr Katsikandarakis agreed to meet to discuss alternative changes to the full runway Spinning Reserve cost allocation method. Ms Ng requested to be involved in this discussion, while Mr Fairclough suggested that representatives from Synergy and Alinta should also be invited to attend.	
	Ms Ng noted that she objected to the proposal presented by AEMO, primarily because ERM Power had no say in becoming part of a group contingency and did not consider itself a part of a group contingency.	
	Ms Laidlaw suggested it would be helpful to confirm which if any of the other GIA generators will be sharing lines with existing generators so that the affected generators can be made aware of the situation and can participate in the discussion of the issue.	
	Mr Katsikandarakis advised that AEMO would use its best efforts to develop a Pre-Rule Change Proposal for the November 2019 MAC meeting, but may not be able to achieve this deadline if the proposed discussions resulted in significant changes to the current thinking on the proposal.	
	Mr Gaston acknowledged the complexity of the issues but considered the prevention of unwarranted constrained off compensation was a priority that needed to be progressed quickly. There was some discussion about the time required to implement the proposed changes to remove constrained off compensation, the expected commissioning dates for the GIA generators, and the potential to use a staged commencement if the preferred solution could not be implemented in the required timeframe.	
	Action: AEMO to develop a Pre-Rule Change Proposal for AEMO’s ‘option 2’ (i.e. option 2a and 2b) to address the North Country Spinning Reserve issue, as discussed at the 29 July 2019 MAC meeting, for discussion at the 26 November 2019 MAC meeting.	**AEMO**

Item	Subject	Action
	Action: AEMO and RCP Support to discuss options for changes to the full runway Spinning Reserve cost allocation model to account for the largest single contingency comprising multiple generators, and to invite ERM Power, Alinta and Synergy to participate in those discussions.	**AEMO/RCP Support**
8(c)	**Pre-Rule Change Proposal: Administrative Improvements to Settlement**	

Mr Katsikandarakis provided an overview of AEMO's Pre-Rule Change Proposal: Administrative Improvements to Settlement (RC_2019_04). The Pre-Rule Change Proposal is available in the meeting papers.

The following points were discussed:

- Mr Katsikandarakis presented a slide (available on the Panel's website) showing an example of the proposed timeline for Notices of Disagreement. Mr Katsikandarakis advised that while developing this example AEMO found a minor drafting error in the Pre-Rule Change Proposal (i.e. the deadline for Notices of Disagreement specified in clause 9.16.4(e) should be the first Business Day of the eleventh month following the commencement of the Trading Month being settled, not the first Business Day of the tenth month).
- Mr Katsikandarakis noted that RCP Support had indicated that section 9.24 of the Market Rules (Settlement in Default Situations) also needs to be updated to account for Ancillary Service Providers. AEMO intended to review this section and include the required changes in RC_2019_04.
- The Chair noted that RCP Support had received an email from Skyfarming expressing its concerns that the minimum invoice amount for which a payment must be made (currently set to one dollar in clauses 9.22.6 and 9.22.8) is less than the cost of processing the payment. Skyfarming suggested increasing the minimum invoice amount to ten dollars.

  Mr Katsikandarakis noted that AEMO used Austraclear to facilitate settlements in the market, and that Austraclear charged between five and ten dollars per transaction. The MAC was generally supportive of Skyfarming's suggestion and Mr Katsikandarakis advised that AEMO was happy to include the proposed change in RC_2019_04, although it would need to give some thought to how any unsettled amounts should be handled from an accounting perspective.

Item	Subject	Action
	• The MAC generally supported the progression of RC_2019_04 into the formal rule change process. • In response to a question from Ms Laidlaw, the MAC confirmed that it did not consider there was a need for any additional changes to the calculation of Theoretical Energy Schedules beyond those proposed in RC_2019_04 (e.g. broader changes to require recalculation of values using interval meter data). • The Chair sought a recommendation from the MAC on the urgency rating for RC_2019_04, noting that AEMO proposed a High urgency rating because of its compliance concerns associated with the issue. Mr Katsikandarakis noted that AEMO did not want to be in a situation where it might have to let the market settle with manifestly wrong outcomes, or else be demanding the submission of Notices of Disagreement from Market Participants. AEMO preferred that the changes were put in place as soon as possible, so that AEMO could settle the market with the most accurate information available. Mrs Papps considered that a High urgency rating was appropriate given the importance of accurate settlement. The MAC was generally supportive of a High urgency rating for RC_2019_04.	
9	**Review of the Framework for Rule Change Proposal Prioritisation and Scheduling** The Chair noted that RCP Support reviewed the Panel's Rule Change Proposal Prioritisation and Scheduling Framework (**Framework**) following a discussion of the Framework with the Gas Advisory Board (**GAB**) in 2018. The Framework is intended to apply to both the GSI Rules and the Market Rules, but was originally drafted from a Market Rules perspective. RCP Support discussed several proposed changes to the Framework with the GAB at a recent GAB meeting, and now intended to conduct a public review process for the proposed changes. RCP Support proposed to publish the draft Framework by the end of October 2019 and seek submissions from participants in both the gas and electricity markets. The intention was to present the changes for approval at the Panel meeting scheduled for December 2019, with the revised Framework to take effect from 1 January 2020. The Chair invited questions or comments on the proposed changes from the MAC.	

Item	Subject	Action
	The following points were discussed: • Mr Peter Huxtable asked where RC_2019_04 would fit into a single queue for changes to the Market Rules and GSI Rules. The Chair replied that RCP Support continued to be of the view that it would not make sense to maintain two sets of resources, one for electricity and one for gas. However, if a single pool of resources is applied to both queues then the effective outcome will be the same as if a single queue is used. Ultimately, if a Rule Change Proposal is assigned a high priority it will go to the top of RCP Support's task list, regardless of whether the change is to the Market Rules or the GSI Rules. • In response to a question from Mrs Papps, the Chair and Mr Richard Cheng advised that the GAB had not raised any key issues or concerns about the proposed changes to the Framework. • Mr Matthew Martin noted that the GAB had not had much experience with dealing with Rule Change Proposals or applying the Framework, as they had only dealt with two Rule Change Proposals since the Panel commenced operation. Mr Martin considered that GSI Rule Change Proposals would not rate highly under the current Framework because they are not of a nature that they are likely to compromise system security. The Chair considered that this was a fair observation, and that the greater risk with the one queue approach was that a GSI Rule Change Proposal might be continually pushed down the queue. However, the Chair noted that the Panel had made some progress in reducing its backlog of proposals.	
10	**General Business** Workflow Reporting: The Chair noted that the MAC asked for additional information on RCP Support's work program at the previous MAC meeting. The Chair understood that this was to assist stakeholders in their planning by giving them a better understanding of the events that were expected to occur in the immediate future. The Chair proposed to add a new section at the start of the Overview of Rule Change Proposals (**Overview**) (which is tabled at each MAC meeting) listing the events that are expected to occur before the next MAC meeting (e.g. workshops and consultation periods). Alternatively, RCP Support could add a new column to the report showing the target date of the next	

Item	Subject	Action
	step rather than the official date. The Chair noted that in some cases the official ‘next step’ dates on the Panel’s website did not reflect the actual target dates. The Chair sought the views of MAC members on the proposed changes. Mrs Papps noted that after a period of relatively little activity several market events had been scheduled over a six-business day period, including two MAC workshops, an APCWG meeting and a TDOWG meeting. The Chair suggested that listing such events at the start of the Overview would help stakeholders with their planning. Ms Laidlaw noted that RCP Support sought to avoid scheduling events that conflicted with, or occurred too close to, events held by other agencies such as ETIU, and that to do this it was helpful to know the dates of these events as early as possible. The Chair indicated that RCP Support would update the Overviews as discussed, and invited future feedback from members about the effectiveness of the changes.	

The meeting closed at 11:30 AM.