



## Minutes

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	Market Advisory Committee (MAC)
<b>Date:</b>	8 February 2024
<b>Time:</b>	9:30am –11:28am
<b>Location:</b>	Microsoft Teams online meeting and Wyndham Room

Attendees	Representing in MAC	Comment
Sally McMahon	Chair	
Martin Maticka	Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO)	Joined at 10.07am
Dean Sharafi	AEMO	
Zahra Jabiri	Network Operator	
Genevieve Teo	Synergy	
Noel Schubert	Small-Use Consumer Representative	
Christopher Alexander	Small-Use Consumer Representative	
Jacinda Papps	Market Participant	
Adam Stephen	Market Participant	
Paul Arias	Market Participant	
Peter Huxtable	Market Participant	
Geoff Gaston	Market Participant	
Patrick Peake	Market Participant	Left 10.24am
Tessa Liddelow	Market Participant	Proxy for Paul Arias
Rajat Sarawat	Observer appointed by the Economic Regulation Authority (ERA)	
Also in Attendance	From	Comment
Ms Guzeleva	EPWA	MAC Secretariat
Bronwyn Gunn	EPWA	MAC Secretariat
Shelley Worthington	EPWA	MAC Secretariat
Stephanie Hemsley	EPWA	MAC Secretariat
Ryan Dawson	Western Power	Presenter for Item 6
Dr Matt Shahnazari	ERA	Presenter for Item 7(b)

Tim Robinson	Robinson Bowmaker Paul (RBP)	Presenter for Item 7(e)
<b>Apologies</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Paul Arias	Market Participant	
Tim Edwards	Market Participant	
Noel Ryan	Observer appointed by the Minister	

Item	Subject	Action
------	---------	--------

## 1 Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 9:30am with an Acknowledgement of Country.

The Chair noted that she had no new conflicts to declare.

The Chair noted her role as Commissioner at the AEMC and that the views or advice provided by the MAC to the Coordinator do not necessarily represent the views of the Chair.

The Chair noted the Competition and Consumer Law obligations of the MAC, inviting members to bring to her attention any issues should they arise.

The Chair noted that MAC operates for the good of the WEM Objectives and members are to participate in the interests of the stakeholder group they represent. Any specific views pertaining to particular organisations can be provided through the applicable consultation processes.

The Chair noted that the minutes from the MAC and its working groups are very detailed and useful.

## 2 Meeting Apologies/Attendance

The Chair noted the attendance and apologies as listed above.

The Chair noted that this was Mr Sharafi's last MAC meeting and thanked him for his time and contributions to the MAC.

## 3 Minutes of Meeting

The MAC minutes of the 23 November 2023 meeting were approved out of session and published on the Coordinator's website on 21 January 2024.

## 4 Action Items

The Chair noted that the BRCP WEM Procedure Review Working Group had been established and closed item 18/2023.

The Chair noted that there was an update provided on item 19/2023.

- Mr Stephens noted his preference to have a review of the effectiveness of the market sooner rather than later.

Ms Guzeleva noted that it was too early to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the new market. She noted that she would speak with Mr Stephen offline to discuss the best way to get Market Participants

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>views on the operation of the new market, and how to structure the conversation to ensure the MAC adds value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Schubert noted that the publicly available data is limited and that AEMO's website states that the WEM data cannot be relied on.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva advised that AEMO has been running a Real-Time Market Insights Forum that anyone is able to attend. She noted that it focuses on the operation of, and matters relating to, the WEM Real-Time Market (RTM) and the WEM Dispatch Engine (WEMDE) including providing Market Participants with analysis and insights regarding the operation and functionality of the RTM and WEMDE. She added that the details could be provided to the MAC.</p>	
	<p><b>ACTION: EPWA and Mr Stephen to discuss how an agenda item on the operation of the New WEM can be structured in a way that provides a benefit to both the MAC and the WEM more generally.</b></p>	<p><b>EPWA</b></p>
	<p><b>ACTION: EPWA to provide to the MAC the details of the next meeting of AEMO'S Real-Time Market Insights Forum.</b></p>	<p><b>EPWA</b></p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Market Development Forward Work Program</b></p> <p>The Chair noted the updates, and the paper was taken as read.</p>	
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Western Power Update</b></p> <p>Ms Jabiri advised that the intent of the presentation was to provide a high level overview on Western Power's infrastructure investment plans over the next few years.</p> <p>Mr Dawson introduced the presentation, noting that the North Region Energy Program (NREP) would be renamed to the Clean Energy Link North and that this was not new information being presented, but rather a refresh on information already announced.</p> <p>Mr Dawson presented Slide 2</p> <p>Mr Dawson presented Slide 3, noting the four key regions identified by the South West Interconnected System Demand Assessment (SWISDA) that require investment.</p> <p>Mr Dawson presented slide 4. Ms Jabiri clarified that the transmission towers indicated new infrastructure required, while the spanner and screwdriver symbol indicated significant maintenance and upgrades required.</p> <p>Mr Dawson presented slides 5 – 7.</p> <p>Mr Dawson presented Slide 8 and noted the challenges associated with energising the new and upgraded lines by 2027 and that the priority project status would assist due to the amended timing of NFIT approvals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mrs Papps noted that the transfer capacities as depicted on slide 7 differ to those in Western Power's Transmissions System Plan (TSP) and sought to also understand the difference between the transfer capacity versus the quantum of generation that can connect.</li> </ul>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Dawson noted that the figures were the latest that he was aware of and took the question on notice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs Papps asked if Western Power was available for one-on-one discussions about this.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Dawson responded yes.</p> <p>Mr Dawson presented Slide 9, noting that State and Commonwealth approvals were required, that community engagement had commenced and that overall timeframes were ambitious.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Schubert: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ noted that he was strongly supportive of the Program as it was improving utilisation and the capacity of existing assets;</li> <li>○ asked how a potential contingency would be treated with two 330 circuits on the same tower;</li> <li>○ questioned who will pay for the new transmission infrastructure;</li> <li>○ asked EPWA what has been done to manage peak demand, as shifting the peak to the middle of the day would negate the need to build so much infrastructure; and</li> <li>○ stated that there was a need for demand side management outside of the WEM.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Chair sought to clarify whether Mr Schubert comments related to the investments in the NREP or were in relation to future investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Schubert clarified that he considered that stage 1 made very good use of existing assets and improved their capacity, and that his comments pertained to stages 2 and 3.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva reminded the MAC that the work on implementing the Distributed Energy Resources (DER) Roadmap is considering these matters in relation to residential customers and that program of work is still underway. She added that the recently completed DSR Review considered demand response at the larger end of the market.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Schubert acknowledged the current work program and that there was not a need to discuss his comments right now, but considered that more focus was required otherwise it would be a missed opportunity.</li> <li>• Mr Sharafi noted, in regard to the contingency risk, that the double circuit will only be considered the same contingency if there are unusual situations in the same area, such as a bushfire.</li> <li>• Mr Stephen asked whether there was any forecast of potential disconnections during the construction process.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Dawson noted that a detailed outage plan had not yet been developed but that Western Power was currently working with AEMO on this and further information would be provided when available. He noted that options such as live line stringing were being looked at to minimise the effect of outages.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>The Chair noted that Western Power was open for members to continue the conversations one on one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following on from Mr Stephen’s question with regard to outages, Mr Alexander noted that it was important to have consideration for people along the corridor who already have preexisting issues with reliability and noted opposition in the NEM states to transmission/generation investment in regional areas.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Dawson responded that Western Power was very mindful of the need for community engagement and the need to maintain social licence throughout the whole process. He added that many of the corridors are existing but in new ones Western Power recognises that community support is integral.</p> <p>Ms Jabiri invited MAC members to follow up with Western Power through their existing contacts or herself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mrs Papps asked whether, given the difference with what was presented and the TSP, Western Power intended publishing an updated TSP given it was meant to be the single source of truth for investment decisions.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Jabiri took that question on notice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Huxtable asked if work was proceeding as per the schedule in the slides.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Dawson confirmed that was the case.</p>	
	<p><b>ACTION: Western Power to advise the MAC on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the reason for the discrepancy between the figures presented and the TSP;</li> <li>the difference between transfer capacity and the quantum of generation that can connect; and</li> <li>whether the current TSP will be updated.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Western Power</b></p>
	<p><b>ACTION: MAC Members to contact Western Power if they wish to discuss the matters in the presentation further.</b></p>	<p><b>MAC</b></p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Update on Working Groups</b></p> <p><b>(a) AEMO Procedure Change Working Group (APCWG)</b></p> <p>The Chair noted the updates, and the paper was taken as read.</p> <p>The Chair asked for an update on the next step, noting that the paper had a commencement date of 12 December 2023.</p> <p>Mr Maticka responded that he will take that offline and respond.</p>	
	<p><b>ACTION: AEMO to provide an update on the next steps, if any, and indicative date for the Procedure Change Proposal AEPC_2023_03.</b></p>	<p><b>AEMO</b></p>
	<p><b>(b) ERA’s BRCP (Benchmark Reserve Capacity Price) Procedure Working Group (BRCPWG)</b></p>	

Item	Subject	Action
------	---------	--------

The Chair noted the updates, and the paper was taken as read.

Dr Matt Shahnazari, the Chair of the BRCPWPWG, provided an update to the MAC and the next steps noting that:

- the ERA expects to commence formal consultation in April 2024 after publishing the Procedure Change Proposal.
- the intent is to have the new BRCP Procedure taking effect from July 2024, which would apply for the ERA's next BRCP determination (for the 2027-28 Capacity Year).
- the second meeting of the BRCPWPWG was held on 6 February 2024, with feedback sought on:
  - battery chemistry;
  - rate of return;
  - cashflow profiles; and
  - what adjustments might be needed to the annualisation process.
- the third BRCPWPWG meeting is expected to be held later this month and GHD had been engaged to provide advice on best cost parameters and technical specifications.

Dr Matt Shahnazari asked the MAC to contact him with any feedback.

**(c) Power System Security and Reliability Standards Working Group (PSSRSWG)**

The Chair noted the updates and minutes from the PSSRSWG meeting on 14 December 2023, and the papers for the 1 February 2024 PSSRSWG meeting.

Ms Guzeleva stated that a more formal update will be provided to the MAC once there are more substantive conclusions from the Stage 1 and Stage 2 work.

- Ms Jabiri noted that on 19 December 2023, Western Power withdrew a proposal it had submitted to the ERA to amend its Technical Rules.
- Ms Jabiri emphasised the importance of some of the proposed Technical Rules amendments relating to network reliability to be considered in the PSSR Standards Review. She added that some of those proposed amendments may influence Western Power's network investments and services to be delivered to the community. She noted the complexity and need to align timing for these decisions with the next Access Arrangement to optimise outcomes, and that Western Power was looking forward to working collaboratively to achieve this.

**(d) Demand Side Response Review (DSRRWG)**

The Chair noted that the Information Paper had been tabled at the MAC meeting for discussion, together with the Table of Outcomes in Attachment 1 to Item 7(d).

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Ms Guzeleva went through the proposals as outlined in the papers and asked for comments within the next week. She noted that an Exposure Draft of the Amending WEM Rules would be published shortly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Outcome 3, Mr Gaston asked whether consideration was given to having different market participants as the Financially Responsible Market Participant (FRMP) for separately registered components.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva said there had not been discussion on this matter, that views would be welcome through consultation on the Exposure Draft but that consultation with AEMO on whether systems and rules are set up to allow for that would be required.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the work of the Australian Energy Market Commission on Consumer Energy Resources benefits may be a valuable source of additional information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Outcome 3, Ms Papps asked if participants will be allowed to have separate registrations for the facility components behind a common connection point.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva confirmed this, but noted that it will be limited to one separately registered component and welcomed comments on this through the consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Outcome 4, Mr Sharifi noted that the dynamic baseline does not contemplate weekend dispatch for DSPs and that this may become more common.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva agreed that EPWA needed to consider a separate arrangement for weekends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Outcome 4, Mr Gaston asked if there were measures to prevent gaming and/or double dipping on IRCR.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva confirmed that there were and outlined the measures to prevent gaming as discussed in the papers. She noted that double dipping on IRCR will be prevented anyway as a single load DSP won't be able to provide capacity and reduce its IRCR at the same time, but that this may not be that easy to prevent for DSP aggregations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Outcome 11, Mr Sharafi said that AEMO would like some clarity on the scope of this review.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva noted that advice from AEMO officers was that the review of telemetry requirements for Loads providing contingency reserve was progressing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Outcome 12, Mr Sharifi noted that AEMO considers that the rotation method should be defined in procedures.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva acknowledged AEMO's position but said that the rest of the DSRRWG members did not agree with AEMO's view.</p> <p>The Chair stated that the minutes of the working groups are useful in helping people to further understand the discussions that took place on each Outcome. No further comments were received.</p>	



Item	Subject	Action
	<b>ACTION: Any further comments on the DSR Review Information Paper to be provided to EPWA by Wednesday, 14 February 2024.</b>	<b>MAC</b>

**(e) WEM Investment Certainty (WIC) Review Working Group (WICRWG) Update**

The Chair noted that the MAC was asked to note the minutes and update on the WICRWG meetings and to provide comments on the proposals.

The Chair noted that Mr Peake had left the meeting but had earlier provided his support for the work undertaken thus far on the WIC Review via email.

Ms Guzeleva reminded the MAC of the following:

- that the intent of the review is to determine whether there are sufficient incentives and certainty for investment;
- the review has five initiatives, and the rationale for including the Reserve Capacity Price (RCP) curve is to ensure that, in the context of everything else, it sends sufficient signals for investment when there is a capacity shortfall, but that there are not perverse outcomes for consumers during a capacity oversupply;
- oversupply was unlikely to happen but that it had previously been an issue, such as prior to the 2018 RCP reforms;
- EPWA had reviewed what other markets are doing, particularly those with Reserve Capacity Mechanisms (RCM);
- the WICRWG was made up of over 20 members from all parts of the industry, including consumer representatives, and there were quite different views over the spectrum.

Mr Robinson presented Slides 12-17. He noted that options 2, 3 and 4 are variations of curves with inflection points and varying numbers of segments, and that option 7 had a smooth curve.

Mr Robinson presented slides 24 - 26.

Regarding slide 26, he noted that in the decision to retain gross-CONE, rather than move to net-CONE, there is some acknowledgement that there are infra-marginal rents being gained in the energy market by the BRCP reference technology. This balances off having the RCP at 100% of the BRCP, rather than higher than the BRCP, at the Reserve Capacity Target.

- Mr Stephen asked if infra-marginal rent meant that the cost of generating is lower than the market clearing price.

Mr Robinson confirmed this.

- Mr Schubert agreed that there is no need to support additional investment when the target is being met and indicated his support.

Mr Robinson presented Slide 27 – Absolute zero point. He emphasised that this is concerned with an oversupply of capacity



Item	Subject	Action
------	---------	--------

credits, not of nameplate capacity, which is relevant when renewable generators are only getting a proportion of their nameplate capacity in capacity credits under the Relevant Level Method (RLM).

Mr Robinson referred to the international curves (slide 46) and highlighted the higher absolute zero point in the WEM compared to most other markets.

- Mr Maticka acknowledged the desire to avoid overbuild but noted that, in a very small market like the WEM, a 5% margin is very different compared with a 5% margin in some of the other much larger markets, as relatively small number of projects could move the RCP quite far along the curve, and asked Mr Robinson to elaborate on the choice of 5% over 15%.

Mr Robinson noted that the international comparison is 105 to 115, which was, as Mr Maticka noted, 250MW to 750MW in the WEM. What is proposed is to retain the absolute zero point at 130%, which is around 1,500MW in the WEM. Mr Robinson suggested that perhaps Mr Maticka was referring to the deadband, to which Mr Maticka agreed.

Mr Robinson moved to slide 28 and clarified that the proposal was for a 10% deadband, symmetrical around the target, noting that there were two alternatives to this:

- to have no deadband, with the curve sloped at all points but there was concern that a small change in capacity (in one project) could significantly change the price, which was the point to having the deadband in the first place; or
- to have no price curve and give everyone who enters a certain amount.

Mr Robinson noted that the intent was to achieve balance between providing certainty with providing investment signals.

Mr Robinson noted that with the 10% deadband that amounted to around 500MW and, when compared to the size of current plants in the SWIS, the loss of the largest Facility in the SWIS will still be within that dead band, The consensus of the group was that this seemed reasonable and that the dead band should be symmetric on either side of the target.

- Mr Maticka considered that anything less than that target is an issue, which would require AEMO to procure capacity to make up that difference. That would infer that the BRCP is not providing sufficient signal to build, resulting in a shortfall. Mr Maticka sought to understand why keeping the dead band symmetrical would ensure there is sufficient investment.

Mr Robinson explained that the WICRWG had considered the use of a dead band from an investment perspective and had indicated a preference for the certainty it provides. He noted that this comes back to the question of whether the capacity price on its own is the factor that draws in new investment and the WICRWG considered that this was not the case and that there are a range of factors.

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Clarifying why the dead band should be symmetric around the target, Ms Guzeleva noted that the intent is to make sure that the interest of consumers and investors are properly balanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Alexander noted that the curves depicted did not have a symmetrical deadband.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Robinson agreed that the initial curves on slide 15 did not have a symmetrical deadband, but that the final proposal on slide 31 did.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Gaston provided his general support for the proposal and asked Mr Robinson to elaborate on the option to base the floor on the cost of debt.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva noted that this was not part of the proposal, rather that it was a suggestion made during the WICRWG discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Gaston considered that going to absolute zero makes sense economically and is best for customers. However, a debt-based floor would provide more certainty for the new capacity that is needed now. Mr Gaston believed that if financiers see a chance of the RCP going to zero, this is what they will model scenarios on.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva noted that this proposal had the most discussion in the WICRWG and that it will go out for public consultation.</p> <p>Mr Robinson added that in the WICRWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some parties considered that it does not matter what the average is, if it can go to zero, that is what investors care about; and</li> <li>other parties considered that there is always an amount of risk in making an investment.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Robinson continued that ability within the WEM Rules to lock in a fixed price for 5 years takes care of some of the potential downside risks. He added that one of the other initiatives to be considered within the WIC review was a 10-year fixed price for new technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Schubert noted that the likelihood of a 30% excess in the next 5-10 years is low, and as such the risk of hitting absolute zero is low right now.</li> <li>Mr Alexander noted that he had some sympathy for the position of investors, but considered that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there was a need for a curve that would endure in the future;</li> <li>there needs to be an investment signal and protection for consumers and that absolute zero is very important;</li> <li>there were other things required in this transition beyond the changes to the RCP; and</li> <li>additional changes such as moving the target and a higher BRCP were all promoting investment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr Alexander pointed to the escalation of capacity payments per MW (slide 35) and noted the need for this to be sensitive to</li> </ul>	

Item	Subject	Action
------	---------	--------

consumers. He strongly supported a sensible absolute zero, with a cap and dead bands set at appropriate points.

Ms Guzeleva noted that without a robust investment signal in the RCM, AEMO would have to procure Non-co-Optimised Essential System Service and Supplementary Reserve Capacity which were far more expensive.

Ms Guzeleva noted that the point is to bring capacity through the RCM because ad hoc mechanisms that are not designed for that purpose increase costs dramatically and that increases investment uncertainty for industry in Western Australia (i.e. industrial load customers). She noted that it is important for the system to stay reliable, and that there are other side mechanisms that are happening in WA and in other states to achieve this, and it's important to make the RCM work for everyone.

Ms Guzeleva noted that there was a desire to ensure that consumers do not pay for oversupply, and that at the start of the market the curve ensured that every MW of surplus translated to a commensurate reduction to consumer bills so we never paid, as a whole, for capacity that was not required.

The Chair summarised that Mr Alexander was stating that the market needs to be enduring through the transition and there might be extra support required.

Ms Guzeleva agreed that there are other things that needed to be done, but that this discussion was specially relating to the RCP curve.

- Mr Alexander added that the curve should not be doing too much of the work.

Ms Guzeleva agreed that the curve should not create a barrier for investment that needs to be fixed with other mechanisms.

- Mr Gaston agreed that equity should be at risk but that a debt floor provides some surety for the debt funders and he would prefer that over a 5 or 10 year guarantee.

The Chair noted that the points made had been picked and EPWA should consider how that was addressed prior to public consultation.

Mr Robinson discussed slide 29 (capacity shortfall at which the price cap is met), slide 30 (differentiating Peak and Flexible Capacity) and slide 31 (proposal summary). He noted that in the WICRWG meeting it was pointed out that the Flexible Capacity target should be lower than the Peak Capacity target and questioned the need for the deadband at all. He noted that the final proposal is seeking to maintain some signal for the Flexible Capacity product even if there are issues with getting enough Peak Capacity.

Setting the Peak Capacity cap at 1.5 and the Flexible Capacity cap at 1.6 is similar to what other jurisdictions are doing.

Mr Robinson presented slides 32-37, and summarised that the RCP curve is not the only thing influencing investment, but that it needed to be consistent in sending appropriate investment signals.

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Mr Robinson noted that the team was in the initial stages of modelling investment incentives, market revenues and consumer impacts.</p> <p>The Chair summarised that the MAC was supportive of the proposals going out for public consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Gaston noted the need to be mindful of the impact of increasing prices on demand destruction, either arising from industry shutting down or investing in generation behind the meter. Mr Gaston added that in the early 2000s entire industries left when gas prices in North America went to \$16 per kilojoule.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair asked if the modelling would look at the impact on prices.</p> <p>Ms Guzeleva noted that all elements of the cost stack are going up, and that the modelling would only be looking at WIC initiatives.</p> <p>Mr Robinson replied that the overall cost of electricity will be modelled, and that in the long run energy prices should come down precipitously and that will be modelled. He noted that the reason for the review is that previous modelling has shown that if the Reserve Capacity Target is met with renewable generation then the energy price would collapse.</p> <p>Noting that residential prices are regulated by the Government, Ms Guzeleva added that the modelling will make some projection of how prices in the energy market would drop with the penetration of renewables, but she did not consider that this will address the issue that Mr Gaston has raised.</p> <p>Mr Robinson noted that there was information in the appendix for MAC members to further understand the context for the proposals.</p> <p>The Chair summarised that, aside from the few controversial issues that were likely to remain, there was general support from the MAC for the approach that is being taken. The Chair thanked Mr Robinson.</p>	
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Rule Changes</b></p> <p><b>(a) Overview of Rule Change Proposals</b></p> <p>The Chair noted the updates, and the paper was taken as read.</p>	
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>General Business</b></p> <p>The Chair noted that the 21 March 2024 meeting will be an online and that the 2 May 2024 MAC will be held in person.</p>	

**The meeting closed at 11:28am.**