



## Minutes

|                       |                                 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Meeting Title:</b> | Market Advisory Committee (MAC) |
| <b>Date:</b>          | 25 July 2024                    |
| <b>Time:</b>          | 9:30am – 11:25am                |
| <b>Location:</b>      | Microsoft Teams online meeting  |

| <b>Attendees</b>            | <b>Representing in MAC</b>                  | <b>Comment</b>             |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Sally McMahon               | Chair                                       |                            |
| Amy Tait                    | Australian Energy Market Operator           |                            |
| Katie McKenzie              | Australian Energy Market Operator           |                            |
| Genevieve Teo               | Synergy                                     |                            |
| Noel Schubert               | Small-Use Consumer Representative           |                            |
| Christopher Alexander       | Small-Use Consumer Representative           |                            |
| Zahra Jabiri                | Network Operator                            |                            |
| Jacinda Papps               | Energy Producer                             |                            |
| Adam Stephen                | Energy Producer                             |                            |
| Paul Arias                  | Energy Producer                             |                            |
| Patrick Peake               | Energy Retailer                             |                            |
| Tim Edwards                 | Energy Retailer                             |                            |
| Geoff Gaston                | Energy Retailer                             |                            |
| Peter Huxtable              | Contestable Customer                        |                            |
| Rajat Sarawat               | Economic Regulation Authority<br>(observer) |                            |
| Noel Ryan                   | Minister (observer)                         |                            |
| <b>Non-member attendees</b> | <b>From</b>                                 | <b>Comment</b>             |
| Dora Guzeleva               | EPWA  | MAC Secretariat            |
| Laura Koziol                | EPWA  | MAC Secretariat            |
| Shelley Worthington         | EPWA  | MAC Secretariat            |
| Sean McAvoy                 | EPWA  | MAC Secretariat            |
| Jenny Laidlaw               | EPWA  | Observer for Agenda Item 9 |

|                  |                                      |                                   |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Wayne Trumble    | Newmont Mining                       | Presenter for Agenda Item 5       |
| Aaron Walker     | Chamber of Minerals and Energy (CME) | Presenter for Agenda Item 5       |
| Kate Ryan        | Australian Energy Market Operator    | Presenter for Agenda Item 6 and 7 |
| Douglas Birse    | Australian Energy Market Operator    | Observer for Agenda Item 9        |
| <b>Apologies</b> | <b>From</b>                          | <b>Comment</b>                    |
| No apologies     |                                      |                                   |

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Subject</b>  | <b>Action</b> |
|-------------|---|---------------|
| <b>1</b>    | <b>Welcome</b>  |               |
|             | <p>The Chair opened the meeting with an Acknowledgement of Country.</p> <p>The Chair noted that she had no conflicts to declare.</p> <p>The Chair noted her role as Commissioner at the Australian Energy Market Commission and that the views or advice provided by the MAC to the Coordinator do not necessarily represent the views of the Chair.</p> <p>The Chair noted the Competition and Consumer Law obligations of the MAC, inviting members to bring to her attention any issues should they arise.</p> <p>The Chair noted that MAC operates for the good of the Wholesale Electricity Market (WEM) Objectives and members are to participate in the interests of the stakeholder group they represent. Any specific views pertaining to an organisation can be provided through the applicable consultation processes.</p> |               |
| <b>2</b>    | <b>Meeting Apologies/Attendance</b>   |               |
|             | The Chair noted the attendance as listed above.   |               |
| <b>3</b>    | <b>Minutes of Meeting 2024_06_13</b>  |               |
|             | The 13 June 2024 meeting minutes were approved out of session and published on the Coordinator's website on 23 July 2024.   |               |
| <b>4</b>    | <b>Action Items</b>   |               |
|             | <p>The Chair noted the open Action Items in the paper.</p> <p>The Chair noted that an update for item 2/2024 would be provided under Agenda Item 10 and any additional matters arising from that discussion would be recorded as a new item. Therefore, item 2/2024 could be closed.</p>  |               |

| Item | Subject   | Action |
|------|---|--------|
| 5    | <p data-bbox="290 257 778 293"><b>Wholesale Electricity Market costs</b></p> <p data-bbox="290 309 1193 376">The Chair invited Mr Trumble<sup>1</sup> from Newmont Mining and Mr Walker<sup>2</sup> from CME<sup>3</sup> to present.</p> <p data-bbox="290 392 1120 459">Mr Walker and Mr Trumble presented the slides provided in the MAC papers.</p> <p data-bbox="290 474 1168 542">Mr Walker noted that reducing emissions through electrification will require:</p> <ul data-bbox="290 557 1197 728" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- decarbonisation of existing electricity generation;</li> <li>- conversion of non-electricity energy use to electricity; and</li> <li>- an expanded supply of low emission electricity to provide for new industries such as critical minerals processing.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="290 743 1225 974">Mr Walker noted that progress is being made on lowering emissions with the share of renewable generation growing from 15% to 35% since 2018. However, recent price and reliability developments are alarming. Wholesale electricity prices have doubled within three years and Essential System Services (ESS) and Non-Co-optimised Essential System Services (NCESS) costs have tripled since the new WEM market started in October 2023.</p> <p data-bbox="290 990 1241 1220">Mr Walker noted that CME had difficulties assessing reliability developments because the Australian Energy Market Operator's (AEMO's) Quarterly Energy Dynamics did not provide consistent metrics on reliability. CME is engaging with AEMO to get better reliability data. However, with AEMO procuring supplementary reserve capacity and Demand Side Programmes starting to be dispatched more often, CME is concerned that reliability is decreasing.</p> <p data-bbox="290 1236 651 1272">Mr Walker noted that CME:</p> <ul data-bbox="290 1288 1216 1458" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- commissioned an independent analysis forecasting total electricity costs in the South West Interconnected System (SWIS) until 2042;</li> <li>- will not publicly release its results for at least another month; and</li> <li>- is willing to provide individual bilateral briefings.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="290 1473 1184 1509">Mr Walker provided the following high-level overview of the analysis.</p> <p data-bbox="290 1525 1193 1561">Three scenarios were modelled based on the following assumptions:</p> <ul data-bbox="290 1576 1161 1688" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- demand grows as per the SWIS Demand Assessment's future ready demand scenario;</li> <li>- all coal plants exit by 2030;</li> </ul> |        |

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr Trumble oversees Newmont Mining's Australian energy supply which includes the supply of the Boddington gold mine. This mine consumes approximately 5% of the WEM's 18 terawatt hours (TWh), making Newmont Mining a major consumer.

<sup>2</sup> Mr Walker is CME's Head of Economics and Manager of the Industry Competitiveness and Economics portfolio. Mr Walker is leading CME's work regarding the decarbonisation of the WEM, the proposed Goldfield's regional network and the Pilbara energy transformation.

<sup>3</sup> The CME is the peak representative body for the Western Australia (WA) mining and resource sector with its members, including Newmont Mining, accounting for approximately 60% of the WEM's industrial demand.

| Item | Subject  | Action |
|------|--|--------|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no nuclear, hydrogen or hydro generation in WA; and</li> <li>- any transmission, generation and storage are built on time and within budget.</li> </ul>   |        |
|      | <p>Scenario 1 - unconstrained scenario:</p>  |        |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assesses the lowest cost to meet expected energy demand;</li> <li>- applies no constraints regarding emissions or renewable generation; and</li> <li>- allows the build of new gas generation.</li> </ul>   |        |
|      | <p>Scenario 2 – aggressive decarbonisation</p>   |        |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% renewable generation by 2030;</li> <li>- 90% renewable generation by 2040; and</li> <li>- allows the build of new peaking gas generation.</li> </ul>  |        |
|      | <p>Scenario 3 – no new gas scenario:</p>   |        |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% renewable generation by 2030;</li> <li>- 90% renewable generation by 2040; and</li> <li>- no new gas generation.</li> </ul>   |        |
|      | <p>Mr Walker shared some high-level outcomes from the different scenarios that will be published in an upcoming CME public report in September 2024.</p>   |        |
|      | <p>Mr Walker noted that transitioning the SWIS to meet the forecasted demand over the next 20 years will be more expensive than historically and that prices are very unlikely to return to the levels seen in the 2010s.</p>  |        |
|      | <p>Mr Walker considered that the forecasted increase in electricity prices over the medium term could impact the viability of existing and new resource projects. Therefore, as a next step, CME will attempt to compare the forecasted WEM prices to current prices in other jurisdictions to assess competitiveness. Mr Walker noted that AEMO's Q2 Quarterly Energy Dynamics report showed prices were already reaching, or perhaps exceeding levels forecasted by CME's analysis.</p>                  |        |
|      | <p>Mr Trumble presented a back-of-the-envelope analysis on the expected short term increase of the delivered cost of energy in the WEM from 2023 to 2025. Mr Trumble highlighted that, in his analysis, every cost component, except the costs for the Renewable Energy Target, was significantly increasing causing the delivered cost of energy to increase from approximately \$150 per MWh in 2023 to \$270 per MWh in 2025. Mr Trumble expressed his concern about the pace of the cost increase.</p> |        |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs Papps highlighted that the current ESS costs are not comparable to the ESS costs before the start of the new WEM. Under the previous regimes, Synergy received a significant WA Government funded system security transition payment as a subsidy to compensate it for its role in maintaining security and reliability. Under the new WEM, the ESS are provided through the market and</li> </ul>  |        |

| Item | Subject  | Action |
|------|--|--------|
|      | <p>costs are recovered through the WEM instead of taxpayers' money. Mrs Papps noted that the forward estimates show that the Synergy subsidy is reducing. Therefore, Mrs Papps recommended that any comparisons of ESS costs should be like-for-like as the new WEM could be reflecting the true market price.</p> <p>Mr Trumble stated that in any case, the direct costs to consumers have increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Gaston noted that ESS costs are approximately \$2 per MWh in the NEM compared to \$15-\$30 per MWh in the WEM. Mr Gaston also considered that many small and medium businesses will be moving back to Synergy's standard tariff and that this will result in an increase in Synergy's subsidy.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair considered that a discussion of each cost element would not be useful in the discussion today. She noted that her takeaway from the presentation was that industry is experiencing increases in electricity costs in the SWIS at a greater rate than in the past. So, the focus should be on the options to address this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Gaston noted that his experience with small customers aligned with Mr Trumble's analysis. Mr Gaston considered that the pace of the cost increase is not justified based on the existing generation fleet. Mr Gaston believed that, if the trend continues, WA will lose a lot of industry and will not maintain its mineral processing industry.</li> <li>Mr Alexander stated that the small-use consumer experience also aligns with Mr Trumble's analysis. Recent survey figures from Energy Consumer Australia showed that 40-50% of those earning over \$150 thousand a year report financial pressure. Even people supporting the energy transition are concerned about its affordability.</li> <li>Mr Schubert noted that he was also concerned about the recent increase in electricity costs.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair concluded that the increasing electricity costs are concerning, and that the discussion was a good reminder that the MAC must consider electricity costs when making recommendations to the Coordinator of Energy.</p> |        |

---

**6 Draft Rule Change Proposal – Amendments to the framework for determination of AEMO's budget**

Mrs Ryan presented AEMO's Draft Rule Change Proposal.

Mrs Ryan acknowledged that it may look like AEMO is trying to reduce regulatory oversight at a time of increasing costs. However, the costs of the current process are adding to the cost pressure on participants.

Mrs Ryan stated that:

- it costs AEMO around \$1 million to seek budget adjustments.
- AEMO found that independent system operators globally are generally governed via two methods:

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

- for-profit making system operators are usually subject to incentive-based regulation or competitive procurement process; and
  - government-owned not-for-profit system operators for which costs are usually set via a government budget process;
- however, AEMO does not fit in either category as it is a not-for-profit entity subject to independent regulation.

Mrs Ryan noted that some MAC members have already provided feedback since the circulation of the papers. Consequently, AEMO will make the following amendments to the Draft Rule Change Proposal:

- in the new proposed clause 2.22.3 add the principles of prudence and efficiency; and
- expand the role of stakeholders by allowing Rule Participants to identify major projects that would trigger the process.

Mrs Ryan advised that AEMO is asking the MAC for:

- suggestions for a more specific definition of a major project; and
- feedback on whether AEMO is the right party to determine if something is a major project.

Mrs Ryan noted that the goal of the proposal is to provide the MAC with greater visibility of the change agenda and the opportunity to influence it more proactively. Most of AEMO's projects link to AEMO's functions under the WEM Rules. However, there is always the opportunity to adjust the timing, prioritisation and in some cases scope of these projects in a way that is more beneficial for stakeholders.

- Mr Alexander believed that the proposal provided good principles that should be considered in the budget development. However, he had a few concerns:
  - transparency and stakeholder confidence can only be achieved through the oversight of an entity like the ERA;
  - without the ERA asking AEMO the right questions stakeholders could not assess AEMO's budget;
  - the ERA's power requiring AEMO to provide greater detail, like AEMO's internal labour costs in AEMO's recent in-period adjustment of its budget (AR6), is crucial;
  - recent years have been turbulent for the WEM with AEMO's restructures, the Energy Transformation Strategy, and the recent economic shocks. Due to this, he considered that regulation in the WEM should not change hastily.
- Mr Arias stated that he agreed with many of Mr Alexander's comments. Mr Arias expressed concern that the proposed new framework would not result in lower overall costs as it introduced several new processes and working groups. Mr Arias considered that the ERA's oversight of AEMO's processes is more important than the stakeholder's ability to influence AEMO's projects.

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

- Mr Peake supported AEMO’s proposal as he considered it provided a smooth pricing path going forward.
- Mr Trumble asked how the new proposal would address budget overspent, noting that AEMO spent its last three-year budget in the first two years.

Mrs Ryan noted that the current framework does not prescribe how the three-year budget is spent over time and does allow for in-period budget adjustments. Mrs Ryan noted that in the original AR-6 proposal, AEMO did not receive everything it asked for and had advised the ERA that it would likely return seeking greater funding. AEMO had also signalled during its first in-period submission that more funding would likely be needed.

Mrs Ryan noted that AEMO was held accountable to an annual internal budget for the WEM and should be held accountable to the same budget externally by stakeholders. The proposed new framework would align the external budget with AEMO’s internal process of an annual confirmed budget with a forward trajectory. Mrs Ryan considered that, in that trajectory, AEMO would be able to signal costs it was aware of that the ERA would not be able to approve under the current framework because of the degree of uncertainty.

- Mr Trumble asked how AEMO’s cost compares to other market operators, noting that AEMO’s NEM budget is \$200 million for 185 TWh while AEMO’s WEM budget is \$100 million for 18 TWh.

Mrs Ryan advised that AEMO compared its overall costs to its peers. In 2021, AEMO was one of the lowest cost system operators. However, as AEMO’s costs increased due to new functions, AEMO’s costs are now within the middle of its international peers. Mrs Ryan acknowledged that in the WEM the cost per MWh is higher than in other systems. However, that is inherent in a small system. Mrs Ryan considered that, as energy consumption increases in the SWIS because of the energy transition, the cost per MWh should decrease. Mrs Ryan stated that AEMO aims to keep its costs within the international benchmarks.

- Mr Trumble noted that the proposal did not include any key performance indicators (KPIs) for AEMO and asked if other system operators were held to KPIs.

Mrs Ryan advised that she wasn’t aware if other system operators have KPIs. Mrs Ryan considered that the Coordinator’s three-yearly review of the WEM effectiveness would measure AEMO against KPIs

In response to a question from Mr Stephen, Mrs Ryan advised that for its NEM operations, AEMO sets its budget without any formal external governance.

Mrs Ryan noted that:

- AEMO would reflect the MAC’s feedback in the proposal and take on board any further feedback MAC members would offer after the meeting; and

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

- AEMO has requested that the due date for its AR7 budget submission be extended to 31 January 2025 to allow for the Rule Change Proposal to be processed.

The Chair asked if there was an opportunity to prevent duplication of budget information if the information used for AEMO’s internal decision-making processes could be shared to address the transparency issue. The Chair summarised that Mr Peake was supportive of increasing flexibility for smoothing the budget out over the years. However, other MAC members were concerned about effective oversight without the ERA and linking the budget to deliverables.

---

## 7 Proposal to establish AEMO Major Projects (AMP) Working Group

Mrs Ryan advised that this proposal is modelled on AEMO’s NEM Reform Delivery Committee and asked the MAC for feedback.

- Mrs Papps was supportive of the proposal and suggested that:
  - the priorities of the implementation of five-minute settlement and the implementation of the outcomes of the cost allocation review should be discussed first by this group. Mrs Papps noted that she was not convinced that the costs of these changes were justified by the benefits; and
  - the working group should be chaired independently and not by AEMO.
- Mr Arias supported the proposal. However, he did not believe it should be linked to the proposed removal of the ERA’s oversight in the budget process.
- Ms Jabiri supported the proposal and was looking forward to seeing the proposed terms of reference (ToR).

The Chair noted that the MAC was supportive of the proposal and suggested that AEMO should develop draft ToRs for discussion at a future MAC meeting.

---

**ACTION: Provide a Draft ToR for the AMP Working Group**

**AEMO**

---

## 8 Update on Working Groups

### (a) AEMO procedure Change Working Group (APCWG)

The paper was taken as read.

Ms Tait advised that AEMO was working on three procedure changes regarding dispatch compliance, supplementary capacity, and network access quantities. They are expected to be released for consultation in the next weeks.

- Mr Arias noted that feedback for the supplementary capacity provisions had been provided through different forums. However, the note for consultation was sent out without any updates on the procedure. Mr Arias suggested that the consultation should build on the previous feedback.
-



| Item | Subject   | Action |
|------|---|--------|
|      | The Chair asked if AEMO could include a section for upcoming procedure changes in its standing paper. |        |

|  |   |             |
|--|---|-------------|
|  | <b>ACTION: AEMO to include a section for upcoming procedure changes in the APCWG update</b> | <b>AEMO</b> |
|--|---|-------------|

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

Ms Guzeleva advised that there are two working groups for this project:

- the Power System Security and Reliability Standards Working Group (PSSRSWG), which is a MAC working group; and
- a technical working group, consisting of AEMO, EPWA and Western Power, which generally meets weekly.

The PSSRSWG is meeting after this MAC meeting on 25 July 2024.

The PSSRSWG has not met for a while because the issues, (including system trends, network planning arrangements, grid forming and how will everything be brought under the WEM Rules) the technical working group needed to resolve first had been more complex than expected. Therefore, the draft consultation paper will be discussed with the MAC in November 2024 and not September as originally planned.

**9 FCESS Cost Investigation**

Ms Guzeleva presented the summary of identified issues on slide 5 from the TDOWG meeting presentation and asked for further feedback.

Mr Gaston asked if Frequency Co-optimised Essential System Services (FCESS) uplift payment for the Rate of Change of Frequency (RoCoF) could be removed immediately instead of waiting until November 2024.

Mr Schubert supported the implementation of the proposed solutions as soon as possible to reduce the cost to consumers.

Ms Guzeleva advised that all changes needed to allow for proper consultation and time for AEMO to implement the necessary system changes. Therefore, the proposed solutions could not apply until 20 November 2024.

In response to a question from Mrs Papps, Ms Guzeleva advised that under the proposal, if someone is dispatched only for RoCoF then they will be entitled to uplift payments.

Mr Birse further clarified that this uplift payment would not apply when a facility is dispatched because their RoCoF offer is priced at \$0 but when AEMO intervenes for the purposes of RoCoF control services only.

Mr Schubert asked if there was consideration to reintroduce the previous second energy price cap that was based on gas.

Ms Guzeleva considered that, with the proposed changes to the market power mitigation strategy where offers are based on the efficient variable cost, there is likely no need to reintroduce the Maximum STEM Price. However, if market behaviour does not improve the decision can be revisited.

| Item             | Subject   | Action |
|------------------|---|--------|
|                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Edwards did not support reintroducing the previous cap based on gas due to economic reasons.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva reiterated that it was not planned to reintroduce a gas based energy price cap and invited Mr Edwards to discuss this topic offline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Arias considered that the offer construction is not a straightforward process, but it is a dynamic calculation that must consider many variables. Mr Arias noted that over the last three months, Newgen Neerabup had been dispatched to start more than twice a day and sometimes even up to nine times and that is not how the generator was designed to operate. Therefore, outages are brought forward, and this flows through to the variable costs that must be considered.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva agreed variable costs are not assumed to be static and that this was expected to be reflected in the ERA's amended offer construction guidelines. Ms Guzeleva noted that the fast start service was an already available option for participants to mitigate some of the issues around minimum generation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Stephen noted that Market Participants structure their bids to avoid dispatch under minimum generation but that AEMO's dispatch engine does not recognise minimum generation. This should be considered for future improvements.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva advised that this issue would be considered in stage 2.</p> |        |
| <p><b>10</b></p> | <p><b>WEM Effectiveness Review</b></p> <p>The paper was taken as read.</p> <p>Ms Guzeleva advised MAC members that EPWA will start the WEM Effectiveness Review once the FCESS Cost Investigation is completed. Ms Guzeleva explained that EPWA intends to have individual conversations to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>what stakeholders believe should be included in the WEM Effectiveness Report to the Minister;</li> <li>the effectiveness of the governance bodies: AEMO, Western Power and ERA and what criteria to use for the assessment; and</li> <li>how the market is operating.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva asked the MAC for feedback and the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mrs Papps suggested to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the effectiveness of the outage planning process and how the new reliability threshold in the new Planning Criterion is applied. Mrs Papps expressed concerns that the current outage planning process might be too conservative leading to outages being rejected. This may, over the long term, decrease reliability, increase costs, and increase technical issues; and</li> <li>the additional RoCoF cost which was intended to be deployed when it was more efficient than dispatching contingency raise.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |        |

| Item | Subject  | Action |
|------|--|--------|
|      | <p>However, generators are currently experiencing high additional RoCoF costs with no savings on the contingency reserve raise costs.</p> <p>Ms Guzeleva acknowledged Mrs Papps' concerns, noting that the additional RoCoF costs could also be the subject of the Coordinator's upcoming FCESS Review, depending on the timing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Alexander suggested that cost transparency should be considered as for many stakeholders it is unclear what drives the costs they are facing.</li> <li>• Mr Stephen was uncertain if it was within the review's scope but considered that the WEM's overall impact on the WA economy should be assessed.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Guzeleva acknowledged Mr Stephen's suggestion but considered that it might be too early to have an economic impact study, given that the new WEM commenced in October 2023. The focus of this report is to ensure that the WEM is operating effectively and efficiently. However, Ms Guzeleva noted that she would discuss options to address this issue with Mr Stephen in a one-on-one meeting.</p> |        |

---

## 11 Market Development Forward Work Program

The paper was taken as read. The Chair asked if any MAC member had anything to discuss, but no one raised any issues.

The Chair asked if the Coordinator's response to the reports on the MAC Review and the Procedure Change Process Review would be presented to the MAC once available.

Ms Guzeleva advised that the response to the report on the Procedure Change Process Review is due for publication at the end of July. Presently, there is no timeframe for the publication of the response to the report on the MAC Review.

---

## 12 General Business

The Chair asked if there was any issue having the 17 October 2024 meeting in-person or if 5 September 2024 was preferred for an in-person meeting.

- Mr Huxtable advised that he would not be available for the 5 September meeting and preferred the October meeting for the in-person meeting.
- Mr Stephen advised he preferred September for the in-person meeting as he could only attend online in October.
- Mr Peake noted he would be happy to have all MAC meetings in-person.

Ms Guzeleva advised that there was not a lot on the agenda for the September meeting.

MAC members expressed support for an in-person October meeting.

---

**The meeting closed at 11:25am.**