

Date: Tuesday 28 July 2020	Start time: 1pm	Finish time: 3pm	Venue: Webex videoconference	Meeting no: 18
Facilitator: Gerard Reilly (Powerlink)		Minutes: Tanya Fowler (Powerlink)		
Attendees: Chris Hazzard (St Vincent de Paul Society) Claire Hamilton (Shell) Henry Gorniak (CS Energy) Mark Grenning (Energy Users Association of Australia) Robyn Robinson (Council on the Ageing) David Hiette (BHP Billiton) Ian Christmas (Edify Energy) Georgina Davis (Queensland Farmers' Federation) John Gardner (CSIRO) Observers: Bev Hughson (Australian Energy Regulator Consumer Challenge Panel (AER CCP)) Mark Henley (AER CCP) David Prins (AER CCP) Slavko Jovanoski (AER) Powerlink panel members: Gerard Reilly Jenny Harris Chris Evans Narelle Fortescue	Apologies: Shelley Ashe (Energy Consumers Australia) Andrew Barger (Queensland Resources Council) Stephen Jones (Energy Queensland) Norike Ganhao (Powerlink)		Powerlink presenters: Matthew Myers Paul Simshauser Gerard Reilly Dana Boxall Greg Hesse	
Attachments will include all documents provided to panel members at the meeting including: PowerPoint presentation and pre-reading documents				

1. Welcome and introductions

- Gerard Reilly, General Manager Communications

Summary:

- Introduction of Shell's representative Claire Hamilton who has replaced Ayden Rye. Claire brings a wealth of engineering experience to the panel.
- Nicole Maguire announced a new partnership with Energy Queensland and Indigenous Consumer Assistance Network (ICAN) based up in Cairns with the assistance of Chris Hazzard and Robyn Robinson's input. The partnership will be providing seven financial counselling scholarships across regional Queensland and e-modules in energy literacy and energy efficiency to be able to help customers with their bills.
- A new internal training course under our "Great place to work" principle is incorporating customer perspectives. We are calling on participation from panel members who are willing to assist with a customer focus video used internally only.

2. Update from Revenue Proposal Reference Group (RPRG)

- Mark Grenning, Customer Panel and RPRG member

Summary:

- Powerlink is exploring options to best manage their insurance costs while ensuring a prudent and efficient level of cover is maintained.
- Interesting presentation on global insurance update from Marsh which looked at influences to the insurance a COVID world. No different to the capital adequacy issues around the banking system.
- Marsh are saying they are doing a lot more due diligence on the parties that they are willing to insure and basically COVID-19 is regarded as the biggest loss ever in the global market.
- The Pacific Composite Insurance Pricing Change was of interest. Global insurance prices have been increasing since Q1 2017, so it's not a recent pattern – just in the last 12 months or so – it's a trend that has been increasing. We've just seen the 10th or 11th consecutive quarter of price increases, but the price increase this year is the largest in that period of time. In the Pacific region, overall insurance pricing in Q1 2020 increased 23%.
- The topic of our last meeting was depreciation tracking. Powerlink currently uses a weighted average remaining life approach for depreciation in its revenue building blocks and they're looking to change to a year-by-year tracking method which is the more accurate measure of asset recovery and better reflects the underlying nature of those assets.
- Initial analysis presented to us showed that adopting that new procedure would result in additional revenue of \$20 million per annum or 3% over the forthcoming regulatory period which is about \$2 per annum increase for the average residential customer.
- The next topic was around business IT. IT Capex for 23-27 is currently forecast to be similar to the current period analysis. Powerlink is not going to pursue an Opex step change for business IT as part of its regulatory proposal.
- We are appreciative of the team's engagement regarding Cut 2 forecast.

Comments (C), questions (Q) and Powerlink response (R)

Q. Do you see potential benefits in your insurance premium because of the relative position of Queensland in managing COVID issues or is that something that you're yet to see?

R. I think it's probably too early to tell at this stage.

3. Update on Revenue Determination process – Preliminary Positions and Forecasts Paper (PPFP)

- Matthew Myers, Manager Revenue Reset

Summary:

- Powerlink's efforts to engage through the RPRG are appreciated.
- In conjunction with the pre-reading full presentation, our aim is to gather input on Powerlink's July 2020 (Cut 3) forecasts and proposed engagement activities.
- Input will inform our Draft Revenue Proposal, which we are aiming to release for consultation by end September 2020.
- Material changes since Powerlink's April 2020 forecast – highlighting the forecast for Capex (quiet significantly) and Opex have both come down since April.
- MAR is still reducing.
- Capex and Opex incline as compared to current period.
- Engagement activities through to January and PPFP release communications.
- Requesting input into the needs for future activities such as a cybersecurity deep dive forum.

Comments (C), questions (Q) and Powerlink response (R)

Q. In the Opex, the wage price index, is 1.06% your view on the average of Deloitte and BIS Oxford Economics?

R. Yes. We had previously assumed just Deloitte. After the change in approach in recent determinations from the AER, what we have done is adjusted that to be Deloitte and BIS Oxford Economics. What I would say is – the Deloitte figures are still based on some older information from previous determinations, so they won't have been updated. The BIS is Oxford Economics' figures up to end of the March quarter so we'd expect them to change at the end before the September forecast comes out and it will be interesting to see what happens in terms of COVID impact.

Q. I note that the Treasurer's statement last week had much lower – that's overall economy, not particularly your sector, but had considerably lower forecasts for overall wage growth.

R. Yes, and I think it is important to – as you say – look at our sector, but also Queensland-specific rather than just national as well.

Q. Is it true to say that with constant WACC, prices would go up?

R. That's right.

Q. By how much?

R. I can just see the MAR and I can't calculate the price impact off the top of my head, but MAR was set to probably increase by around \$160 million.

Q. I'd be interested in what the price would be with the same WACC. I know there's all sorts of different customers, but it'd be worthwhile. You'll no doubt be talking about what the price decrease is going to be including WACC. What would the price increase be with the same WACC as in the current period?

R. I can have a look at that.

C. Thank you.

Q. I'm going to build on our discussion which was really helpful about expected inflation. I think it would be interesting if you were able to say what would be the WACC and what would be the MAR if your preferred method of expected inflation were to be applied because a lot of the debate about expected inflation is around the impact on the customer bill. I'm still trying to get an understanding of would it be a material impact if your preferred – or the network's or ENA's or Powerlink's preferred approach to expected inflation were implemented for your 2023/27 reset.

R. For the Cut 3 inflation forecast, we have adopted the AER's methodology and used the trim mean forecast for the first two years of that methodology so that's given us a CPI of 2.25%. We haven't gone and calculated what that CPI forecast would look like under the alternate methodologies that are being discussed under the AER's inflation review. Just to clarify, I think what you are asking is for us to run a couple of scenarios based on what those other views may look like to just understand the impact that we have to go through?

C. Yes please.

R. What is the objective sitting behind your questions?

C. In that particular question, as I read the proposals from the networks, they're saying that they need a different measure of expected inflation because they think that having a lower forecast of expected inflation would give them a higher revenue. I'm wondering how material is that higher revenue in the whole scheme of things.

C. As a non-expert at this, are we still able to choose – how much flexibility have we got and which inflation approach we go with moving forward?

R. I think we're just mindful that the AER's inflation review is underway at the moment and the outcome of that will be in December, so I think we'll be looking at how that's progressing. There is a draft position paper I believe out in August.

Q. Yes, so is this one aspect that's going to be hard for us to give certainty even in our draft Revenue Proposal in September because of the timings of what's going on with the AER?

R. Yes.

Q. Yes, so the decision – when it comes in December – will apply to the Powerlink 2023/27 reset. I'm just trying to get an understanding of – there's a lot of debate between stakeholders on the issue of expected inflation and the best measure of expected inflation. The interesting thing is that the AER in its position paper has not provided any data to show how material a change is. That's all I'm seeking some information on.

R. Yes, so I think some of this is certainly directly relevant to the proposal itself, but some of it is broader in terms of that inflation review.

Q. Is the AER intending to provide some data at the next stage of its inflation consultation to demonstrate materiality of some of these things?

C. I'm not across that detail. It's not my area, but I just want to clarify that point. The AER has not changed approach at this stage in terms of inflation. Trimmed CPI, we used that in our recent round of resets that we announced in June to acknowledge some of the effects of COVID. That really was a one-off at that time so inflation review if you like, takes over from there. As Powerlink pointed out, the inflation review will provide clarity on the approach going forward, but we have not moved away from applying headline CPI, applying the trim mean approach in that unique circumstance of the recent round of resets. I just wanted to make that clarified just in case some of the Customer Panel members were of the belief we had amended our approach which we haven't.

Q. What I'm asking is, can you please go back to the relevant people in the AER and suggest to them that it would be useful at their next stage of the inflation review to release data and information to demonstrate the materiality of the differences.

Q. Can I ask you about the Efficiency Benefit Sharing Scheme (EBSS)? This non-recurrent adjustment has been subject to discussions with the AER and with the AER agreement?

R. That's right, yes. We've worked this through with the AER as well?

Q. Can you confirm that all the dollar values are in nominal terms and that contingent capex, opex are not included.

R. All the dollars on here are in 2022 dollars. The contingent project capex for this regulatory period is not included.

Q. Because sometimes the RAB values are in nominal I wanted to make sure I was monitoring at that. The other one was, the forecast contingent projects – whether they are included in the forecast going ahead?

R. No. On that prior chart, we have outlined the RAB in nominal terms and real terms so the yellow line there is nominal, and the aqua colour is the real.

Q. What's the assumed productivity percentage factor?

R. This productivity assumed there is 0.14 which is what has been assumed previously. One thing on the rate of change, so we have received an early version of the consultant report benchmarking that the AER uses to then draw up their benchmark report at the end of year. We will be expecting that there will be some change potentially on back of that. Whether that's within the output rate of productivity, or the Wage Price Index. All I can say is that I expect that that 1.6% rate of change will move, and I expect it to be coming down for the September forecast. Productivity is also an area of focus for us and opex overall is going to be a very big focus area for the team. We know that we need to work on our base year and efficiency of the base year because we have only recently made that choice in terms of what our base year is, but we will also be looking at items like productivity and wanting to have a chat with our customers in a bit more depth about that.

Q. Something for another time perhaps. It's unusual that your proposed base year is not the last or second-last year of the current period.

R. Yes, there's a couple of reasons why we've chosen it. A key factor for us was we think that it is reflective of a typical year of operations whereas 19/20, 20/21 with COVID impacts, may not be. It is also the lowest year in terms of overall opex so that did factor into our considerations. It also meets the requirement of the 'revealed cost' approach preferred by the AER.

Q. Are you saying that opex is going up because of COVID, that's why you are not choosing 20/21 or 21/22?

R. Not necessarily that it's going up, but we may be observing expenditure in different categories than we otherwise would and I think for 20/21, we don't have a finalised budget yet, but we wouldn't really know at this stage whether it is going to be impacted by COVID or not.

Q. So the change in Capital Expenditure Sharing Scheme (CESS) forecasts doesn't reflect revisions in opex due to COVID factors?

R. No, there was a 500kV project in the previous period and the treatment of that, but also the shift from using the 19/20 AER allowance to using an actual year of operations – being 18/19.

R. And it does reflect our daily forecast and what we've seen for these so the 19/20 is in there as well so we have updated that as well. But that's not driving the big change.

Q. Given that under the revenue cap regulated customers take demand risk, how much of the \$12 reduction would there have been if there wasn't the fall in demand. If it was the same demand as the current regulatory period?

R. I haven't figured that one out. We'd have to have a look at that one.

R. You're asking us to calculate the price impact based on a situation where current energy levels were maintained?

C. Yes, it's just to get an understanding of what the demand risks that customers take under the regulatory framework. And I'll just make a comment about how price changes are represented. This is something that I'll put my CCP hat on in what we've been doing with AGN gas networks in South Australia. We've found that a representation of a price change for residential customers and to business customers in a low inflation environment is much better done in nominal terms rather than real terms. I know this one's done in real terms and that's the conventional view, but AGN in their final plan submitted a month ago, have gone to the nominal price measure. I'll give you a simple example. If the price today is \$1 and you've got 2% inflation and the price next year would be a \$1.02, and then you say the price next year is not \$1.02, it's 95 cents, then traditionally the comparison has been a percentage change between \$1.02 and 95 cents whereas the way that AGN has done it as we've suggested to them is a comparison between 100 and 95 because that's the actual price decrease that customers get on 1st July in the first year of the new reset period. That's just out there as a suggestion as something we put to AGN and they've accepted that. I think it's much clearer to residential and business customers that what's going to happen on day one of the new regulatory period.

R. Please send through the AGN example to Powerlink.

R. Keep in mind this price chart, it does include nominal and real. This chart is the indicative price which the AER was able to calculate in their determination as well. I agree those numbers we quote for residential and business are indicative of average residential and average business. This may not be what customers actually see on their bills from a transmission.

R. I might put out as a question to the Customer Panel, do you need more around the concept of capable acceptance and what does that actually mean? To the extent that we could actually have something included either with the Revenue Proposal in relation to whether it is capable acceptance or not. I think that it would be good to have something actually solid there either from the CP or the RPRG or individual members. However, is that the best way to handle it? I would like some input from the Customer Panel as to your thoughts on how that could be provided and whether that is something that you've seen in other networks successfully?

R. Agree, are we actually going to ask the Customer Panel and RPRG to sign off on something and what would that look like. I think we have come in with our eyes wide open and we have deliberately tried to engage in a meaningful way for our customers, the AER, the CCP and ourselves to try and push things forward. But also we'd like to get feedback from customers if this is shaping up to be something that meets the rule requirements in those areas that customers feel they are sufficiently informed to give us an opinion.

R. The challenge we've got is that there are some aspects which rely on the AER having technical nous to review. From the Customer Panel's perspective and what they've seen, is it believed to be something capable of acceptance. We'd like to know sooner rather than later if we should be doing something more or differently.

R. I expect that will be one of the key questions that we'll ask on the release of the draft Revenue Proposal but I wanted to plant the seed in terms of the Customer Panel to have a think about how that might be best responded to. And if needed, provide us advice on the optimal way to go about that from a customer perspective.

Q. I was just wondering in that program that you've got there on that slide – that proposed Revenue Proposal – where would that sit in on that calendar?

R. The release of the draft Revenue Proposal is on 30th September and then we'll have a one-month more formal public feedback period.

Q. One of the things I've found with the AEMC and their submissions is that they prepare a template. It provides some sort of framework and guidance so you can assess the feedback because it's in a template provided by each party. I'm just wondering whether that's worthy of merit?

R. Yes, I think that this definitely something we can take on board to see if there is something we can do in terms of a template for submissions.

C & Q. Probably a more direct question in terms of the topics that I had was, in the larger pack we've flagged four clear topics at this stage – contingent reinvestment projects being one. This is the topic that we've talked about a few times, but we want to continue to progress with the AER because we do think it is an important potential development in the contingent projects. Productivity, so picking up on the need to focus on that and some of the questions that have been raised by the RPRG about productivity and our benchmarking performance. Cyber security and insurance. I'd be keen to know if there any other topics that we're missing?

Q. Just a comment, I guess capable of acceptance and some of those other issues, questions that you've posed, I think that one thing that would be useful for me anyway is the opportunity for a meeting of either the RPRG and/or the Customer Panel exclusive of Powerlink so that we could compare notes and agree or not agree particular points of view between us that could then come back to Powerlink as a shared approach.

R. I think that's a great idea. When do you think the best timing for that would be? Probably like after the draft Revenue Proposal is obviously released, I would say. Maybe that October, early November timeframe maybe?

R. Yes, I think that's a great idea. I suppose we'd be happy to maybe set up the technology to enable that to happen and then just let you guys go at it and then we'll just receive what comes out of that meeting and respond to it.

C. Yes, I haven't canvassed that question with other members, but it's something that would be useful for me anyway.

C. I agree, it's a good idea.

Q. I was just going to say if you're asking about how are we feeling at the moment on what we've been presented and what should be the areas of focus, I think one of the big issues to me is that –we need to be comfortable that Powerlink has not used the fall in WACC to enable it to lessen the focus on efficiency. That's why I keep asking the question, well what are you doing with the things that are under your control and given Powerlink's relative position – and I don't know what the latest data will show – at or near the bottom for some time of the relative productivity of TNSPs, I suppose I'll be looking for what are you doing over and above what you normally do so that you are not resting on the laurels of WACC saving you in terms of delivering price reductions to customer.

R. Yes, good point.

Q. I guess it's the engagement that I'd like to comment on. I think it's been great to have this Customer Panel engagement and the RPRG engagement in such depth and to go through all of the issues and any others that we're interested in. What concerns me a little bit is that might be narrow and that we are missing potentially some views of customers or stakeholders outside this small group that we're dealing with. I see there is an opportunity through the feedback on the draft Revenue Proposal to try and encourage some other broader feedback on the issues. I'd be certainly looking for input through that avenue and how that might or might not affect the proposal before the final. I think we're very Brisbane-centric.

R. Yes, I think we're very conscious of that too and we want to be able to get – in the first instance – the PPFP information out through some of those wider channels and providing to our direct connects. When I say wider channels too – just to be a little bit more specific on that – similar to the stakeholders that we use for our Transmission Network Forum each year, so that includes people across local government areas, more people within industry bodies as well as more advocates than are just on our panel. If there is anyone that you think we should be talking to within this area that we might not have on our stakeholder list – please flag them with us so that we can make sure that they are captured.

R. Yes, to be honest, part of the challenge we've got from the engagement perspective is just getting people interested to be involved. We ask a lot of people to be involved and just the nature of who we are and the type of our business – more people are going to be more interested in Energy Queensland's revenue determination process than the transmission business so we actually do struggle sometimes to even bring people to the table to try and engage with them. It is something that we need to keep on doing, but again it's something that we do struggle with just because people with only a finite amount of time and resources have to pick and choose where they put their time and energy. Sometimes unfortunately, we're not top of their list.

R. I have to say I do not want us to undervalue the input we've had already from our directly connected customers because some of the drivers of where we are going in terms of our network and drivers of the business, some of that has already been picked in the narrative document because we don't just engage with our directly connected customers at a revenue reset. We do that on an ongoing basis, so I think that's important to recognise. I think it's also important for us to ensure that we get informed input which has been part of the value of having this

Customer Panel and the Revenue Proposal Reference Group because the quality of the input is different if you've taken somebody on the journey as opposed to just one-off input. I do want to ensure that we are getting informed input, but I also do not want us to be missing some of the key messages that are coming from people beyond the RPRG and Customer Panel.

Q. Following previous revenue resets, what sort of publicity – I mean, where from or where was it received from and alike because sometimes that might enable you to target some stakeholders that maybe haven't participated. As you say, after the event you can get the commentary, but it's a bit too late. Had you noticed any pattern or observed anything and sought to engage with those parties? I mean, you can only put your hand out if they choose not to engage you can't do much more than that. I just wondered how much level of commentary occurs when the final announcements are made and the like?

R. That's one of the key reasons we're delving back into the past to contact those people that did actually make submissions on our Revenue Proposal and revised Revenue Proposal where appropriate and relevant. We're also looking at whether at Energex and Ergon's as well to see whether there is particular stakeholders or customer groups who are interested in energy generally. We may be able to contact them and say, we know that you've put in a submission on a different Revenue Proposal, but you may be interested to know about this one as well.

R. We've developed letters to proactively contact key stakeholders across a range of different elements that proactively say, hey this has been released, get involved, let us know. We are obviously going to publicise it through social media, and then we are also happy to get any thoughts from you about is there any other person or organisation you think we really should be talking to. Always happy to hear that. We're always happy to have a chat about things like this.

R. We also get interest from our directly connected – more interest from our directly connected customers on the issue of our price methodology because that's the outcome of this process, but also an input in terms of how do we allocate the revenue from this process. I'll just flag now, we are finalising the next stage of our pricing consultation paper that started last year and we are expecting to publish that paper if not I'd say the first week of August is what we are targeting.

Actions:

- ***Powerlink to prepare what the price increase would be with the same WACC in the current period.***
- ***Powerlink to calculate the price impact based on a situation where current energy levels were maintained to gain an understanding of what the risks are that customers take under the regulatory framework.***
- ***Customer Panel to send Powerlink AGN example.***
- ***Powerlink to set up a CISCO Webex meeting for CP/RPRG panel exclusive to Powerlink's attendance.***

4. Powerlink's commitment to customer focus from Chief Executive

- Paul Simshauser, Chief Executive

Summary:

- Early perceptions of Powerlink's depth of customer focus is much stronger than anticipated.
- Engaging with customers will be far more important than less going forward into the future.
- Powerlink needs to be hyper-engaged with the outside world and our Customer Panel engagement is of high importance.

5. Energy Charter Disclosure Statement – feedback from Customer Panel

- Gerard Reilly, General Manager Communications

[Conflict of interest - Please note that Customer Panel member Mark Grenning departed the meeting for this agenda item.]

Summary:

- Indicative timeline of the Energy Charter process between now and the end of the year.
- The Independent Accountability Panel will be chaired by Clare Petre who was a long-term energy and water ombudsman for New South Wales and now works in a customer role in NAB. Other panel members include Andrew Richards from the EUAA and Cassandra Goldie from ACOSS.
- Powerlink's panel interview is on Friday 16 October 2020.
- Learnings from first disclosure statement.
- Expectations from End User Consultative Group for this year's Disclosure Statement.
- Structure of the 2019/20 document.

Comments (C), questions (Q) and Powerlink response (R)

C. I thought the document read pretty well and it described a lot of new developments and things that looked impressive to me in terms of things that have been done over the last 12 months. I think that it's shaping up well. I agree with your comment about sharpening up the focus areas. What are the targets for the next period? They were very generic and a bit of duplication there as well. I think what I in particular would like to see would be to say last year you said you'd do a, b and c. Did you do them and how did it go? The document at the moment doesn't seem to provide a comparison with last year's commitments. And I haven't gone back to check that.

R. No, that's a good point. What we are actually thinking about is what we might do is we might create a separate section on our website where we can go into a bit more detail. I think because it's hard to stick to a 10 or 12 page document and try and cover everything so one of the proposed things that we are looking at is maybe we have the Disclosure Statement which is probably a bit more the narrative and the future focus areas and then we're going to have a separate link which takes you to a spot on our website which will go into more details about this is

what we said we do last year and this is what we delivered on it. I can say a lot of work has happened work across the business and the External Communications team have put together an Energy Charter Action Plan.

It was actually built into every single Executive and General Manager's performance agreement for the last 12 months, so we have to actually deliver against the commitments that we said in the Disclosure Statement. We put together a really comprehensive document which grew because once we were having conversations across the business, that's where a lot of the new ideas came out and a lot of those have gone into the new Disclosure Statement. We'd be very happy to maybe put on our website a bit more of an inventory of this is what we said last time, and this is what we've done with it. It just might be hard to fit that in, in the current commitment to keeping that quite concise.

C. It would be great to have access to that further information. My view would be that some sort of a small summary of that in the document would be helpful and then a direction elsewhere just to demonstrate that you've done what you said you would do.

R. Yes, I agree.

Q. When I looked at the principle around sustainability, Powerlink is – and quite correctly – demonstrating a lot of focus on renewables and facilitating renewables in the market and the transition to clean energy, but I didn't spot any commentary on what Powerlink is doing in that respect.

R. I think it's probably something that we need to continue on that maturity model. I've been speaking with our Health, Safety and Environment managers and I think what we are actually going to be doing is using the coming months to get some benchmark views across where we are at across a range of different things from a sustainability perspective and then we can start setting ourselves some targets in the future. I think that's a good point and I think it's probably something we definitely to look at improving our maturity in.

Q. I'm just wondering how many recommendations were there and I suppose it's incumbent on me to probably go on the website and have a look, but I just wondered how many?

R. There were 32 recommendations from the Panel's report last year and again we're actually thinking again on a separate part of our website, having a bit of a table saying here are all the recommendations that were relevant to a transmissions business and what we've done with them. Almost having like two tables on our website. One is showing how we have delivered on our commitments and another one showing how we've taken on board the relevant recommendations. Out of the 32, a number of them are probably more retailer-focused, but what we have done is gone through the ones relevant for a transmission business and what we've done with those recommendations.

C. Over a number of years, you'll be able to track the direction that you have taken on specific key items.

R. I agree and that's the importance of that maturity model because that's what is going to guide our continued improvement and what will help people see in a more transparent way about where we are at and targeting where we are trying to get to and how we are going to get there.

C. You can certainly see the difference between last year and this year.

C. I learned something out of it, but as you say, if we can incorporate some of those suggestions, I'm sure it will take it to the next level. Thank you.

Q. I would agree with the comments made and possibly because this is about demonstrating that continuous improvement, those points need to be in there about making sure you are reiterating how you've made the commitment. I know putting them on the webpage is one thing, but I do think there needs to be reference to them in the report. I'm wondering if you could get away with putting just a couple of small graphics to really show where you've been and where you are now? It's a good report. It's a really good start, but some of the statements on what you have done and what you've achieved I think are still too general. I think there was a guideline to pay small businesses quicker. I think it would be stronger if there was a commitment by Powerlink to pay small businesses within, say, 10 business days. You know what I mean? There's obviously a lot of work in the background, but these commitments are not particularly quantifiable, and I think it's just about language to be honest.

R. Okay, that's good. Thanks for that. If we had to blow out the report from say 10 or 11 pages to 13 or 14 and probably have a bit more information in there about the commitments made, is this a realistic trade off? Would that put people out if we just increased the page count by two or three to give a more complete picture on our commitments and the IAP's recommendations?

C. I think that's okay.

C: My view is still 10 pages should be the limit. I'd rather cut down some of the other words, sorry.

R. What I'm hearing from panel members is quality over quantity and be targeted and focused on the information we conveying.

Action:

- ***Powerlink to prepare an online update or review current formatting of document to include what we said we did last year and what we did do. "Did you do them and how did it go?"***

7. Close and thanks

- Gerard Reilly, General Manager Communications

Summary:

- Thank you very much for everyone's attendance today.
- The value of the Customer Panel and the important role that you play in our ongoing business decision making is something we value, and we don't take for granted your ongoing participation and enthusiasm.
- A special thank you to the members of the Revenue Reset team who have devoted a great deal of effort.
- Transmission Network Forum is on Thursday 10 September
- Next Customer Panel meeting is on Thursday 26 November.

Q. When do you expect, at this point in time, resuming face-to-face meetings?

R. Maybe the November meeting as Powerlink has recently changed our visitor protocols where we can now accept visitors to site. Visitors need to ensure that they haven't been to a hotspot recently and we've got temperature checking on site, but as long as people are happy to go through the visitor protocols coming on site, I think the other challenge we've got is just making sure that we've got a big enough room to meet social distancing protocols. We'll watch the ongoing developments.

8. Meeting closed 3.00pm