Date:	Start time:	Finish time:	Venue:	Meeting no:
Thursday, 27 October 2016	1pm	4.15pm	Whittaker Room 33 Harold Street Virginia QLD 4014	Six

Facilitator: Gerard Reilly (Powerlink)

Minutes: Nicole Maguire (Powerlink) & Kiara Bowles (Powerlink)

Attendees:	Apologies:	Powerlink presenters:
Georgina Davis (Qld Farmers' Federation) Gary Madigan (Energex) Jane Schober (Ergon Energy) Mark Grenning (Energy Users Association Australia) Robyn Robinson (Council of the Ageing) David Hiette (BMA) John Gardner (CSIRO) Erin Bledsoe (QGC) – *via teleconference* Stewart Bell (Powerlink) Jenny Harris (Powerlink) **Observers**: Hugh Grant (Consumer Challenge Panel) Garry Mulherin (Powerlink)	Andrew Barger (Queensland Resources Council) Lynne Gallagher (Energy Consumers Australia) Julia Mylne (Chamber of Commerce and Industry Qld) Mr Peter Maher (St Vincent de Paul) Simon Taylor (Powerlink)	Ian Lowry Greg Hesse Gary Edwards Gerard Reilly

Attachments will include all documents provided to panel members at the meeting including:
PowerPoint presentation and pre-reading documents

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
1.	**Welcome to Powerlink –** Gerard Reilly, Group Manager Stakeholder Relations			
2.	**Introductions and meeting agenda –** Gerard Reilly			
3.	**Presentation on AER's Draft Decision on Powerlink's 2018-22 Revenue Proposal** - Ian Lowry, Revenue Reset Leader Discussion on the AER's Draft Decision including: • Summary of Draft Decision – areas of alignment as well as concerns • AER Pre-determination conference • Next steps in the revenue proposal process **Comments (C), questions (Q) and Powerlink response (R)** **Q:** I'm interested in understanding the rate of return and the impact on price reductions. What happens if the rate of return was unchanged? [that is, not reduced from current period level of 8.61%] **R:** The reduction in WACC drives around 80% of the reduction in prices between the current and next period. If you left the WACC unchanged at current levels, the average indicative transmission price would go up. **Q:** How much would prices go up? **R:** I don't know the exact number, but we would expect revenue to go up by between $500m and $1bn over the five years. **C:** I'm trying to understand how much of the cost savings for consumers is linked to			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	measures that Powerlink has taken to reduce prices, as opposed to the WACC calculations. If the financial markets hadn't tanked, customers would be paying more, correct? **R:** Powerlink applied the relevant AER guideline regarding the WACC including the AER's point estimates. This resulted in Powerlink putting forward a lower WACC than other businesses have proposed. Overall, the AER's Draft Decision saves the average residential electricity consumer an additional $7 to $9 per annum, compared to Powerlink's Revenue Proposal. Most of this is due to a further reduction in risk free rate and cost of debt. **Q:** If you had applied the same WACC as you applied in previous years, your prices would go up? **R:** The WACC is a significant driver on the price reduction, as mentioned earlier it is around 80% of the price reduction. However we've also reduced our capex and opex spends, so we did do something to reduce prices. **C:** We absolutely understand the point you're making. We've applied the AER's WACC guideline as it is and it distinguishes us from a lot of other businesses. **Q (meeting observer):** The RAB you're showing here, that's in real terms? [referring to AER's decision to reduce roll forward of RAB from current regulatory period in line with lower 2015/16 inflation]. **R:** Yes, showing current period outcome, not forecast. When our Revenue Proposal was put up it related to our thinking on what we were going to spend for the balance of the current period at that time – around October 2015. **Q:** You say that reinvestment is reduced by 23.2%. [referring to Powerlink slide pack]			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	I think that figure is incorrect – the AER's decision reduced reinvestment by 21.9%. R: Having reviewed the AER's decision in detail we think the reduction in reinvestment is 23.2% but will check. There were nine categories of capex that were accepted by the AER. **C:** Powerlink is proposing that the AER apply any changes in its approach to WACC which may result from merits or judicial review to its Final Decision. Reviews are underway on aspects of the guideline, not the whole guideline. **C:** Powerlink's main concerns relate to the reduced reinvestment capex. We also have concerns about how the AER has amended the incentive schemes. We want to clarify how those schemes will operate. We also intend to go back to the AER on the pricing methodology. **C:** With regard to the pricing methodology, the AER rejected our amendments. We've had discussions with them on it and it appears they've misinterpreted the changes made. **C:** At the AER Pre-determination conference, the AER recognised that Powerlink had been reasonable in our approach and acknowledged that we sought to align with their approach in many areas. A representative from the AER said this in his opening statements. **C (meeting observer):** The statement in the second bullet point on slide 10 is incorrect. CCP4's submission did not express concerns about the indexation of the RAB. CCP4's critique of the AER's 'return on capital' estimation methodology is not directed solely at Powerlink. It is a generic critique that applies to the AER's approach to determining return on capital allowances for all networks.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	CCP members have been debating this critique with the AER for over two years. As the debate has progressed during each reset, the CCP has provided more and more detail to support its critique. The CCP4 submission on Powerlink's revenue proposal identified that Powerlink has been one of the biggest beneficiaries of the deficiency so that may have magnified the focus of the issue on Powerlink. **C:** The main purpose of my comments is so we can understand how that feeds into all utilities. Currently this is something that sits outside the regulatory process. The ACCC report on gas looked at regulated and non-regulated returns on pipelines. They found that that the way this operated was not illegal, but had implications that the ACCC drew out. **C:** There was a clear view from the CCP4 comments (David Headberry) made during the Pre-determination conference that reinvestment was considered to still be too high. **C:** There was also feedback from CCP4 at the Pre-determination Conference that they could not understand how the AER had formed a view on an alternative forecast of opex that was higher than Powerlink's. CCP4 raised questions regarding the efficiency of the base year. **C:** There were also comments about trying to show how replacement work might impact on some customers. There were comments along these lines at the forum on behalf of ECA which we will try and cover during the presentation on forecast capex. **Q:** Any other comments following the pre-determination conference? **C:** The agricultural sector has serious concerns, particularly in relation to the RAB and WACC and how this relates to price impacts. In our last few meetings with the			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	AER they came across as quite arrogant in their approach. They seem stuck in process and selective as to how they interpret the regulations. That is not a criticism of Powerlink. It rests with the AER around the laws and regulations they use. They need to realise this approach is too process driven, and need to be more clear in their approach for the benefit of consumers and farmers. **C:** There should be an independent review on the rates of return, as there is a difference of opinion between networks, AER and consumers. At a recent public consultation session with Energy Consumers Australia, it was very clear there were concerns about the failure of the regulatory framework in terms of meeting the needs of consumers. Seeing the work that Hugh Grant has done is evidence of the failure in this regulatory regime – the amazingly huge difference in the WACC and actual rate of return. This is a significant barrier to genuine consultation. **C:** There was a strong view at the ECA forum from a number of participants who expressed the view that they won't be participating in the regulatory process any longer. The AER needs to be prompted to be more explicit in their determinations, particularly around where they have or haven't taken various consumer views on board in making their decisions. There are concerns that consumer representatives are not seeing value in participating in regulatory processes. **C:** Agree there are significant barriers to consumer participation in this process. It may even be that we need an independent study of all networks. So if there is a difference, there's a good reason for the difference. **C:** Next step for Powerlink is that we need to lodge a Revised Revenue Proposal by 1 December 2016.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
4.	**Presentation on Powerlink's Revised Revenue Proposal – Key Issues** - Greg Hesse, Reset Stream Leader (Capital) Summary of presentation: • The AER's Draft Decision and consequences for Powerlink's proposed program of work • Impact of extended replacement lives on cost/service outcomes • Panel feedback on key issues to help Powerlink achieve the balance between cost/service outcomes and our broader obligations under regulation and legislation **C:** One area where we are not in agreement is replacement capex. We are interested in the panel's feedback on the cost/service outcomes in the Draft Determination and the broad implications that may have. **Q:** What is the basis for the AER increasing the mean replacement life by one standard deviation? **R:** AER increased mean replacement lives by 13-22% based on a sample of observed replacement ages. **C:** I had a look at the EMCa Report. In their view the bias in estimating capex is systematic in nature. It shows a systematic overestimation of risk. **Q:** Which report, the first report or the addendum? **R:** The first report. **R:** I believe the AER decision is based on the addendum.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	Q: So you don't think you have a systematic overestimation of risk? **R:** We don't agree with the AER's assessment, no. **C:** It comes back to information symmetry. The AER needs to do an analysis of all projects in a consistent way. **Q:** How many projects would Powerlink have for the next five years? **R:** Couple of 100, 150 maybe. **C:** EMCa report reviewed 25 projects I think. **C:** I thought it was maybe 18 projects? Essentially they took a sample of projects which are in the asset population that already exists, which is problematic as well. **C (meeting observer):** In terms of the AER's repex assessment process, the EMCa reviews were limited in scope but both of the EMCa reports provided very damning assessments of Powerlink's repex forecasting methodology. The second report was particularly focused on the implications of Powelink's assumed asset lives, but EMCa and the AER identified many other deficiencies in Powerlink's underlying processes - including inadequate options analysis, ineffective risk assessment processes, inefficient asset management practices, etc. Having reviewed the critiques in detail, I believe that the AER should have made much higher repex reductions on the basis of EMCa's findings. **Q:** What about the comparison of Powerlink against other transmission entities. What was the view on that?			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	R: Some companies have variable ages of assets. For example some companies might say they make do with a 70 year life of their assets, but are they tower painting at ten years to make that happen? A driver might be the environment an asset is in, we potentially could have an asset last 70 years depending on their location, say out west somewhere, but in an aggressive tropical environment would we get the same result? That environmental difference in terms of our reinvestment activities is important – you're not comparing apples with apples, you're comparing red apples with green apples. **C (meeting observer):** One comment from the EMCa report was that Powerlink wasn't taking a whole of life approach, you were taking a different view. **R**: We have to look at the benefits of doing things like tower painting. Might mean we have to do more work and weighing up the cost over time from taking that approach. **C:** What you're looking for usually is what the ultimate solution might be. Assets might not have an enduring need so we take a particular approach. You often see things looking back that you won't see looking forward. **Q:** If an asset is considered a stranded asset, you won't need to spend as much on maintenance though? **R:** In some areas, we have proposed that lines are taken out, while in other areas we are proposing to undertake refit work. It's inconclusive in some places, if the load is potentially going to grow we need to keep the lines in place. For example, we sought feedback on some of our metro lines where for example, there might be growth down the track so we would want to keep lines in place. This is a factor we consider in our area plans and have sought external feedback on. Once the lines are taken out, we know we can't get them back in again. So how sure are we that in five years' time,			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	that will still be the case? The feedback from people was to be very careful before we take lines out of service. We feel our forecast is robust and we'll reprioritise where needed, but we can never be 100% sure. **Q:** If assets are ten years old, and have a 50 year life span, then there's a change in the forecast from the original investment decision, do you change your plan and spend differently on that line? **R:** Once we get to 40 years-plus, so maybe we're looking at things like nuts and bolts starting to go, we get to the stage where we look at the investment decision we've made and consider whether we spend, and invest, or take that asset out of service. **Q:** Is there an explanation of where the 15% came from, in relation to the AER including an offset in Powerlink's forecasts for those adjusted asset categories? **R:** The EMCa referenced Transpower in New Zealand, which has been spending money on early life tower painting to increase the overall lifespan of their assets. The EMCa report then extrapolated this 15% figure to other network components. **C:** I think there was a paragraph in the EMCa report about the 15%. **C:** The effect of the reduced capex program is that there is reduced spending in some areas. *(shown geographically in presentation)* **Q:** So you've applied that one standard deviation to your asset management plan and that's what you've come up with? **R:** No, our presentation shows all of the big ticket items in our Asset Management Plan. We would need to review the priority of these projects based on the AER's			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	decision on capex. **Q:** Do the numbers in the presentation shown add up to the total reduction shown in the repex graph? Are the numbers in the maps you've shown meant to add up to the different figure in the table shown previously? **R:** No, it won't add up. The maps just show the big ticket items in certain geographic areas. There are lots of other things included in that total figure. **Q:** So the zones you're showing, C and B etc, that relates to the geographical location of an asset? **R:** Yes, it shows geographical differences. And different zones generally have different environmental factors. One zone is everything west of the Great Dividing Range, while another is in a tropical environment. **C:** Our age profile is not flat. It comes in waves so to speak as we go through the various points from the 1960s through to the 1970s. There are implications to that from a modelling point of view also. It's important we flag now that for subsequent reset periods we would need to ratchet up the spending to factor in decisions made now. **Q:** So does that suggest that repex capex will be even higher in future regulatory determinations? **R:** Yes, for transmission towers definitely. For aspects such as secondary systems, which are the controls on the network, we might be looking at functional failures that affect some part of an asset's performance. That 15 year mark is definitely the tipping point. If something fails, and we can't get a like for like replacement, it will extend out the time for the duration of any given event. At the 25 year mark, it's			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	double again. **C:** After 15 years you start to get more failures, and the time taken to fix them also extends. Our Revenue Proposal is targeting 20 years, so driving that 15 year mark out to 20 years. The 25 year mark just mentioned is effectively what the AER's draft decision will mean. At that point, the risk and likelihood of things going wrong increases markedly. It's the swiss cheese effect – it's making the holes in the cheese larger. **C:** And it's hard to be definitive, for example this decision will result in x impact. But it's effectively pushing up the risk curve. **Q:** Regarding age profiles and associated reinvestment options, are there likely to be visible disruptions to supply for consumers if Powerlink delays reinvestment activities? **R:** The AER's Draft Decision is unlikely to affect reliability in the short term, say the next five to seven years. Powerlink will not let reduced reinvestment capex compromise network safety. The first impact of reduced reinvestment capex is increasing opex to rectify more functional failures and working under operational constraints. This may result in an increased risk of a material number of asset failures in the medium term. **C:** However, things like electrical safety and workplace health and safety will still need to be maintained. We will still need to do the relevant tests and checks to ensure the network is safe etc. But we might find we see more of those functional failure type issues over time. It might mean we have to apply things like exclusion zones, so no one can enter a substation, and start to take more things out of service to do work. So a network outage by itself might not lead to interruptions to supply, but a combination of the factors I just mentioned might. It might just be that more			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	assets are out of service more often. **Q:** What's the VCR (value to customer) value you used when you evaluated repex? **R:** We did not use a VCR for the Revenue Proposal forecast. **Q:** How can you say that it's a good thing to spend on repex if you don't use a VCR? I don't understand how in your proposal of what repex should be, you don't use a VCR value? **R:** It is inferred from the number of interventions in the previous calibration period of the Repex Model. **Q:** You want our view on whether repex is worthwhile yet you don't have a VCR figure for us to work from? How can you say the $150M reduction from the AER will result in all these terrible things, but you don't have a VCR view to compare it with? Given consumers' VCR they may prefer that the $150m is not spent. **R:** We are giving a view of the potential impacts, we can't put an exact figure on it. Our assessment is that if we get $150M less there will be impacts, regardless of whether we do or don't use a VCR. **C:** We more so use things like detailed condition assessments, and consideration of the risks associated with aspects such as safety, supply, operational factors to understand impacts. **R:** Where Powerlink uses the VCR in risk assessment and prioritising projects. We use VCR consistent with AEMO. **C:** Otherwise you're looking at a very expensive insurance premium.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	Q: What is the quantum dollar difference per household with what the AER has handed down for capex? **R:** The AER's draft decision resulted in $7-$9 saving of which the reduced capex contributes about $1, but I am mindful that this is a short term view of the capex impact as it goes into the RAB over its life. **C:** We are forecasting 7-9 years ahead, and used the repex model to do that. There is that process of checking the forecast against the repex model and working from there. We could use a VCR to reprioritise work, but we take into account other factors such as recent condition assessments and other info in our Revenue Proposal. **Q:** Powerlink is asking for $794.3M on a repex model that doesn't include the VCR. Wouldn't you be in a much better position if you use the VCR to get to this original figure? Shouldn't you be saying when we decide what we spend that $794M on we will use a VCR? Until we get an AER rule change around using non-network solutions, there's no obligations on you to look at those solutions. **R:** We don't need a rule change to consider non-network solutions. **R:** Let's take Garbutt for example, where two transformers are reaching their end of life. We need to replace one, but we could avoid replacing the second one by going with a non-network solution. So we went to market for a non-network solution and got three solution options back. The cost was significantly higher than a network solution, so we're going through a process of replacing those transformers now. But the point is we went out and we sought non-network input from providers. When we're doing reinvestments, we want to build for base load to get longer term investment – we aren't always building for peak demand.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	C: That's great to hear. I hope Powerlink does that with all projects. **Q:** So let's say you get $794M, then use a VCR to assess what and where you'll spend it, isn't it still the case that you still have to raise or recover that $794M and put it in your RAB? **R:** Only if we spend it. **Q:** The point is that you still have the right to spend it. I maintain it's just a much better process if you use a VCR to come up with the repex number in the first place. **C:** There's pros and cons between bottom up and top down, and it's hard to quantify numbers. We go with the increased probabilities and risks versus repex spend. **Q:** Is it the case that there's no way of knowing if the AER or Powerlink is correct until we're down the track? When we're looking at the life expectancy given by the AER, it seems there is no real way to know which position is right at this point? **R:** No objective way, no. **Q.** Is there any way to know whether the 15% is enough to counteract future network pressures? I'm wondering if this is just going to be an argument for your next determination period that last time the AER got it wrong and it resulted in outages. You cut us back and we had these outages as a result. Are you building in future pain? **R:** It's a risk we're taking with 26,000 towers around the state. The standard we're now working to N-1-50 allows for some risk, but it's still a difficult situation.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	R: Our obligations when lodging our Revenue Proposal and Revised Revenue Proposal are that we develop a reasonable forecast of expenditure that reflects the Rules requirements. We made the decision to use a hybrid forecast model for capex and were strongly encouraged to take this approach by the AER. We also consulted with this panel about our proposed approach to forecasting. I hear you saying that there are other ways to do that but we can't do both, it's just too costly. We need to submit our Revised Revenue Proposal on 1 December 2016 and we only have 45 days to turn around that revised document. We don't have sufficient time to change to a full 'bottom up' model. **C:** Energex has applied similar assumptions in its repex model, so we're in a similar boat. We've had to look at failure statistics and the models we used for our own proposal. **C:** For Ergon, our final determination reviewed the lives of a number of asset classes. We can appreciate the issue of 'bottom up' vs 'top down', and how best to set the numbers in the first place. It takes time and expense to go through a process of doing both assessments. It would be great to do both, but it's difficult. **C:** For us, reliability is key. Without power, we don't operate – simple as that. We'd need to understand that there could be outages, there could be impacts. If you don't spend the money now, will you be kicking the can down the road. Or do you take the view that you spend over a 20 year period. But regardless, reliability is key. **C:** In response to the AER's Draft Determination, there seem to be two stakes in the ground: the one standard deviation increase and the 15% offset. Both need to be negotiated. My impression is that I'm not seeing strong evidence of arguments supporting those points. I'm not seeing that the AER has closed the door to negotiations on those two points. I would be putting most of my effort into finding supporting views that those two positions can be changed.			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	C (meeting observer): Powerlink has presented unsubstantiated statements that it is taking higher risks through this revised determination. I'd encourage you to all read the EMCa report to gain more understanding and to help you form a view on how much risk is involved. **R:** Just regarding your comment regarding us taking higher risks, I want to assure you that the 'sky is not falling' in the next seven years. We don't expect deterioration straight away. That said, the long-term impacts are more apparent and important. In trying to advise you on the impacts of the draft decision, we took that long term view regarding the life of our assets. It's hard to put a VCR number in a single figure to quantify that customer service impact. **C:** I agree that reliability is important but I want to be convinced – and I haven't been so far – that we are going to get the level of reliability that consumers are willing to pay for. I understand your point about VCR and the expense of a bottom up forecast, but I'm not convinced, I still haven't seen a VCR applied in the calculations you are showing me. **Q:** I wanted to also discuss and provide feedback today on opex. I'm interested in your response to the Economic Insights report and views on the base year calculations. Are we going to cover this? **R:** Today's session has focused primarily on capex, with just a small overview of opex in the early slides. This is because the AER has accepted our proposed opex forecast and we cannot go back with any revisions or have an influence in this space. For today we want to focus on areas we can still influence. I'll put it to the panel, are all panel members okay with the scope of today's engagement, or did you want to discuss opex?			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	C: No. **Q:** Perhaps some information could be provided after this meeting on those points? **R:** Certainly we can provide info, if you give us more detail on what you're after, being mindful that the AER has accepted our opex. For those panel members who may not be aware, we can only go back to the AER in our Revised Revenue Proposal on areas where they have rejected our Revenue Proposal. So it's best to spend our time here today talking about the aspects we can still influence. We only have 45 business days to respond, so we want to focus on the parts we can potentially change and influence.			
	Q: Can Powerlink prepare a response to the Economic Insights report on benchmarking? **R:** Yes, we can confirm that we can do that.	Send Powerlink response on report to panel members.	18 Nov	Ian Lowry
	C: Powerlink has made a submission on the AER's draft 2016 benchmarking report. We're happy to provide a copy of this report to panel members. It will be published on the AER website soon.	Send Powerlink submission to panel members.	18 Nov (reports will be sent together)	Ian Lowry
5	**Presentation on Powerlink's Service Target Performance Incentive Scheme (STPIS)** - Gary Edwards, Executive Manager Operations and Field Services Summary of presentation: • Version 5 components – will be applied to Powerlink from 1 July 2017			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	• Service Component (SC) – AER accepted all target, cap and floor values proposed by Powerlink. Deemed to be compliant with Version 5. • Market Impact Component (MIC) – AER did not accept Powerlink's proposed values. • Network Capability Component (NCC) – AER accepted only one of three priority projects that Powerlink proposed. • Powerlink is reviewing the AER's draft decision and is likely to accept the AER's Draft Decision with some qualifications. • Powerlink intends to raise concerns regarding disproportionate arrangements under NCC between the maximum allowable rewards and the maximum allowable penalties and provided an example of the scheme differences between Version 4 and Version 5 NCC. **Q:** There is nothing stopping you from undertaking these same projects as part of capex or opex is there? **Q:** For example, you could still do the Greenbank system integrity protection scheme project? **R:** Yes we can still do these projects. The issue we're raising is that Version 4 is symmetrical and Version 5 is disproportionate. **C:** An important point is that if the AER does provide an allowance for these projects, that it is explicit in the decision. We also need to ensure that one project is not captured under one incentive, and then also under another. **C:** We might accept the outcome, but we just need to understand it better. Under a disproportionate incentive payment arrangement, the AER is saying of all the projects you've got, we're going to test that you got the result and improvement you			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	outlined. **C:** Powerlink has concerns with the disproportionate incentive arrangements for the network capability component of the STPIS. In our response to the AER, we intend to formalise our concerns that the scheme needs to be looked at. In our view, the balance is not right between the incentive and the potential penalty. We just want to flesh that out. **C (meeting observer):** Have a look at the historical payments and see if they are symmetrical. **C:** We are not complaining, we are just pointing out that it needs fleshing out. **C:** I think this is a great topic to engage this group on. It just needs to be broader than just this aspect. You should be engaging about the whole scheme, not just one aspect. **R:** We take your point. We have a view that this scheme has driven different outcomes for TNSPs. That's not a complaint, it's just different to our expectations. **C:** You could say there was a perception we were being over-rewarded for performance. **C:** Our view is that they have misapplied what they call a balanced scheme. I'm sure consumers would have a view on this. For us it's the idea of presenting a scheme as balanced when the carrot and stick is disproportionate. We will definitely be talking to the AER on that point. **C:** We have previously raised this issue about disproportionate incentive payments with the AER and will raise it again to ensure the scheme is balanced. We want to			

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	make sure the 'carrot and the stick' match.			
6	**Group discussion to gain input on "What would a more customer-focused Powerlink look like?"** ***See attached notes in Appendix A.***			
7	**Discussion regarding panel membership and focus for 2017** - Gerard Reilly, Group Manager Stakeholder Relations Summary of discussion: • Review the panel's Terms of Reference, particularly regarding membership • Potential areas of interest for next year's panel meetings **C:** It works well to have a Powerlink person facilitate the panel. **R:** We'd also like to invite representation from a renewable energy provider or generator onto the panel, in the interests of seeking a wide and varied membership. **C:** We also need to confirm all panel members wish to remain active, and consider the change-over period or succession planning as we approach the two year period of service. This will be an organic process with active participants. **Q:** Does attending meetings via teleconference work well?	Identify and invite new members as appropriate. Contact panel members who haven't regularly	Jan 2017 Jan 2017	Gerard Reilly Gerard Reilly

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	C: They don't often work well. Members really need to be in the room to actively participate. You can't do what we've just done regarding customer service (*discussion and notes on butcher's paper*) if you're not here in person. **C:** They obviously can't be involved in the interactive discussion. **C:** We'd like to set expectations that in-person attendance is the best way to participate. We really want to keep this panel going and ensure we get great value from the group.	attended meetings to discuss their level of ongoing interest.		
	C: Perhaps we can make teleconferencing the last resort if a member absolutely can't make the meeting. It's not about stopping people from taking part, it's just that our experience is the best way to engage is here face to face. **Q:** Is there an interest from panel members to participate in training regarding TNSPs and how our network operates?	Send revised Terms of Reference to panel members	Dec 2016	Nicole Maguire
	C: That would be a great idea and allow us to gain a better understanding of your business and the electricity industry. It would also help with allowing us to contribute better in these meetings.	Consider training for panel members.	By next meeting	Nicole Maguire
	Q: Can you send us today's presentation slides ASAP? **R:** Yes we can do that this afternoon. **C:** We also need to set a date for our next meeting, bearing in mind we usually have our Demand and Energy Forum in March.	Email members with presentation slides.	Completed	Nicole Maguire
	C: It's my preference that you provide the full year's schedule of meetings well in advance, would help with planning things out.	Email members with proposed	Dec 2016	Nicole Maguire

Item	Discussion	Action	Due date	Who
	R: We will also circulate a proposed 2017 meeting schedule to members.	2017 meeting dates.		
	Meeting closed at 4.15pm			

Appendix A – Group discussion notes regarding “What would a more customer-focused Powerlink look like?”

UNDERSTANDING

- Amount of information Powerlink provides on its operations eg share information with panel and members in a way that’s understood.
- Balancing act of information overload and explaining to provide minimum level of understanding.
- Education process eg post-final determination explain decision – making process once revenue determined eg spend on project.
- Assign with TNSPs and DNSPs performance – people only know us when there is a problem
- How to make people care
- Ensure when outages occur (or network planning) we can rapidly raise our profile
- Take proportionate approach to engagement when incidents occur (compared with business as usual)
- Source input on surveys from DNSPs (synergies)

INTERACTIONS

- Powerlink representatives attend customer/consumer organisations
- more regular meetings (BD ream reps)
- Maps of distribution and transmission networks – shared information on where networks are located
    - Help educate community
    - Can be confusing – so be clearer
- Inclusion of groups like local government
- Customer survey
- Coordinate engagement with DNSPs and retailers (stakeholders are stretched)

INFORMATION

- More dynamic network information (be able to do a quick desktop review) Eg substation loading and ratings
- More frequent than just TAPR
- Chapter information in public reports eg renewable chapter in TAPAR
- Information you already have – get it out there
- What renewable generations is going into grid
- Transparency on transmission component
  - Included on individual electricity bill

- Rail time demand information (security considerations) eg outage map
- Capacity map – dynamic
- Consumer engagement information
  - Difficult to find
- Sometimes better to target information better
  - Work out what's important and what's not

INNOVATION

- Low carbon future investment
  - Let's avoid making the same mistake
- Important Powerlink is out there talking about what it's doing
  - Not SA
- Update website
- Generator on customer and consumer panel?
- Participation on industry-wide support for consumers in vulnerable circumstances
- Consider representative on panel from landholders
- Increased genuine engagement and taking more risks for more projects (IAP2 spectrum)