



First session




To allow us to use anonymised poll data, do you represent:




Do you agree that financeability challenges could arise in the future under ISP scenarios?



Do you support the draft recommendation?




Is the development of AER Guidelines an appropriate way to implement these arrangements?



Second session

Do you agree that the current cost recovery mechanisms are appropriate to allow TNSPs to recover the costs associated with social licence activities?



In a word or 2 are there other activities that are not captured under the existing cost recovery mechanism?

No

Legal advice for community

CESS dis-incentivises social licence

Buying social licence. Greater compensation for land access?

indigenous rights

No. And it's extension is an invitation to future infrastructure being held to ransom

Don't know

Planning for Tailored community engagement

Building goodwill that will transfer to the next project. Communities talk to each other.

In a word or 2 are there other activities that are not captured under the existing cost recovery mechanism?

Non project direct costs AER approach to capitalisation

Unsure

Community Communications costs to inform why and how Transmission is important

"Appropriate/acceptable" compensation for landholders/communities


correctly treating capex and opex activities

Building relationships

relationship to RITT outcomes

Third session

Do you agree with the proposed approach?



7. Is anything further needed to clarify the recovery of expenditure for planning and delivering major transmission projects?

Unsure

Just who pays and how (current tariffs are BAD)

Unsure

no, just ensure there is full transparency

The AER needs to write an appropriate Guideline. They don't need any additional powers to do so.

The key issue is the workability of staging and how to assess the benefit v costs of early works as a standalone project

Why should the costs of doing good business be refunded

Some degree of cost amalgamation for multiple projects

Implications of incentive mechanisms

7. Is anything further needed to clarify the recovery of expenditure for planning and delivering major transmission projects?

Does this include costs for any feed back loop reviews

Would unforeseen preparatory activities (ie selection activities) also be recoverable in CPA or just pass through?

1. Clear definitions/classifications of "major transmission project"
2. Interconnector costs should be shared across NEM regions commensurate with the % benefits each region derives (rather than 50/50 between the directly-connected TNSPs).

Costs related to preparatory activities for major transmission projects are not always clear when the project size, impact technology solution are unknown, given how far out the Future ISP projects are.

Whether this will eliminate the need for Commonwealth/ States to provide underwrites


What consumer/community engagement is required as part of the process especially the CPA process

We must have Transmission - the end consumer is not told why, how, and what they pay for


Final session



Do you agree with the draft recommendation?



9. Is the proposed exclusion window the best way to align the feedback loop with a draft or final ISP?



In you answer no to the previous question, please indicate why?

How long is the exclusion window- 6 months?

No - will be around 4/5 months

Without FEEDBACK on CONSUMER impact it's all moot

transmission projects are already at the risk of delays...


I answered Unsure - because I really don't think we need to do anything. But the window has the effect of DELAYING investment, so not really a good idea.

adds delay to implementation of projects.

the simultaneous feedback loop and CPA process seems problematic in terms of consumer engagement processes

Market modelling should be done for the ISP and projects selected through that process, rather than also requiring RIT-Ts with complex feedbacks that just delay projects.

10. Should the feedback loop be aligned with a draft or final ISP?



11. Will delays due to bunching of assessments around a draft or final ISP be material?

Yes, need to prioritise timely investment in transmission

Unsure

I don't think anyone can actually answer that question.

Unlikely, but should be considered further in Stage 3 as part of a broader solution

not material - the timing of projects is not driven by these approval issues - it is driven by the time it takes to get social licence

Possibly

Yes. but running CPA in parallel would help.

Probably ... continuous feedback might be better

No. And if materiality is the test, not sure anything presented today will make any difference

11. Will delays due to bunching of assessments around a draft or final ISP be material?

paralysis by analysis?

AEMC could map this out on the basis of indicative project timings of Actionable projects?

The real way to address delays is to either streamline or remove the RIT-T process and just do all the market modelling and project selection in one hit via the ISP.

running the CPA and feedback loop process simultaneously seems problematic for consumer engagement

Known unknown.

Will depend on the timing of the different. Timing of the projects

No - ISP projects mostly have different commencement dates. Also there is still an 18 month window in a 24Month period still provides flexibility