Transmission Access Reform

stakeholder feedback template

The template below has been developed to enable stakeholders to provide their feedback on the questions posed in the Transmission Access Reform updated technical specifications and cost-benefit analysis, and any other issues that they would like to provide feedback on. The AEMC encourages stakeholders to use this template to assist it to consider the views expressed by stakeholders on each issue. Stakeholders should not feel obliged to answer each question, but rather address those issues of particular interest or concern. Further context for the questions can be found in the consultation paper.

SUBMITTER DETAILS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORGANISATION:** |  |
| **CONTACT NAME:** |  |
| **EMAIL:** |  |
| **PHONE:** |  |
| **DATE** |  |

**CHAPTER 2** – Design Components LMP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree with the use of the Volume Weighted Average Price as the regional price? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that dynamic marginal losses should be reflected in LMPs? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that some form of pricing mitigation should be introduced to apply an offer cap on LMPs in certain conditions? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that an ex ante mitigation mechanism is the best method for pricing mitigatiom? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders have any other comments on any of the other design elements of LMP? |  |

**CHAPTER 3** – financial transmission rights design

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that no additional measures are required to address competition in the FTR market? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree with FTRs being made available in the auction up to ten years in advance, albeit a small portion of the network capacity? |  |
| 1. Is the measure outlined above useful to participants if only a small portion is made available? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that both physical and non-physical participants should be able to purchase FTRs? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that there should **not** be a reserve price for FTRs? |  |
| 1. A) Do stakeholders see a benefit in terms of simplification of the reform with FTRs only being available between a limited number of pre-defined nodes on implementation? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that STIPS should be adjusted to be based on the cost of congestion, rather than instances of material congestion? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree that FTRs should not hedge price differences that arise due to marginal losses? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders have any other comments on any of the other design elements of FTRs? |  |

**CHAPTER 4** – Quantitative Impact Assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. What are the views of stakeholders regarding the estimation of a range of total consumer benefit of $6.2 – 8.2 billion over fifteen years operation of the NEM from 2026 to 2040? |  |
| 1. What are stakeholder views on the modelling that has been undertaken, including the methodology? |  |
| 1. What are stakeholder views on the different categories of benefits included? |  |
| 1. What are the views of stakeholders regarding the preliminary cost assessment that has been undertaken, and the indicative cost range provided? |  |

**CHAPTER 5** – Implementation and transitional ftr arrangements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree with a four-year implementation period for transmission access reform, following the finalisation of rules? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree with the objectives or benefits of the transitional allocation of FTRs? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders believe that the proposal for allocating transitional FTRs is appropriate? |  |
| 1. Do stakeholders agree with the eligibililty criteria set out in the paper? |  |