

Minutes

Meeting Title:	Gas Advisory Board (GAB)
Date:	12 March 2020
Time:	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Location:	Training Room 2, Albert Facey House 469 Wellington Street, Perth

Attendees	Class	Comment
Stephen Eliot	Chair	
Matthew Martin	Small-Use Consumer Representative	Minister's Appointee
Martin Maticka	AEMO	
Lipakshi Dhar	Economic Regulation Authority (ERA)	Observer
Alexandra Willis	Gas Producers	
Claire Quinn	Gas Producers	
John Jamieson	Pipeline Owners and Operators	
Rachael Smith	Pipeline Owners and Operators	
Hans Niklasson	Gas Users	
Richard Beverley	Gas Users	Proxy
Allan McDougall	Gas Shippers	Proxy

Apologies	Class	Comment
Chris Campbell	Gas Users	Proxy attended
Kathryn Sydney-Smith	Gas Shippers	
Michael Lauer	Gas Shippers	Proxy attended
Kate Ryan	Energy Policy WA (EPWA)	Proxy attended

Also in attendance	From	Comment
Natalie Robins	RCP Support	Minutes
Bryon McLaughlin	Energy Policy WA	Observer
Karan Sharma	APPEA	Observer

Item	Subject	Action
1	<p>Welcome</p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting at 1:00 PM and welcomed members and observers to the 12 March 2020 GAB meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Meeting Apologies/Attendance</p> <p>The Chair noted proxies and observers, as listed above.</p>	
3	<p>Review of Minutes from previous meeting</p> <p>The GAB accepted the tabled minutes of the GAB meeting on 26 September 2019 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p>	
4	<p>Actions Arising</p> <p>The Chair noted that the following three items were closed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 90 – AEMO provided a cost estimate for it to modify the Gas Bulletin Board (GBB) to receive and publish Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) trucking data on 12 November 2019. • Item 91 – Woodside provided a cost estimate for it to provide LNG trucking data to AEMO on 31 January 2020. • Item 92 – RCP Support circulated the cost estimates provided under Actions 90 and 91 to the GAB, which were discussed under Agenda Item 6. 	
5	<p>Overview of Rule Change Proposals</p> <p>The Chair noted that there were no open Rule Change Proposals.</p>	
6	<p>Displaying Trucked LNG Volumes on the GBB</p> <p>The GAB noted the paper summarising the issue and the actions undertaken to date. Cost estimates had been provided for Woodside to provide LNG trucking data to AEMO and for AEMO to modify the GBB to receive and publish LNG trucking data. The Chair asked the GAB to consider whether there is any value in capturing this information on the GBB, given these costs estimates; and if so, who is going to develop a Rule Change Proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Alan McDougall noted AEMO’s \$65,000 cost estimate and that Woodside had indicated that they are not geared up to provide daily trucked LNG volume data, given how they currently track the trucked LNG volumes. • Mr McDougall questioned whether trucked LNG counts toward Woodside’s domestic gas obligations and requirements. Ms Alexandra Willis confirmed that the Pluto trucked LNG volumes are considered domestic gas for the purposes of reporting to the State. 	

- Mr McDougall suggested that, given the practicalities of how Woodside manages trucked LNG, the information could be provided in a monthly report because Woodside probably already undertakes monthly reporting of its trucked LNG volumes for invoicing purposes, which can be provided in a standard report that does not cost \$65,000 to implement. Mr Maticka agreed that the cost of a standard monthly report published on the AEMO website would be trivial because AEMO would only need to put the information into a standard template and upload it onto the website. Mr McDougall considered that this option is quite feasible.
- Ms Willis explained how Woodside measures its trucked LNG volumes and why it cannot report these volumes on a daily basis and indicated that volume data is downloaded monthly for invoicing purposes.
- Mr McDougall and Mr Richard Beverley considered that it becomes like a basic meter in the distribution network that is read once a month, and you can just divide by the number of days to produce the daily number.
- Ms Willis noted that some of the trucked LNG volumes may go into storage, so the daily volume is not going to be an accurate reflection of what is actually being delivered to the market, although it would provide an estimate.
- Mr McDougall considered that this is similar to pipeline imbalances and noted that it can take four days for gas to get from Karratha to the South West, that positive and negative imbalances occur for long periods of time, and that there are different storage positions and unaccounted for gas. Given the number of different scenarios, Mr McDougall considered that the process should be made as simple as possible for all concerned. For example, Woodside could determine how many tonnes of LNG it trucks from the facility, convert this volume to gigajoules or terajoules for the month, and then put the average into a simple template using basic data entry. This process would not be costly or onerous. Mr McDougall reasoned that the whole purpose of the GBB and the Gas Statement of Opportunities (**GSOO**) is to make the market more transparent and this proposal would help achieve that purpose.
- Mr Hans Niklasson agreed with Mr McDougall's suggested approach and that the original intent of the GBB and the GSOO needed consideration. Mr Niklasson considered that the intent was to capture the gigajoules that enter the WA market and that the tonnes per day of trucked LNG could be converted to gigajoules using a Higher Heating Value (**HHV**). Ms Willis noted that conversion from volume to gigajoules was

	<p>not really the issue but that the challenge is measuring the daily volume that comes out of the facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr McDougall considered that on the Midwest pipeline, they adjust the HHV for the calculations every 1-3 weeks, and the pipeline balance swings according to the updated HHV number. Mr McDougall considered there are plenty of examples where things are not accurate (such as the accountability for nominations). Several attendees agreed with Mr McDougall. The Chair summarised that there appeared to be agreement from the GAB that a monthly report may have merit and questioned whether it was achievable from Woodside's perspective. Ms Willis indicated that Woodside would need to consider this further but noted that a daily report was not feasible at this point in time. Mr Niklasson questioned whether this was because the volumes do not get captured on the main tank daily. Ms Willis responded that, from her understanding, trucked products require weighbridge dockets to come back from the transporter before being uploaded into a back office system and that this does not occur on a daily basis. The Chair questioned whether AEMO and Woodside could provide feedback on a monthly report. Mr Maticka advised that a monthly report would simply be absorbed as 'business as usual' by AEMO, as it's as simple as updating a couple of procedures and uploading a PDF file to its website. Ms Willis indicated that Woodside would provide feedback in a month on the possibility of a monthly report. The Chair indicated that RCP Support would circulate the information from Woodside to the GAB via email and, if there was support for the proposal, a discussion could take place about who would develop the Rule Change Proposal. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woodside to provide feedback on the feasibility and cost of providing a monthly report on its trucked LNG volumes for the GBB. RCP Support to circulate Woodside's feedback to the GAB via email. GAB members to provide RCP Support with their views of the costs and benefits of a monthly report on trucked LNG volumes. 	<p>Woodside (30/04/2020)</p> <p>RCP Support (07/05/2020)</p> <p>GAB (21/05/2020)</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Recent Linepack Adequacy Events</p> <p>Mr Maticka gave a presentation regarding several linepack adequacy events that had occurred this year. Mr Maticka explained that the purpose of the presentation was not to imply that anyone</p>	

has breached the GSI Rules, which does not appear to be the case, but to discuss whether the GBB and the Emergency Management Facility (**EMF**) are meeting industry needs.

- **Slide 1:** provided a recap of the general capacity obligations, including for the Medium-Term Capacity, Capacity Outlook and Linepack Capacity Adequacy (**LCA**).
- **Slide 2:** showed gas days with amber (likely curtailment of interruptible flows) and red (likely curtailment of firm flows) linepack capacity adequacy. Mr Maticka explained that there have been a few more recent events than have occurred historically, with about 18 days of amber or red status on linepack capacity. Mr Maticka considered that this may be an isolated seasonal occurrence but it was probably still worth discussing it at the GAB.
- **Slide 3:** Mr Maticka noted that the first event occurred when there was flooding in an area, and a couple of the compressors tripped on the Goldfields Gas Pipeline (**GGP**). This led to a change to an amber status on 16 and 17 January 2020 and then it went to a red status on the 18 and 19 January 2020. Mr Maticka's understanding of the situation was that some gas was curtailed, AEMO was updated regularly and knew what was going on, and EPWA was advised of the situation through Mr Bryon McLaughlin. Mr Maticka explained that Parkeston Power station bid higher prices so they would not be dispatched but had gas in case they needed to be dispatched. Mr Maticka noted that there was no compliance issue under the Wholesale Electricity Market Rules and that the EMF was not activated.
- **Slide 4:** Mr Maticka explained that in the second event, Cyclone Damien had made landfall and Karratha Gas Plant was shut down on 8 February 2020 and Devil Creek on 9 February 2020. Mr Maticka noted that the LCA turned amber and the Capacity Outlook was changed to zero, and then the LCA reverted to green status (normal operation) for one day, before reverting to amber status for a couple of days until it was resolved.
- Ms Rachael Smith considered that the GBB may have been updated with Devil Creeks nameplate on 9 February 2020 but noted that both the Karratha and Devil Creek plants were actually shut down within 5-minutes of each other, on 8 February 2020, by 4:00 PM. Mr Maticka considered that this made more sense.
- **Slides 5 and 6:** Mr Maticka presented two slides on the production output that was seen on the pipelines during the two events, noting that the orange columns in the slide showed that the pipeline had an amber status and that production flowed for a couple of days before it built up again.

Mr Maticka considered that, from a generation point of view, the only real variation occurred due to wind, and AEMO was not aware that any gas plant was curtailed because of the reduction in gas coming in at the other end of the pipeline.

- Mr Beverley asked Ms Smith whether the amber event on 12 February 2020 was related to production or demand. Ms Smith considered that it was related to production and noted that the day before the event they had determined that North West Shelf had no redundancy and had only one platform operational. Ms Smith explained that, with no redundancy in gas supply coming through they decided to go to amber and to contact Mr McLaughlin. Ms Smith considered that the Dampier to Bunbury Pipeline (**DBP**) was not satisfied that there was redundancy in the system until the Angel and Goodwin Platforms were back, and so the LCA remained at amber.
- **Slide 7:** Mr Maticka presented a slide showing that injections into storage were reduced and Mondarra was injecting gas into the pipeline during the two events and then it reversed back after the situation was restored.
- Mr Beverley noted that Mondarra used to be slow in switching between injection and withdrawal from one day to the next and asked whether this was still the case. Mr Jamieson considered that it was no longer the case and that it takes about four hours to switch from injection to withdrawal.
- Mr Maticka noted that, as the operator, AEMO felt informed enough during the events but questioned the GAB as to whether:
 - the EMF should have been activated and, if it had been activated, would it have helped;
 - any more information could have been provided to the general industry in relation to these events;
 - the obligations on production facilities were sufficient; and
 - people should have responded or been notified in a broader way because there were issues with production.
- Mr Jamieson provided more background on the GGP situation, noting that:
 - Currently, GGP is fully contracted. There have been significant extensions since 2016 on the Eastern Goldfields pipeline where a number of new mine sites have connected to the GGP.
 - In contrast to the DBP, the GGP is a long skinny pipeline so, with increased load at the Southern end of the pipeline, the survival times are greatly reduced from two

or three years ago if there is an incident at one of the compressor sites on the GGP.

- The first thing that the GGP does when it has an incident is to cut off or curtail the interruptible customers, which triggers an amber status. The incidence of amber linepack status on the GGP is likely to increase going forward due to the increased load and the fact that it is fully contracted.
- The GGP is looking at what it can do to extend its capacity, but it is going to take time for this to happen.
- Ms Willis questioned whether the GGP cut off customers in the amber status events. Mr Jamieson responded that the GGP curtailed interruptible customers. Mr Jamieson considered that the GGP had historically relied fairly heavily on its long-term services to get by, which worked fine when the GGP had capacity, but now that it is fully contracted. Mr Jamieson noted that he was not sure that the EMF would help in this situation because the GGP had operational issues that were resolved onsite, and the GGP kept in regular contact with the affected Shippers and customers by email, which produced reasonably prompt responses.
- It was further suggested that the contractual obligations on notification of these events address most of the issues, and that the EMF probably could not respond more quickly, as the issue has usually been dealt with by the time a meeting could be arranged.
- Ms Smith considered that the situation is different for the DBP because it is beholden upon production facilities. Ms Smith noted that one of the DBP's issue is the rigour with which production facilities updated their information on the GBB. Ms Smith considered that production facilities never update their nameplate capacity on the GBB in a timely fashion, and that they often do not update their nameplate capacity when they have reduced down to different trains. Ms Smith considered that, from a market perspective, this creates an issue if people still think there's 1,200 TJ available when there is not, and DBP end up bearing the brunt.
- Ms Smith further considered that the definition of 'linepack' under the GSI Rules is not right. Ms Smith explained that DBP's circumstance during the event was that it had lots of 'capacity' but it had a linepack issue on that particular day, as 45% of the gas dropped off and linepack dived quickly. Ms Smith noted that gas was still being injected into the DBP and it could deliver 1,100 to 1,200 TJ/day, with all its services available, but there was not enough gas being injected. Ms Smith considered that the Varanus Island explosion is a classic example because DBP still had all of its capacity but there just was no gas being injected. Ms Smith noted that

linepack is a commodity issue, whereas curtailing is more of a capacity issue.

- Ms Smith noted that the GGP's issue was different again, as it was more about deliverability. Mr Jamieson agreed and considered that linepack adequacy is probably not the right term, as its really about pipeline health and whether it is able to deliver.
- Ms Smith considered that adding to this issue, communication by production facilities has been quite poor. Ms Smith explained that the production facilities do not respond unless the DBP goes to amber status, but something is done within half an hour if the DBP goes to amber status. Ms Smith considered that it would be beneficial for everyone if there was more rigour around posting on the GBB because otherwise the DBP will need to text Market Participants to let them know that the production facilities are off.
- Mr Beverley agreed with Ms Smith, noting that Alinta often does not know that there is an issue until they get a text message to tell them that a production plant is out, and then they do not know how long that plant has been down or when it is expected to be back. Mr Beverley considered that it is difficult when you have thousands of customers and power stations that need gas, and because of the contractual arrangements, it is not clear whether you have gas until after the gas day is done, which is too late. Mr Beverley noted that Alinta needs to address pressure issues on pipelines by bringing gas from storage and procuring gas from other producers. Knowing that there is a major production plant out in real time, and the expected timeframes as to when it will come back online and at what rates the production plants are producing, would help retailers.
- In response to a question, Mr Maticka noted that electricity generators in the Wholesale Electricity Market have an obligation to update their status immediately or as soon as practicable, and that once logged, the information is published within half an hour. However, Mr Maticka noted that supply and demand have to be balanced in real time in the electricity market and questioned whether a one to two-hour limit might be more acceptable for production facilities. Ms Smith considered that a three- to six-hour limit would be fine and reiterated that the DBP had found that production facilities do not provide updates at all, and if they do, it is two days later. Mr Maticka agreed that this was too long.
- Ms Smith considered that the DBP are managing events immediately but that they do this behind the scenes by sending texts to Market Participants to advise them to contact their producers. Mr Maticka considered that this is probably

not the most effective way to get the information to the market and that it could be automated. Ms Smith noted that the DBP were looking at ways to automate it internally because they need to get Market Participants to respond.

- Mr Beverley noted that Alinta responds immediately if it gets a text message from the DBP, but they get a number of amber alerts from the GBB and the seriousness of the issue behind the amber alert is not always clear (i.e. whether Alinta is going to be impacted, if the issue is going to be corrected straight away, and whether it is a linepack issue or a pressure issue). Mr Maticka considered that notification by text in this instance appeared substandard.
- GAB members acknowledged that they need something more robust than notification by text message. Mr Niklasson considered that operators are too busy addressing issues with their plant, which is understandable, and noted that part of the issue may be a reluctance to make a call in the short timeframe, determining who is best placed to make that call given that we do not have perfect information, and being able to make a call or 'estimate' without being held to it.
- Mr Martin observed that there is a requirement in the GSI Rules for estimates to be made in "good faith", which is all that you can really ask for.
- A discussion followed about whether:
 - some form of outage notification is required; or
 - a Rule Change is needed to enforce production facilities to update their status on the GBB as soon as reasonably practicable but no later than three hours.
- It was suggested that the information that is required for users to determine the impact of a plant trip and what they should do about it includes:
 - the rate of production;
 - when the trip occurred;
 - when the facility will start up again; and
 - what the ramp up will be.
- Ms Willis agreed that the information needs to be more readily available to everyone in the market rather than being sent by text messages, as you cannot be sure that all the necessary people are on the text message list. However, Ms Willis considered that care should be taken around how much information is provided because some producers have portfolios that they can use (such as transportation) to manage their supply commitments under their contracts, and you do

not want to alert customers that they need to source their own gas if the producer or operator can sort it out.

- Ms Smith considered that when multiple production facilities and 45% of gas supply is lost, as occurred when Devil Creek and KGP were shut down within ten minutes of one another, the DBP needed everyone in the market to know so that they could recalibrate and buy gas from somewhere else. However, in this instance, nobody was reacting 48 hours later, and it is situations like this when the DBP ends up at EPWA. Ms Willis agreed, noting that a market notification would trigger those conversations immediately, rather than having a time lapse and things getting out of hand. Ms Smith added that if pipelines are beholden to providing nameplate capacity, linepack capacity and LCA flags, then producers should be as well.
- Mr McLaughlin agreed that this is an issue and noted that it makes it hard for the Coordinator of Energy to assess risk under the State Hazard arrangements. With early advice and good quality information, the relevant stakeholders can be bought together, and the market can do what it needs to do. Mr McLaughlin considered that the lack of activation of the EMF was an oversight and that issues are sometimes over by the time the EMF can be activated. Mr McLaughlin noted that EPWA is cognizant of its responsibilities and the criteria for activating the EMF, and that there will be more focus on this going forward.
- Mr Maticka indicated that AEMO can investigate the need for a Rule Change Proposal and that GAB members can email him directly regarding the information that may be useful for an outage notification, and what it is that they are trying to address. Mr Maticka would accept that information received would be considered confidential unless otherwise directed and would produce a discussion paper for the GAB before going out to the industry or having an industry workshop.
- Ms Willis considered that in addition to the information that should be contained in the potential outage notification, consideration should be given to the timeframe around it.
- Mr Maticka clarified that, as an industry, you want information available straight away and that some time should be allowed to resolve critical aspects of the issue. Extra information can then be provided as it becomes available but would need to be finalised after a set time, such as after three hours after the event occurs. Mr Maticka further considered that you do not want people to be distracted from resolving the issue by filling out lots of forms, and there are lots of ways the notice could be constructed so that it could take two minutes to capture initially. Ms Willis noted, however, that you do not want to

	<p>unnecessarily panic the market as trips do occur, and they also have production facilities that change compressors that are back up within four hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms Smith offered to send Mr Maticka the DBP's pipeline thresholds for when DBP considers that it needs to alert the market. However, Mr Jamieson noted that he is cautious about linepack thresholds because the usefulness of the threshold depends on the pipeline. Mr Jamieson considered that this is why flags have traditionally been used, rather than getting into reporting linepack numbers that can be easily misconstrued (i.e. reporting a high linepack number is not useful if the linepack cannot be used). Ms Smith agreed with not reporting specific linepack volumes, as what the DBP considers is good vs. what is an issue depends on the time of year. Mr Jamieson noted that thresholds are given to AEMO every 6 months under the Short Term Trading Market rules to update the linepack capacity for a particular pipeline, as it affects particular points. Mr Jamieson noted, however, that this information is not published and is only used to provide AEMO with linepack capacity for a contingency event. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAB members to email Mr Maticka regarding the information that would be useful for outage notifications, and what it is that they are trying to address. AEMO to develop a discussion paper regarding information reporting for outage notification, for consideration at the next GAB meeting. 	<p>GAB (17//04/2020)</p> <p>AEMO (10/09/2020)</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>General Business</p> <p>Potential to Move to Teleconferencing or Video Conferencing for GAB Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair noted that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Market Advisory Committee (MAC) are looking at giving everyone the option to attend MAC Meetings by teleconference or by videoconference going forward. The Chair noted that he is looking to do the same for the GAB, using 'TEAMS', which has an online portal for those that don't have access to it. <p>Energy Policy WA 'Directions Paper' regarding the Rule Change Panel's (Panel) appointment process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair noted that the Panel had asked him to make sure that GAB members are aware of the EPWA's Directions Paper as it will result in some changes to how the Panel works. The Chair invited Mr Martin to provide an overview of the paper. 	

- Mr Martin noted that:
 - With the previous IMO arrangement, strict criteria were put in place around appointment of Panel members to manage potential conflicts of interest. Some of the main criteria were that Panel members could not work for Market Participants or the ERA and could not be Public Servants.
 - As part of the Electricity Market Reform, responsibility for Rule Making was transferred from the IMO to the Panel. Mr Peter Kolf was made the Chair of the Panel and two other Panel members were appointed who were previously IMO Directors. The Chair was appointed for four years and the others were appointed for shorter terms.
 - Since that time, there have been attempts to find new Panel members to replace old members, but the criteria are so strict that no-one can be found that meets the criteria within Western Australia.
 - Accordingly, EPWA is looking to make some changes to the criteria in the Energy Regulations to allow people who have suitable skills to be Panel members. This includes Public Servants outside of EPWA and the ERA, and persons employed in any industry, including Market Participants, consultants of Market Participants, and Customers. Staff from AEMO will continue to be excluded. The main people who are employed in the energy industry who do not have any conflicts of interest are employable for the Gas Industry.
 - EPWA will aim to employ people with as few conflicts as possible and to put processes in place for the Panel to manage any issues that may arise. The Panel will also need to have measures in place to manage its own conflicts of interest, as would any other Panel, such as the Takeover Panel.
 - EPWA is proposing an expansion of the Panel from three to five members, whilst keeping the quorum at three Panel members, so that any particular matter will be heard by three, four or five Panel members, depending on the presence of conflicts of interest.
 - The paper has been endorsed by the Minister for Energy and EPWA, and draft changes have been made to the *Energy Industry (Rule Change Panel) Regulations 2016*, which are out for comment for any unforeseen consequences or drafting errors.
 - The Panel Chair's term expires in January and he does not wish to continue, and a process is needed to get new

Panel members with the right skills and experience to assess Rule Change Proposals, particularly with the changes to the electricity market that are occurring.

- Mr Maticka questioned whether being a director of AEMO was considered employment at AEMO. Mr Martin confirmed that this was the case.
- Mr Maticka questioned whether there was any intention to have an ERA style Chair that is a full-time employee? Mr Martin indicated that EPWA had tried not to change the nature of the Panel and its operations in terms of the payment rate, as it did not want to create an undue impost on the market.
- Mr Martin noted that the paper is open for comment until the 26 March 2020 on the EPWA website and the Chair recommended that the GAB have a look at the paper and direct any comments to EPWA.

GAB Appointment Process and GAB Structure

- The Chair explained that:
 - Currently the GAB is structured with 14 members:
 - a Chairman;
 - the Coordinator of Energy;
 - an AEMO representative;
 - a small use customer representative;
 - two members appointed by each of the Producers, Pipeline Operators, Shippers and Users; and
 - two observers, one from the ERA and one from the Minister.
 - Each year, half of the GAB members representing Producers, Pipeline Operators, Shippers and Users step down. The positions are open for nominations and the Panel then reappoints members. This appointment process is an administrative burden to manage for a body that meets twice a year.
 - Four GAB members (Claire Quinn, Rachel Smith, Mike Lauer, and Hans Niklasson) are due to step down in July this year. These members can renominate but RCP Support is required to run the nomination process again, because a change to the structure cannot be implemented before then.
 - The GAB is operated in such a way that any observers that request to attend the GAB are usually allowed to attend and everybody's comments are

	<p>minuted, irrespective of whether they are an official member.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GAB is not a voting body. The only decision that the GAB makes is about recommending the urgency rating of Rule Change Proposals to the Rule Change Panel. ● The Chair questioned whether this structure is still fit for purpose or whether, for example, GAB meetings should be open to all gas Market Participants to attend, as they see fit, or if there is something in between that may be more suitable? The Chair noted that Market Participants pay for this process and offered that if the GAB wants to continue with the same structure it can. ● Ms Smith questioned whether, considering that the GAB only meets twice a year, the appointment term could be lengthened, so that instead of it being two years, it could be four years. The Chair noted that this is an option. ● A suggestion that everyone is rolled off the Board at the same time every second year and then reapplies was put forward, but it was considered that this still seemed too onerous. ● Mr Martin offered that the purpose of the current structure was to ensure that the membership is balanced and representative of the industry. ● Mr Maticka considered that the GAB should have defined members, which ensures that members acknowledge their obligation as representatives in the forum. Mr Maticka liked the fact that observers' comments are currently minuted, as its good practice, but noted that this is not a mandated requirement and there is always a risk that, with a change in the Chair, this approach may change. Mr Maticka considered that, in terms of the regularity of the nomination process, it is too short given the workload that the GAB has and that the administrative load to even submit a nomination is too high. Accordingly, Mr Maticka was supportive of a longer term, noting that people can stand down if they are not available, and their circumstances change. ● The Chair noted that it would certainly be a much simpler change to extend the timelines. There was some question around whether changes would be required to the Market Rules and/or Regulations to amend the term of the nomination process. Mr Martin considered that it was a change to the Market Rules. ● Mr Maticka and Mr Martin highlighted the difference in the volumes of material dealt with by the GAB and the MAC, which meets much more frequently. Mr Maticka considered that the frequency with which the nominations are refreshed through 	
--	--	--

	<p>the MAC is quite valuable, because of the volume of material that it goes through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair questioned whether a 4-year structure, with staggered reappointments every two years would be suitable and there was agreement in the room that this sounded reasonable. Mr Martin questioned whether the Chair would need someone to propose this. The Chair confirmed that this was the case and suggested that he would take a look at how the structure might work first. The Chair and Mr Martin agreed to take the conversation offline. 	
	<p>The Chair noted that next meeting is scheduled for the 17 September 2020.</p>	

The meeting was closed at 2:00 PM.