

## Minutes

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	Evolution of the Pilbara Network Rules (EPNR) Working Group (Workstream 1 - PNR)
<b>Date:</b>	31 July 2025
<b>Time:</b>	9:30 AM – 11:30 AM
<b>Location:</b>	Online, via TEAMS

Attendees	Company	Comment
Dora Guzeleva	Chair, Energy Policy WA (EPWA)	
Anthony Ravi	APA	
Rebecca Mason	APA	
Clayton James	BHP	Proxy for Rebecca White
Nathan Kirby	BHP	
Lekshmi Jaya Mohan	BP	
Anthony Marcos Guevarra	CITIC Pacific Mining	
Matthew Bowen	Energy Transform	
Melinda Anderson	ERA	
Herman Prinsloo	Horizon Power (Generation and Other Business)	
Jaden Williamson	Horizon Power (Pilbara Network)	
Jason Chanlongsirichai	Horizon Power (Pilbara Network)	
James Campbell-Everden	Pilbara ISOC	
Peter Van Den Dolder	Pilbara ISOC	
Summa McMahon	Pilbara ISOC	
Noel Michelson	Rio Tinto	
Michael Ford	Woodside	
Reece Tonkin	YEC	
Tom Coates	EPWA	
Thomas Tedeschi	EPWA	
Eija Samson	Robinson Bowmaker Paul (RBP)	
Tim Robinson	Robinson Bowmaker Paul (RBP)	

Item	Subject
1	<p><b>Welcome and Agenda</b></p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting with an Acknowledgement of Country.</p> <p>The Chair noted the Competition Law Statement and reminded members of their obligations, encouraging them to raise any Competition Law issues with her if they arose.</p>
2	<p><b>Meeting Attendance</b></p> <p>The Chair noted the attendance as listed above.</p>
3	<p><b>Minutes of Meeting 2024_11_21</b></p> <p>The working group had previously approved the minutes out-of-session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Chanlongsirichai clarified that Mr Prinsloo attended as a representative of Horizon Power Generation and Other Business and requested that the Minutes be updated accordingly.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: EPWA to update the previous Minutes to reflect Mr Prinsloo's attendance as a representative of Horizon Power Generation and Other Business.</b></p>
4	<p><b>PNR Workstream Implementation Plan</b></p> <p>The Chair summarised the discussions during the two 2025 meetings of the Pilbara Advisory Committee (PAC). She noted that the PAC members now largely support the proposals, or differ only on implementation timing, rather than on substantive issues. She advised that this meeting was an opportunity to further workshop those issues by discussing the proposed implementation plan.</p> <p>The Chair reported that the HTR Workstream had met prior to this meeting and was progressing rapidly toward rule drafting for several HTR initiatives, which will proceed ahead of the PNR workstream.</p> <p>The Chair introduced slides 1 to 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Chanlongsirichai requested an update on the Pilbara Networks Access Code (PNAC) review, noting that it may impact the timing and implementation of the EPNR Proposals. He also emphasised the importance of cost analysis, as any new costs would ultimately be passed on to customers.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair responded that an update on the PNAC review had been provided to the PAC and noted that EPWA's two relevant teams meet regularly to align their work programs. She offered to provide Mr Chanlongsirichai with a contact for the PNAC workstream.</p> <p>The Chair added that modelling had been previously undertaken demonstrating the avoided costs resulting from the proposed reforms, which would be revisited in this meeting.</p> <p>Mr Robinson presented slides 5 to 11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms McMahon recommended that the proposal for classifying confidential information be implemented alongside the long-term planning proposal, as the two proposals are interdependent.</li> <li>Ms McMahon also recommended that the proposed changes to the Metering Code be implemented together with the contingency reserve proposal.</li> <li>Mr Williamson suggested bringing forward the NSP-to-NSP connection proposal, noting that all priority corridors currently being developed under the PETP will involve a new NSP connecting to the NWIS. He emphasised that new NSPs should be made aware of connection requirements early and proposed a mid-2026 implementation timeline.</li> </ul>

Item	Subject
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Tonkin supported Mr Williamson's comments, adding that the proposal would affect investment decisions, as NSP-to-NSP connection arrangements must be settled before access contracts can be issued to customers.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair noted an action for the EPWA teams working on PNR and PNAC evolution to coordinate and identify what must be in place across the Pilbara system to support final investment decisions and Priority Corridor Agreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr James inquired about the readiness of the Pilbara System Plan Proposal for rule drafting. He noted there was still uncertainty surrounding future electrification and renewable development plans, and how that would affect the information requirements and assumptions for the PSP.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Robinson clarified that the rule change would establish a head of power for the plan, with a supporting procedure to be developed later.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Changlongsirichai noted that Horizon Power had made a submission on the outage planning proposal and requested that it is considered during detailed design.</li> <li>Ms McMahon recommended prioritising the detailed design of connection point compliance for self-contained networks, given likely interactions with other early-stage design activity.</li> <li>Mr James queried whether commencement timing for outage planning considered the implementation requirements for participants, including time to develop procedures and systems.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair agreed stating that, while rules could be drafted, their commencement could be delayed to allow time for stakeholders to prepare.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Tonkin suggested that the design for preferential treatment of foundational customers be considered earlier than 2028, highlighting its potential impact on transmission investment and risk allocation between customers and proponents in the Pilbara system.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Robinson noted that EPWA can discuss the issue further with Mr Tonkin offline.</p>
	<hr/> <p><b>ACTION: EPWA to provide Mr Chanlongsirichai with a contact from the team developing PNAC reforms.</b></p> <hr/>
	<p><b>ACTION: EPWA to discuss the timing of design work for the preferential treatment of foundation customers with Mr Tonkin.</b></p> <hr/>
5	<p><b>Initiatives with Trigger Conditions</b></p> <p>Mr Robinson introduced the slides for this item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Kirby asked whether common use infrastructure or transmission corridors could serve as a trigger in their own right. He cited BHP's inland network as an example of a project that could impose significant load on the NWIS, potentially connecting via new transmission before any new renewable generation is built.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair offered to discuss this topic further with Mr Kirby outside the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Williamson noted that while the modelling assumes future interconnection via new transmission, there may be increased renewable uptake without additional interconnection. He questioned whether the 20 per cent renewable energy trigger alone would be appropriate in that scenario.</li> <li>Mr Tonkin agreed that transmission levels and system interconnection would be relevant factors in the implementation plan.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair advised that EPWA would consider this further and update the implementation plan if required.</p> <hr/>

Item	Subject
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms Mason asked whether the 20% renewables trigger would be based on forecasts, committed projects or actual generation output. She noted the uncertainty around future renewable project implementation and the risk of participants incurring unnecessary system costs.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair acknowledged the concern and noted that policy designs of this nature need to commence early, given the time required to finalise them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Williamson highlighted the potential dependencies between these proposals and the PNAC workstream, particularly around new functions being assigned to the ISO. He noted that, for example, it would be helpful for the ISO to have clarity on all functions it would assume when taking the Control Desk functions in-house, to improve efficiency and avoid re-work.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair suggested that an ISO Control Desk could be established and evolve over time to accommodate new technologies, functions and market design.</p> <p>Mr Robinson added that, beyond the materials provided in the meeting slides, the evolution of the ISO would also be mapped at a high level in the implementation plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Chanlongsirichai expressed concern that the proposed two-year terms for ISO industry directors are too short. He suggested that three- or four- year terms were more appropriate. He also asked about the process for selecting which two of the three NSP board members would remain in the short-term.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair agreed that longer terms would be more appropriate and noted that the initial selection of NSP representatives on the board would likely be a Ministerial decision, and not subject to EPWA consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Williamson asked whether the same term lengths would apply to government-appointed ISO directors.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Robinson confirmed that three independent directors would be appointed by the Government, and that similar term lengths would apply.</p>

---

**ACTION: EPWA to discuss the inclusion of new transmission as a trigger in the Implementation Plan with Mr Kirby.**

---

## 6 New Issues

Mr Robinson introduced the slide for this item, which addressed the new issue of reviewing the current PNR balancing payment rules to ensure ESS costs are separated from the balancing costs, to avoid an undercollection of balancing charges.

- Ms Mason emphasised that this issue should be addressed early, as it affects the efficiency of the current system.
- Ms McMahon noted that this issue is likely to be complex due to its broader implications and recommended an off-line meeting with EPWA to discuss the existing Rules and potential implications of changes, as EBAS data is commercially sensitive. The ISO agrees that a public rule-change process is the appropriate forum to resolve this issue given the broader implications on balancing nominees.
- Ms McMahon also raised a potential new issue: the need to create rules and/or heads of power for visibility and metering, which are currently managed by the ISO through its procedures. She noted that the ISO would soon need to conduct a review of the visibility procedure.

The Chair highlighted the need for the Coordinator of Energy to undertake longer-term, more integrated planning for the Pilbara - beyond the GenSOO and Pilbara System Plan. She suggested the Coordinator could prepare a plan similar to the Whole of System Plan in the SWIS and invited PAC members to provide feedback.

---

Item	Subject
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms Mason responded that APA is not opposed to long-term planning by the Coordinator, but stressed whoever is responsible should have sufficient skills, expertise and resources. She advised she would consult within APA regarding the preferred approach to long-term planning in the Pilbara.</li> </ul>

## 7 Other Business

### Next Steps

The Chair introduced the slide on next steps.

- Mr Chanlongsirichai suggested that consultation timeframes take into account school holidays.

The Chair agreed to consider school holidays when setting consultation periods.

- Ms Mason asked when stakeholders would have an opportunity to consult on proposed PNR rule changes developed during the EPNR Project.

The Chair responded that urgent proposals requiring rule changes would be consulted on separate to the Implementation Plan. She added that detailed design for the remaining proposals would be developed following publication of the Implementation Plan.

**The meeting closed at 11:23 am.**