

Pilbara Advisory Committee (PAC) - Minutes

Date:	28 August 2025
Time:	1:30 pm – 3:10 pm
Location:	Level 1, 66 St Georges Terrace and Online, via TEAMS

Attendees	Representing in PAC	Comment
Sally McMahon	Chair	Attended in person
James Campbell-Everden	Independent System Operator (ISO)	Attended in person
Clayton James	Excluded Network Service Provider (NSP)	Proxy for Rebecca White
Gabby Pracilio	Contestable Customer	Attended in person
Rosh Ireland	Small-Use Consumer	
Michael Ford	Discretionary Rule Participant	Attended in person
Kristian Myhre	Discretionary Rule Participant	
Anthony Ravi	Registered NSP	
Momcilo Andric	Registered NSP	
Jaden Williamson	Registered NSP	Proxy for Sandy Morgan
Noel Ryan	Minister Appointed Observer	
Other attendees	From	Comment
Dora Guzeleva	EPWA	PAC Secretariat
Tom Coates	EPWA	PAC Secretariat
Thomas Tedeschi	EPWA	PAC Secretariat
Luke Commins	EPWA	PAC Secretariat
Tim Robinson	RBP	Presenter for Item 5
Apologies	From	Comment
Bethwyn Cowcher	Discretionary Rule Participant	
Sandra McInnes	Contestable Customer	
Melinda Anderson	ERA Appointed Observer	

1. WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting with an Acknowledgement of Country.

The Chair noted that she has been re-appointed as a part-time councillor on the National Competition Council following the expiry of her previous term in August 2025. She also noted that she continues as a Commissioner at the AEMC and that any views expressed by the PAC, are not necessarily those of the independent Chair.

The Chair noted the Competition Law Statement, reminded members of their obligations, and encouraged them to bring any issues to her attention should they arise.

The Chair reminded members that the meeting would be recorded to develop the Minutes.

2. MEETING APOLOGIES AND ATTENDANCE

The Chair noted the attendance as listed above.

The Chair thanked Ms Pracilio, Mr Campbell-Everden and Mr Ford for attending in person.

The Chair welcomed Mr Ford as the newest discretionary member of the PAC.

3. MINUTES OF MEETINGS 2025_06_26

The 26 June 2025 meeting minutes were approved out-of-session and published on the Coordinator's website on 6 August 2025.

4. ACTION ITEMS

The Chair noted that the one action item in the register was closed.

5. EVOLUTION OF THE PILBARA NETWORK RULES: DISCUSSION ON DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Chair introduced this item, referring to the covering paper in the combined meeting papers.

The Chair proposed the following running order:

- Dependencies, triggers and timing (slides 6 to 12).
- Work outline (slides 18 to 24).
- Working group discussion and questions for the PAC (slides 25 to 26).

Ms Guzeleva presented the introductory slides (1 to 5). She highlighted that the HTR Working Group had reached final positions on several issues, with EPWA now drafting amending rules to address them. She advised that the Working Group aimed to finalise the remaining urgent issues at its next meeting in September.

Ms Guzeleva invited Mr Robinson to speak to the remainder of the slides and facilitate discussion for this item.

a) Dependencies, triggers and timing

- Mr Robinson introduced this section and invited member comments.
- Mr Ravi questioned whether renewable energy penetration was the most suitable trigger, noting that renewable generation in the NWIS already exceeds 10%. He

suggested that the number of participants might be a better trigger to ensure sufficient market depth for trading.

- Mr Ravi also emphasised the need to recover costs from new participants who benefit from these reforms. He cautioned that introducing complexity and regulation too early could discourage investment.

Ms Guzeleva reiterated the Pilbara Industry Roundtable's outcome for shared transmission infrastructure. She stressed that, regardless of the trigger, reforms must be planned well in advance and could take three to five years to design and implement. She expressed openness to alternative triggers and invited members input, noting that these alternative options would be included in the consultation on the implementation plan.

Ms Guzeleva agreed that ISO fee reform was required and noted that reform and infrastructure costs would be amortised and shared across participants over time.

- Ms Pracilio reflected that potential NWIS entrants would need clarity on the rules, for their future evolution, and to help evaluate the extent to which parties plan future options.
- Mr Williamson questioned whether benefits would be equivalent if the NWIS reached 20% renewable penetration without further load growth or interconnection. He asked whether other factors should be considered in terms of timing and triggers.

The Chair invited Mr Ford to comment on appropriate trigger.

- Mr Ford asked whether 20% penetration should be treated as a fixed trigger, or whether it should be re-evaluated if system development lagged behind expectations.
- Mr James suggested incorporating forecasts of renewable penetration into the trigger, rather than relying solely on retrospective milestones.

The Chair invited views on any disadvantages to the early introduction of reforms.

Ms Guzeleva responded that the main short-term drawback would be the upfront costs for whichever party built new systems.

- Mr Campbell-Everden agreed that the trigger could be reviewed closer to when 20% renewable generation was projected. He noted that the NWIS already had 10-12% of renewable generation and emphasised the importance of commencing reform design now.

Ms Guzeleva reiterated that EPWA would present options for alternative triggers, in addition to the 20% renewable generation threshold, in the upcoming consultation paper.

b) Work outline

Mr Robinson introduced the discussion on the work outline (slides 18 to 24).

- Mr Andric asked whether transferring control desk functions to the ISO meant it would assume responsibility for the three current control desks of APA, Horizon Power and Rio Tinto.

Mr Robinson clarified that the transfer involved bringing the currently delegated control desk functions in-house in the ISO.

- Mr Williamson suggested that the proposed ISO fee model might like to consider or clarify the definition of 'participant'.

Mr Robinson suggested that this could be considered further during detailed design.

- Mr Myhre proposed introducing a process for regularly reassessing the implementation plan's progress and adjusting as required. He stressed that the efficiency in the Pilbara system was paramount.

The Chair recommended that Mr Myhre's suggestion be considered during consultation, highlighting the importance of overarching governance to ensure resources, personnel and outcomes remained aligned and achievable.

Ms Guzeleva added that implementation plans rarely remain static, citing previous market changes. She committed to regularly providing updates on the implementation plan to the PAC but cautioned against creating formal reviews that would add to overheads and slow delivery.

- Mr Andric suggested that load shedding should be considered earlier in the timeline, given that precedents already exist, and recommended that fault level requirements should also be brought forward.

Mr Robinson noted that these items could be progressed earlier, but the current staging reflect bandwidth considerations, noting the number of planned reform activities.

- Mr Campbell-Everden observed that the ISO already has a control desk function, but currently delegates it to Horizon Power, meaning a rule change is not required to bring the control desk in-house.
- Mr James suggested that the trading mechanism might be introduced ahead of the balancing mechanism.
- Mr Andric suggested that supply arrangements for transmission foundation customers be described as 'appropriate' rather than 'preferential'.

Ms Guzeleva confirmed that EPWA would amend the wording in the final consultation paper to remove the term 'preferential'.

c) Working group discussions and feedback to the PAC

The Chair invited PAC members reactions to the EPNR Working Group's draft implementation plan discussions.

- Mr Ireland reported that the Expert Consumer Panel had discussed the value of incentivising flexible loads early. Although not currently included in the plan, he argued that it was of sufficient value to warrant consideration and encouraged views on whether this should be reflected in the PNR or another policy instrument.

Project timeline and next steps:

The Chair introduced discussion on next steps and invited final comments on the draft implementation plan.

Ms Guzeleva advised that the final date for publication of the consultation paper would be confirmed following internal coordination between the PNAC and PNR work programs within EPWA. She said that EPWA intended to present a summary of submissions at the appropriate PAC meeting.

- Mr Myhre supported retaining the Connection Point Compliance (CPC) concept in the PNR, noting that renewable projects often have a collection of generators with a micro-grid controller, meaning that compliance is only possible at the connection point.

Ms Guzeleva explained that CPC Facilities and self-contained networks are distinct, and a CPC Facility does not necessarily have to be part of a self-contained network. She

advised that the only proposed change to CPC provisions was to remove the requirement for equipment to be non-compliant before CPC could be applied for. She reminded members of the enhanced information requirements for CPC applications, noting that participants should generally be able to opt for CPC even with fully compliant equipment.

- Mr Williamson asked if a self-contained network opting to become a network user would be treated as a regular customer for the purposes of user standards and approvals, rather than continuing to be treated as a standalone network.

Mr Robinson replied that the proposal was not yet developed to that level of detail and would need further consideration.

- Mr Ireland recommended that load shedding plans prioritise essential services communities rely on, such as hospitals, which required secure electricity supply.
- Mr Campbell-Everden stated that the ISO would provide direct support to EPWA during the Pilbara reforms implementation, contributing key information to assist in the design and delivery of reforms.

Action: EPWA will continually review the appropriateness of planned activities and timings, and will update the PAC on progress regularly.

6. GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair thanked members for their contributions and for their work in progressing the EPNR project to date. She also acknowledged those who attended the meeting in person.

The next PAC meeting will be held online at 1:30pm on 30 October 2025.

The meeting closed at 3:10pm.