

Gas Advisory Board Minutes

Meeting Title:	Gas Advisory Board (GAB)
Date:	27 August 2026
Time:	13:30 – 15:00
Location:	Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Class	Comment
Sally McMahon	Chair	
Amy Tait	Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO)	
Michael Bartholomew	Coordinator of Energy Representative	Proxy for Paul Power
Christopher Alexander	Small Use Customer nominated by the Minister	
Noel Ryan	Observer appointed by the Minister	
Cleon Malelo	The Economic Regulation Authority (observer)	
Previn Bhar	Gas Producers	
David Rafferty	Gas Producers	
Jack Rowe	Pipeline Operators and Owners	
Trent Leach	Pipeline Operators and Owners	Proxy for Rachael Smith
Richard Beverley	Gas Shippers	
Nicholas Wish	Gas Users	Joined at 1.39 pm. Proxy for Allan McDougall
Paul Arias	Gas Users	
Other attendees	From	Comment
Hamish McKay	AEMO	Presenter for item 4
Dora Guzeleva	Department of Energy and Economic Diversification (DEED)	GAB secretariat
Sanna Pember	DEED	GAB secretariat
Anthea Page	DEED	GAB secretariat
Apologies	From	Comment
Allan McDougall	Gas Shippers	
Rachael Smith	Pipeline Operators and Owners	

Paul Power	Coordinator of Energy Representative	
------------	--------------------------------------	--

1. WELCOME AND AGENDA

The Chair opened the meeting with an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed members.

The Chair noted that she had no conflicts to declare and that advice the GAB provides to the Coordinator of Energy does not necessarily represent the views of the Chair.

She noted the Competition and Consumer Law obligations, inviting members to bring to her attention any issues should they arise.

2. MEETING APOLOGIES AND ATTENDANCE

The Chair noted the attendance as listed above. The Chair welcomed members and invited new members and reappointed members to introduce themselves.

Mr Rowe, Mr Arias, Mr Bhar and Mr Malelo provided a brief introduction.

3. ACTION ITEMS

The Chair noted that Action 112, the Economic Regulation Authority's (ERA) compliance monitoring and enforcement update remains open as an annual standing item, with next update to be provided by the ERA at the next GAB meeting.

The Chair also noted that Action 123 is closed, as the requested information was provided to GAB members following the 5 March 2026 meeting.

4. 2025 GAS BULLETIN BOARD WA ZONES REVIEW

Mr McKay presented the outcomes of AEMO's 2025 Gas Bulletin Board (GBB) WA Zones Review.

He presented slide 3 (Previous GBB Zone List) and slide 4 (What is the GBB Zone Review) and noted that this is the third review undertaken by AEMO since the GBB was established.

Mr McKay presented slide 5 (How has the WA gas landscape changed?). He noted that:

- at the time of the review there were 75 Gas Market Participants registered on the GBB, representing an increase of 11 participants since the previous review in 2020; and
- the review considered the addition of the Tronox Management Cogeneration Facility, the Walyering Production Facility and the Northern Goldfields Interconnect Pipeline.

Mr McKay presented production and consumption trends and noted that gas production and consumption patterns had remained relatively stable across the zones since the 2020 review.

He advised that:

- the Dampier Zone remains the primary source of production and makes up almost 92 percent of production, with a slight decrease of 3 percent since 2020; and
- most consumption continues to occur within the south-west of Western Australia. In FY 2024/25 about 60 percent of consumption was in the South-West zone.

Mr McKay presented slide 6 (What was the recommendation?) and advised that AEMO's recommendation was to retain the current GBB Zone List, with a minor amendment to include the Northern Goldfields Interconnect Pipeline in the Mid-West Zone description.

Mr McKay presented slide 7 (Current GBB Zone List).

- Mr Whish queried whether GBB Zones have any impact on pipeline contracts or regulatory obligations if gas moves between zones.

Mr McKay advised that the GBB Zones are separate from contractual arrangements and are used solely for information reporting purposes on the GBB. He noted that some zones align with entire pipelines, while others span portions of pipelines, but have no contractual effect.

- Mr Leach agreed with Mr McKay's explanation and noted that the zones only affect how information is aggregated and displayed on the GBB.

5. REVIEW OF THE GAS SERVICES INFORMATION (GSI) RULES

Ms Guzeleva noted that the Review was initiated in response to:

- four recommendations made by the Inquiry into the WA Domestic Gas Policy relating to the GSI Rules and supported by the State Government; and
- National Gas Law reforms as they may apply in Western Australia (WA), in particular those around information standards and transparency, to ensure consistency across the two regimes.

She noted that:

- the Review was carried out in consultation with the GAB and the dedicated GAB working group; and
- following the significant event of 25 August 2025, the Department of Energy and Economic Diversification identified a need for additional, targeted measures to improve the coordination of gas and electricity information between the AEMO and Pipeline Operators. As a result, additional proposals had been developed for consultation before finalisation of the review.

Ms Pember provided an update on the review process and advised that:

- an information paper outlining the final Review outcomes has been prepared and will be published alongside the Consultation Paper with the additional proposals; and
- an Exposure Draft of the GSI Amending Rules designed to implement the final Review outcomes will be published for consultation following consideration of stakeholder responses to the Consultation Paper.

Ms Guzeleva presented the five additional proposals aimed at improving coordination of the gas and electricity information between AEMO and Pipeline Operators (**Attachment 1**) and sought members' feedback on each proposal.

Proposal 1: Improve information sharing between AEMO and Pipeline Operators – Information provided to Pipeline Operators

Ms Guzeleva outlined the proposal requiring AEMO to provide Pipeline Operators with forecast gas-powered generation (GPG) and outage information. She noted that the intent was to improve visibility of electricity market conditions that may impact gas demand and pipeline operations.

- Mr Leach advised that AGIG was broadly supportive of the proposal. He noted that there was already a strong operational relationship between AEMO and the pipeline control

room and considered that additional information sharing is beneficial, provided the arrangements were not overly prescriptive.

- Mr Rowe supported the proposal and noted that the information would be valuable, while agreeing that the arrangements should retain flexibility.
- Ms Tait advised that AEMO strongly supports formalising existing information-sharing arrangements and considered a procedure to be appropriate for specifying information requirements.
- Mr Whish noted that the information would also assist Gas Users in forecasting demand and understanding pipeline behaviour.
- Mr Alexander stated that the proposal was sensible and supported the proposal.
- Mr Beverley also expressed support for the proposal.
- Mr Arias supported the proposal but queried how forecast electricity generation would be converted into gas demand, including the assumptions to be used, the practicality of converting forecasts into TJ demand, and how the information-sharing arrangements would operate. He also noted that more granular outage information may be beneficial for pipeline operators.

Ms Guzeleva advised that the conversion would necessarily be an approximation because generator fuel efficiency varies depending on operating conditions. She noted that further work would be required between AEMO and pipeline operators to develop an appropriate methodology.

- Mr Rafferty queried whether average heat rates could be developed to assist the conversion process and suggested that historical operating data may provide a reasonable basis for estimation.
- Mr McKay acknowledged that there would be challenges associated with converting electricity forecasts into gas demand forecasts and noted that flexibility would be required to refine methodologies over time. He considered that the proposal was an important first step but cautioned against prescribing the detailed calculation methodology in a procedure, as this could limit flexibility to refine assumptions and improve the approach as experience is gained.

Proposal 2: Require AEMO to inform Pipeline Operators of WEM Low Reserve Conditions

Ms Guzeleva presented the proposal requiring AEMO to notify Pipeline Operators as soon as practicable when a Low Reserve Condition had been declared or was likely to be declared in the Wholesale Electricity Market (WEM). She noted that early notification would assist Pipeline Operators in preparing for potential increases in gas-powered generation demand.

- Mr Leach, Ms Tait, Mr Alexander and Mr Whish expressed support for the proposal.
- Mr Bhar sought clarification on current communication arrangements between AEMO and pipeline operators.

Ms Guzeleva advised that communication currently occurs informally between control rooms and that the proposal would formalise these arrangements.

Proposal 3: Require Pipeline Operators to notify AEMO of potential curtailments

Ms Guzeleva presented the proposal requiring Pipeline Operators to notify AEMO as soon as practicable when pipeline constraints arise or are likely to arise.

She noted that this proposal aims to provide AEMO with information that will allow it to apply appropriate WEM constraints and prevent its systems from continuing to dispatch GPG that is unable to deliver, potentially creating further problems within the WEM.

- Mr Leach advised that similar communications already occur on an informal basis and supported formalising the arrangements, subject to review of the detailed drafting of rules.
- Mr Rowe also supported the proposal and noted the importance of maintaining flexibility in communication arrangements to ensure information could be exchanged quickly during operational events.
- Mr Rafferty raised a broader question regarding the interaction between future gas-fired generation development, pipeline capability and electricity system planning.
- He queried whether whole-of-system planning was considering the impacts of generator location on the pipeline, noting that concentrating new peaking generation in the Kwinana/Kemerton area could exacerbate gas pipeline constraints during high-demand periods. He suggested that locating future generation further north, closer to compressor stations, may help reduce pressure on the DBNGP during peak events.
- Mr Leach noted that pipeline operators respond to proponents seeking access to gas transport capacity and provide information regarding available pipeline capacity, rather than determining the location of generation investment.

Ms Guzeleva advised that the broader planning and infrastructure investment requirements are being considered through the current Future Energy System Outlook process, which also examines interactions between electricity and gas infrastructure and future electricity system requirements in the SWIS.

- Mr Whish sought information regarding the proposed Electricity System and Market (ESM) Amending Rules and the provisions intended to help reduce gas demand within the electricity system when the gas pipeline is experiencing linepack adequacy issues.

Ms Guzeleva advised that consultation on the proposed ESM Amending Rules (Tranche 10) had already occurred and offered to provide members with a link to the Exposure Draft.

ACTION: GAB secretariat is to provide GAB members with a link to the Exposure Draft of ESM Amending Rules (Tranche 10).

- Mr Arias sought clarification regarding the circumstances in which notifications would be issued if gas consumption or nominations could not be met and specifically with respect to the wording 'likely unable to be fulfilled'.
- Mr Leach advised that notifications would be expected in circumstances when physical limitations of the pipeline were present and operational discussions between control rooms were required.

Ms Guzeleva noted that any detailed drafting matters should be considered as part of the development of the Amending GSI Rules.

- Mr Beverley supported the proposal in principle but noted an interest in reviewing the detailed drafting, including whether affected shippers would be advised of the same information provided to AEMO at the same time.

Proposal 4: Improve information sharing between AEMO and Pipeline Operators – Information provided to AEMO regarding pipeline contract and use information

Ms Guzeleva presented the proposal enabling AEMO to request from Pipeline Operators customer contract information, and current and historical gas pipeline use to support certification of gas-powered generators in the Reserve Capacity Mechanism (RCM).

She clarified that the information would not be published and would remain subject to confidentiality provisions.

- Mr Whish supported the proposal and noted that information obtained directly from pipeline operators would assist AEMO and provide greater confidence in the information being received.
- Mr Arias queried whether the proposal duplicated information already provided by Market Participants through the RCM certification process and whether there was an efficiency gain to be made by avoiding the duplication.
- Mr Arias also queried whether information on gas transport constraints may affect the Network Access Quantity (NAQ) process and whether proponents would have visibility if such constraints may affect generation output.

Ms Guzeleva clarified that the proposal related to gas transportation arrangements and that the NAQ process models electricity transmission capacity rather than gas transport constraints.

She acknowledged Mr Arias' concern and advised that DEED would consider whether there were opportunities to improve efficiency and avoid duplication of information requests.

- Ms Tait clarified that AEMO supports the proposal and the intent is to allow AEMO to verify information received from participants rather than create an additional reporting process. She noted that similar verification arrangements already exist elsewhere in the market, such as the verification of network information by Western Power, and suggested that an equivalent approach could be beneficial for the gas transport contracts.
- Mr Bhar sought clarification regarding the scope of the information that may be requested.

Ms Guzeleva advised that the proposal related only to gas transportation arrangements and historical pipeline transport data.

- Mr Leach noted that Pipeline Operators did not wish to assume responsibility for supplying contractual information that should ordinarily be provided by participants in the RCM certification process. However, he supported providing information if requested by AEMO for verification purposes.
- Mr Beverley advised that he did not support the proposal. He considered that information relating to RCM certification process should continue to be obtained directly from Market Participants and expressed concern that information obtained from Pipeline Operators may not provide sufficient context regarding contractual arrangements.
- Ms Tait advised that AEMO would continue to seek clarification from Market Participants in the first instance and that the proposal would operate only as an additional verification mechanism.
- Mr Alexander sought clarification on whether the information would be requested during operational events or during the RCM certification processes.

Ms Guzeleva advised that the proposal related to the annual certification processes.

Proposal 5 - Advising activation of the Emergency Management Facility if an Emergency Operating state is declared

Ms Guzeleva presented the proposal that, if AEMO declares an Emergency Operating state in the WEM, it may advise the Coordinator of Energy to activate the Emergency Management Facility under rule 93 of the GSI Rules.

- Mr Bartholomew noted that, from an energy emergency management perspective, the proposal would assist in improving response times during extreme events and support

planning for broader emergency responses. He added that these arrangements already occur in practice and that formalising them would be beneficial.

- Mr Alexander, Mr Beverley, Mr Bahr, Mr Rafferty, Mr Arias, Mr Rowe and Mr Whish supported the proposal.
- Mr Leach supported the proposal in principle, but noted that he would need to review the detailed drafting before confirming his position.

Ms Guzeleva clarified that there are principles in communications embedded in the Emergency Management Facility under the GSR rules and, if this is activated, all the normal processes in an emergency are triggered and formalised.

- Mr Alexander requested an update from AEMO on the publication of the August 2025 Significant Incident Report, noting that 12 months had elapsed since the event.
- Ms Tait advised that the report was nearing completion but was unable to provide a publication date.
- Mr McKay advised that the report had progressed through internal reviews and was expected to be published shortly.
- Mr Rafferty queried the time taken to complete the investigation and suggested that earlier publication of findings may assist industry participants to implement lessons learnt and reduce the likelihood of similar events occurring.
- Mr McKay acknowledged the feedback and advised that AEMO would consider how further information on the investigation process could be communicated to stakeholders.
- Mr Arias noted that publication of any lessons learnt prior to winter would have been beneficial.

The Chair noted members' concerns regarding the time taken to publish the report and requested that GAB members be advised when the report would become available.

ACTION: AEMO to notify GAB members when the August 2025 Significant Incident Report is published and provide a link to the report. If the publication date becomes known before the report is released, AEMO is to advise members of the expected publication date.

6. OVERVIEW OF RULE CHANGE PROPOSALS

The Chair noted that there were no updates to the Rule Change Proposal register.

7. ANTICIPATED 2027 GAB MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chair noted that that March and August/September 2027 had been proposed for the next meeting cycle, but specific dates will be consulted on with members out of session.

8. GENERAL BUSINESS

- Mr Rafferty provided feedback on a request from AEMO to gas producers for information on future committed gas volumes for the Gas Statement of Opportunities (GSOO). He noted that some participants found the request unclear, as the information sought appeared to relate to future contracted positions.
- Ms Tait thanked Mr Rafferty for the feedback and noted that AEMO would consider opportunities to improve future information requests, including conducting a workshop with participants.
- Mr Bhar noted that he was not aware of similar issues within his organisation but would confirm internally.



- Mr Rafferty raised concerns regarding engagement with the Commonwealth Government on the National Gas Reservation Scheme and noted that policy uncertainty may affect future investment decisions.

The Chair noted that discussions were ongoing and that DEED was unable to provide any further information at this time.

The meeting closed at 15:00