## **Stakeholder Feedback Template**

This template has been developed to enable stakeholders to provide their feedback on the Emerging Generation and Energy Storage stakeholder paper.

AEMO encourages stakeholders to use this template, so they can have due regard to 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.

Stakeholder submissions will be published on AEMO’s website unless they are clearly marked as being confidential. Submissions should be sent to [eges@aemo.com.au](mailto:eges@aemo.com.au) by Tuesday, 04 December 2018.

**Organisation:**

**Contact name:**

**Contact details (email / phone):**

| Questions | | Feedback |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section 2 – Improvements to integrate ESS in the NEM: Defining ESS | | |
| 1 | Referring to Section 2.3, are there any other issues with the current arrangements for Energy Storage Systems (ESS)? |  |
| 2 | Do you have any views on whether a definition of ESS should be included in the National Electricity Rules (NER)? |  |
| 3 | Do you have any views on whether a definition of ESS should be generic and encompass technologies other than batteries, for example, pumped hydro? |  |
| 4 | Do you have any views on AEMO’s suggested definition of ESS? |  |
|  |  |  |
| Section 2 – Improvements to integrate ESS in the NEM: Participation and operation | | |
| 1 | What are your views on the appropriate participation model for integrating ESS into the NEM? |  |
| 2 | Would the proposed participation model (see stakeholder paper, section 2.4.2, option 2b) meet your future needs, both in terms of participating in the NEM with an individual ESS or where multiple resources (e.g. ESS and generating units) are to be aggregated?  AEMO is particularly interested to understand the additional benefit that you would derive from aggregating hybrid systems and offering them to the market as a single resource that is not available by separately offering the components to the market. |  |
| 3 | Refer to Table 8 (section 2.4.2), are there other potential challenges and risks associated with option 1? |  |
| 4 | Refer to Table 9 (section 2.4.2), are there other potential challenges and risks associated with options 2a and b? |  |
| 5 | Do you have any views on AEMO’s proposed approach to implement a single participation model to integrate ESS? |  |
| 6 | Do you have any views on the proposed key requirements AEMO has identified for an ESS participation model? |  |
| 7 | Do you have any views on whether existing ESS should be transitioned to the proposed participation model (see section 2.4.2, option 2b)? |  |
| Section 2 – Improvements to integrate ESS in the NEM: NER recovery mechanisms | | |
| 1 | What are your views on how to integrate ESS into the NEM’s recovery mechanisms? |  |
| Section 3.1 – The application of performance standards to a generating system or load in an exempt network | | |
| 1 | Are there other options to address the issue identified for connecting plant in an exempt network? |  |
| 2 | Are there other costs, risks and benefits associated with the options presented? If so, please indicate what these are. |  |
| 3 | Which option to address the issue is your preferred option? Why? |  |
| Section 3.2 – Providing NEM information to project developers | | |
| 1 | Should a person intending to develop or build a generating system or ESS (and not subsequently register as a Generator) be allowed to register as an Intending Participant? |  |
| 2 | What is the market benefit associated with allowing a person intending to develop or build a generating system (and not subsequently register as a Generator) to be an Intending Participant? |  |
| 3 | Referring to section 3.2.3, are there other options to provide a person intending to develop or build a generating system (and not subsequently register as a Generator) with the necessary NEM data? |  |
| 4 | Are there other costs, risks and benefits associated with the options presented? If so, please indicate what these are. |  |
| Section 3.3 – Separation of operational and financial responsibility | | |
| 1 | What is the market benefit associated with allowing the separation of operational and financial responsibilities? |  |
| 2 | What are the risks associated with allowing the separation of operational and financial responsibilities? |  |
| 3 | Are there other models of separate operational and financial responsibilities that should be considered? |  |
| Section 3.4 – Logical metering arrangements | | |
| 1 | What is the market benefit associated with using logical metering arrangements? |  |
| 2 | What are the risks associated with allowing the use of logical metering arrangements? |  |
| 3 | If logical metering arrangements are permitted to be used instead of a NEM compliant metering installation, who should pay for this? Please identify any cost recovery arrangements that you consider appropriate. |  |
| Other Comments | | |
| 1 | Do you have any further comments? |  |