

Attachment B: contains a brief summary of IN002-17W outlining:

- (i) the amendments and a description on which artefact under the Scheme is changing;
- (ii) any additional relevant information that is not covered in the IIR; and
- (iii) rationale whether to delete, replace or retain the existing clause.

- (i) the amendments and a description on which artefact under the Scheme is changing;
- (ii) any additional relevant information that is not covered in the IIR.

(i). The current procedure change process as described in chapter 9 of the Retail Market Procedures (RMP) is complex and difficult to follow. The Procedure Change Committee (PCC) agreed with AEMO's view that chapter 9 should be reviewed. In consultation with the PCC, the proposed change set out in this application involves rewriting chapter 9 to create a more efficient change process without diminishing the level of participant consultation or altering the Approving Body's (AB) functions in this process. The Scheme document that requires amendment is the RMP. **Attachment A** contains the final IIR which includes an extract from the RMP showing the changes in "track change" mode with ~~red-strikeout~~ meaning "delete" and blue underline meaning "insert". There is also a change to a Non-Scheme document. In consultation with the PCC, AEMO has developed an updated version of the PCC charter. **Attachment E** contains the new PCC Terms of Reference (ToR). **Attachment F** contains the new PCC ToR in track change mode. These attachments are included in this application for information purposes only.

(ii) In addition to the information contained in the IIR, it is worth noting that AEMO did not receive any objections at the conclusion of the IIR consultation. AEMO received a submission from AGL supporting the proposed changes. The procedure changes that have been proposed are only changing the process prior to the point when AEMO makes a submission to the AB. It is important to note that the processes post the AEMO submission to AB remains unchanged.

The process that is proposed is similar in nature to the change process prescribed in part 15B of the National Gas Rules (NGR) which applies to those jurisdictions that operate under the NGR. Creating a process that is similar to the NGR will contribute to AEMO's ongoing effort to keep its Scheme administrator fees significantly lower than its predecessor to the benefit of all Western Australian gas consumers.

- (iii) rationale whether to delete, replace or retain existing clause.

Existing clause #	Existing clause heading	Summary of existing clause provisions ¹ .	Rational whether to delete, replace or retain clause.
378	Procedure change request.	Describes who may lodge a procedure change request (PCR) and what it needs to include.	This clause is retained with some amendments. In the proposed changes, it is now new clause 379 titled "Proposal for marking procedure". The entity "AEMO" has been added as a party that can raise a PCR whereas in the old clause 378 AEMO is not explicitly mentioned. There has been several instances in the past when AEMO and the former Scheme administrator have raised a PCR. Adding AEMO as a proponent is therefore warranted.

¹ This column is prepared by AEMO and contains AEMO's high level summary of the existing provision within that clause. It is provided for contextual purposes only.

378A	Proponent may withdraw a procedure change request.	Describes the timeframe when a withdrawal request can be lodged along with what needs to be included in a withdrawal request.	<p>This clause is replaced with a new clause 382 (5) and the definition “procedure change withdrawal request”. It was deemed that the clause was unnecessarily prescriptive for a process that is infrequently used.</p> <p>The ability to withdraw a PCR is still prescribed in the new clause 382 (5).</p>
378B	Procedure change outline.	Describes what information must be included in a procedure change outline (PCO).	<p>This clause is replaced with new clause 379 (3) along with the definition “procedure change outline”. It was deemed that having a separate provision for a PCO was unnecessary. The main component of a PCO is to include the marked up changes.</p> <p>The new clause 379 (3) requires a PCR to have a draft of the proposed procedure.</p>
379	Impact and implementation report.	Describes what information must be included in an impact and implementation report (IIR).	<p>This clause is retained with some amendments. It is now clause 382 titled “Impact implementation report” (IIR). A provision about recommending whether the proposed procedure change should be made with or without amendments has been added. This recommendation is based on the information gathered by AEMO. As part of the IIR consultation process, anyone can make a submission challenging the recommendation. All views on the recommendation will be taken into consideration and the new clause 383 (3) requires that AEMO include a summary of comments received which forms part of the published.</p>
380	Recommendation report.	Describes what information must be included in a recommendation report (RR).	<p>This clause is deleted along with the definition “recommendation report”.</p> <p>Preparation of a RR occurs under the existing clause 400 (AEMO endorses high impact procedure change). See clause 400 for the explanation why this clause is deleted.</p> <p>It was considered that having a separate provision for a report was unnecessary. The key provision which describes the impact to AEMO and stakeholders is retained. See new clause 382 (2).</p>
381	Timing of a procedure change	Describes that AEMO and the PCC must fulfil their obligations expeditiously.	<p>This clause is deleted as the clause doesn’t add any material value as the procedure change process prescribes the time in which AEMO and participants must complete the process.</p>
383	AEMO must have established procedure change committee	Places an obligation on AEMO to establish a PCC. Also places an obligation on AEMO to find a replacement PCC member when a position becomes vacant.	<p>This clause is retained with some amendments. It is now clause 381 titled “Procedure change committee”. Further elements from clause 386 about the objectives of the PCC have been added to clause 381. The fundamental change to the PCC is that this committee moves from a subscribed membership structure to an “open” committee structure. The existing PCC membership is limited as it excludes</p>

			<p>parties that have a vested interest in the retail market such as pipeline operators, potential new entrants etc. The “open” committee approach allows all parties to voice their acceptance or non-acceptance of issues and initiatives. The “open” committee approach underpins the new change process. This type of structure has worked very effectively in the east coast and it is highly desirable that the PCC move to this type of arrangement to ensure that the efficiencies discussed in this proposal are realised. This “open” committee was not contested at the October PCC meeting nor any issue during the draft IIR or final IIR stages. AEMO has taken the view that existing PCC members and other stakeholders are supportive of this move to an “open” committee structure.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the definition of “interested person” has been modified to include AEMO as a party that can determine if someone has a legitimate interest in an issue. This will allow AEMO to mitigate the risk of any nuisance attendees which was raised as a concern by the PCC.</p> <p>Moving to an “open” committee type structure requires changes to the PCC charter. AEMO has worked closely with the existing PCC members and have collaboratively developed Terms of Reference (ToR) on how the PCC will operator should the proposed changes set out in this submission be approved. Attachment E and F contains a “clean” and a “marked up” version of the PCC ToR.</p>
384	Composition of procedure change committee.	Describes the composition of the PCC. This clause also states that the Approving Body (AB) may attend PCC meetings and notes that anything said by the AB at such meetings .PCR	<p>This clause has been deleted. As noted in the comments for clause 383 the PCC is moving to an “open” type committee, and describing the composition of the PCC is not warranted.</p> <p>In relation to the AB’s ability to attend the PCC meeting, this reference has been removed but does not change the ability of the AB to attend meetings given the proposed provisions makes the PCC an “open” type committee allowing those with a legitimate interest in the matter being discussed to attend.</p> <p>The provisions regarding the AB comments at any meeting being non-binding have also been removed, however it has been included in section 4 of the new PCC ToR. The inclusion of this information - nothing said, or done, or omitted to be said or done, by the AB, binds the AB’s discretion in approving or not approving a procedure change - in the PCC ToR should provide a sufficient level of repudiation for the AB.</p>

385	Tenure of procedure change committee members.	Describes the period of tenure for PCC members as well as the criteria in which AEMO may remove a PCC member.	This clause has been deleted. As noted in the comments for clause 383 the PCC is moving to an “open” type committee, the need to describe the tenure of PCC members is not warranted.
386	Objectives of the PCC.	Describes the objective of the PCC which includes upholding competitiveness, efficiency, fair for customers, compliant with all applicable laws and all participants, pipeline operators, prescribed persons and interested persons are given the opportunity to put their views forward.	<p>This clause is retained with some amendments. It is now clause 378 titled “Precondition for making procedure”. Whereas the old clause 386 set out how the PCC is to operate, the new clause 378 places an obligation on AEMO to operate to largely the same set of objectives set for the PCC.</p> <p>Also section 1 of the new PCC ToR describes the objectives of the PCC which are consistent with the provision of the existing clause 386 and the new clause 378.</p>
387	Quorum.	Set the required number of PCC representative to form a quorum which is 4 PCC members.	This clause has been deleted. As noted in the comments for clause 383 the PCC is moving to an “open” type committee, the need to describe a quorum for PCC members is not warranted.
388	Meetings.	Describes when PCC is to meet. This clause also includes administration type process such as: meetings need to be minuted; draft minutes need to be issued with 5 business days; and the retention period for such minutes.	This clause has been deleted. Many of the provisions are duplicated in the PCC charter. Section 5 of the new PCC ToR largely includes these administrative functions and it is inefficient to repeat them in the RMP.
389	Limitation of liability.	Describes the liability provision of being a PCC member	This clause has been deleted as the PCC makes recommendations and is no longer a decision making body and therefore does not carry any liability for decisions.
390	Indemnity.	Places an obligation on AEMO to indemnify a PCC member for any losses unless the PCC member didn’t act in good faith or was fraudulent.	This clause has been deleted as the PCC makes recommendations and is no longer a decision making body and therefore does not carry any liability for decisions that requires an indemnity.
391	AEMO must accept or reject a PCR.	Places an obligation on AEMO to accept or reject a PCR within 5 business days. If the PCR is not lodged by a participant or an interested person or AEMO determines the PCR is frivolous, vexatious, or not lodged in good faith AEMO must reject the PCR and notify the proponent.	<p>This clause is largely replaced by the inclusion of new clause 380.</p> <p>The 5 business day timeframe has been removed. AEMO believes this insufficient time if the PCR is complex, technical and business to business (B2B) in nature involving the transactions between User and Network Operator. In these circumstances, AEMO is not necessarily best placed to complete the assessment in isolation and may seek input from WA participants who better understand the B2B details to help AEMO determine whether to accept or reject the PCR.</p> <p>It is worth noting that almost every initiative is initially presented as a Gas Market Issue (GMI). The GMI process operates today and will continue under the new process allowing a proponent to raise an issue to the PCC. The GMI is a pre-regulatory process which allows the initiative to be investigated and possible solutions developed.</p>

			<p>There are no time restrictions associated with this pre-regulatory process. This explanation was consider by the PCC and was not contested at the October meeting nor raised as an issue during the IIR consultation. AEMO has taken this to mean that the PCC is supportive of the provision as it has been written.</p> <p>The new clause 382 (3) sets out provisions for AEMO to reject a PCR if the person lodging the procedure change request is not a participant or interested person, or if AEMO determines that the procedure change request is frivolous, vexatious, or not lodged in good faith.</p> <p>New clause 382 (4) requires AEMO to notify the proponent if it decides to reject the changes. AEMO is also obligated to publish that decision on its website.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the new clause 379 (4) includes a provision that AEMO must notify the proponent within 2 business days that it has received their PCR.</p>
392	Appeal to AEMO.	Describes that a proponent has 5 business days to appeal AEMO's decision to reject the PCR. AEMO has 20 business days to consider the appeal.	<p>This clause has been deleted. As noted in the comments for clause 391, AEMO believes this is not an issue because the practice is to present initiatives as a GMI. This is an engagement process involving the proponent and the PCC. The proponent will understand if the issue is difficult to justify and hence will be unlikely to take the matter to a PCR. . This appeal process is therefore considered unnecessary.</p>
393	If a PCR is accepted.	Places an obligation on AEMO to notify the proponent that the PCR is accepted. AEMO has 20 business day to complete a PCO and if AEMO considers that the changes is either a low of high impact draft an IIR. The PCO and the IIR is sent to the PCC.	<p>This clause has been replaced with new clause 382 and clause 379 (4).</p> <p>New clause 379 (4) places an obligation on AEMO to notify the proponent that AEMO has received the PCR.</p> <p>New clause 382 places an obligation on AEMO to prepare an IIR within 40 days. This includes a recommendation on which of the new consultation processes is to be used. Typically the ordinary process is used unless it is deemed that the proposal is urgently required; or is non-substantial and is correcting typographical type errors.</p> <p>The 20 business days in the original clause 393 placed an obligation on AEMO to draft an IIR and provide that draft IIR to the PCC. In the original clause 393 effectively placed an obligation on AEMO to arrange a meeting of the PCC to consider the draft IIR within a further 20 business days. This means it can take up to 40 business days to prepare draft and consider IIR under the original process.</p>

			<p>The new clause 382 places an obligation on AEMO to prepare an IIR within 40 business days. It is important to note the new clause 380 requires AEMO to undertake an initial assessment on the PCR before preparing the draft IIR. New clause 381 (3) describes what input is required.</p>
394	Initial assessment by PCC.	<p>Places the following obligation on the PCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meet within 20 business day once it has received the PCR; and - put forward a recommendation to AEMO to accept or reject the PCR; <p>This clause also set out a criteria when a PCR is to be rejected. The clause places an obligation on AEMO to provide more information on a PCR within 10 business days if the PCC considers there is insufficient information. The PCC must meet again.</p> <p>The PCC must recommend the PCR to AEMO if the PCR doesn't satisfy any of the rejection criteria provisions.</p> <p>Places an obligation on AEMO whether to accept or reject the PCC recommendation which must be done with 20 business days.</p> <p>Places an obligation on AEMO to notify the proponent within 5 business days if AEMO decides to reject the PCR.</p>	<p>This clause has been replaced with new clause 380.</p> <p>The provision that the PCC “as a whole” can recommend to AEMO to “reject” a proposal is replaced with a more “inclusive” initiative that anyone can recommend to AEMO to “reject” a proposal. All recommendations (accept or reject) that AEMO receives as part of the consultation will be included in the AEMO decision and the ERA application should AEMO decide to make such an application.</p> <p>The change to this clause invites <u>all</u> stakeholders to submit their view on a proposal rather than a subset of stakeholders (PCC members only) that are required to reach a single view point.</p> <p>The current process allows AEMO to submit a change regardless of the stakeholders deciding to reject the change. As noted above, AEMOs ERA application will include a summary of the feedback including any dissenting views. Under the new process, the same provisions exist.</p> <p>The current process obligates AEMO to publish AEMO's ERA submission on the AEMO website and include instructions on how to make a submission to the ERA on a proposed change. This ensures that for those that feel that AEMO has not properly considered their reason to “reject” a change have a last opportunity to have their views consider by the AB who are the ultimate approvers of the RMP.</p> <p>The new clause 383 (4) was modelled on the current clause 399 in the case of rejecting a change.</p> <p>It is worth noting that clause 2 of the RMP is to be modified to include a new definition for consultation notices.</p>
395	Appeal to AEMO.	<p>Allows for a proponent to appeal the decision to reject the PCR.</p> <p>AEMO needs to consider the appeal and advise the outcome.</p>	<p>This clause has been deleted. As noted in the comments for clause 392 an appeal process is not considered necessary.</p>

396	If AEMO accepts the PCR.	<p>PCC to determine whether the proposed procedure change is likely to have a non-substantial impact, low impact, or high impact. The PCC has 20 business day to inform AEMO.</p> <p>AEMO has 20 business days to consider the PCC assessment of the impact. AEMO must determine whether the proposed procedure change is likely to have a non-substantial impact, low impact, or high impact on the affected parties.</p>	<p>This clause has been replaced.</p> <p>Rather than have three categories, this has been simplified to just two. The concept of expedited process is one aspect in the new clause 384. This category covers mostly changes that are non-substantive in nature such as a typographical error. However this category also covers urgently needed changes which are extreme events. For example, putting in Retailer of Last Resort (RoLR) provisions if a failed Retailer situation emerged and caused retail market processes to be inoperable.</p> <p>The other concept is the new clause 383. This category covers those changes that don't come under the expedited process (new clause 384).</p> <p>The information described in the PCR is used to determine whether to apply either the ordinary process or expedited process, The content that a PCR must contain is described in new clause 379 (3).</p> <p>New clause 381 (3) calls upon the PCC to assist AEMO determine whether to apply the Ordinary process or Expedited process.</p> <p>It is important to note that the current consultation reflects an unnecessarily onerous process involving meeting check points with the PCC then AEMO considering the PCC position. This method is repeated throughout the process. Attachment C of the submission is a diagrammatic representation of the current process. These serial check points have been removed from the new process. The new process involves the same level of PCC input in a way that is more dynamic and less rigid. This dynamic engagement with the PCC is less time consuming and more efficient process.</p>
396A	Non-Substantial procedure change.	AEMO must decide whether to submit the non-substantial procedure change to the AB.	<p>This clause replaced by new clause 384 which has the same definition of non-substantial as currently in the RMP.</p> <p>As noted in the comments for clause 396, Non-Substantial changes will be considered under an expedited process.</p>
397	Low impact procedure change.	AEMO must decide if the change is a low impact, and prepare an IIR.	<p>This clause replaced by new clause 383.</p> <p>As noted in the comments for clause 396 these changes will be considered under the ordinary process which includes a provision to prepare a IIR</p>

398	High impact procedure change.	<p>AEMO must decide if the changes are high impact and therefore prepare an IIR and notify each participant, pipeline operator, prescribed person and interested person that a PCR has been received.</p> <p>This clause also places an obligation on AEMO to seek submissions on the changes and to provide instructions on how to make a submission on the proposed procedure change and the closing date for submissions, which must be at least 10 business days.</p> <p>Within 20 business days after submissions close AEMO must consider the submissions. After a further 10 business days AEMO must decide if the change is still a high impact.</p>	<p>This clause is replaced by new clause 383.</p> <p>As noted in the comments for clause 396 these changes will be considered under the ordinary process which includes a provision to prepare an IIR.</p>
399	Consideration of recommended procedure change by AEMO.	<p>AEMO must within 20 business days determine whether to: Accept or reject the change.</p> <p>If changes relate to clause 362A then AEMO must not endorse the recommended procedure change under clause 399(1)(a) unless at least 80% of the votes cast at a meeting of the AEMO Board support the endorsement of the recommended procedure change.</p> <p>If a proposal is rejected by AEMO they need to advise the proponent and stakeholders of the decision to reject the proposal.</p>	<p>This clause is replaced by new clause 383 except the provision referencing Clause 362A has been included in the new clause 384(2) to ensure that the full consultation process, not the expedited consultation process, always applies to proposed changes to clause 362A.</p>
399A	AEMO endorses low impact procedure change.	<p>If AEMO endorses a low impact procedure change AEMO must notify stakeholders and seek submissions on the low impact change.</p> <p>AEMO must also provide stakeholders with the IIR and procedure change itself and instructions on how to make an objection and</p>	<p>This clause is replaced by new clause 383.</p> <p>See comments in 396. The serial check points with the PCC have been removed. The new process involves the same level of PCC input in a way that is more dynamic and less rigid creating process efficiency</p>

		<p>the closing date which must be at least 10 business days.</p> <p>Any stakeholders wishing to object to the change must notify AEMO by the closing date and include reason why they are objecting to the change.</p> <p>If by the end of the objection period AEMO has received a objection, then AEMO must notify stakeholders. This advice need to include whether the change be considered to be high impact or non-substantial or low impact. AEMO must also provide the object to the PCC.</p> <p>As soon as practicable the PCC must determine whether to ignore the objection and therefore recommend to AEMO to progress the change or recommend to AEMO the change be abandoned, or recommended alterative amendments.</p> <p>Having received the PCC recommendation AEMO is to make a determination whether to whether to ignore the objection and therefore recommend to AEMO to progress the change or recommend to AEMO the change be abandoned, or recommended alterative amendments.</p> <p>AEMO must notify stakeholders if it decides to abandon the change which is to include reasons why. If AEMO decides to make an alteration and it is not materially different AEMO will put the alternate change forward for approval.</p> <p>If AEMO decides to make an alteration and it is materially different AEMO must make a determination under clause 397 (Low Impact procedure change).</p>	
--	--	--	--

400	AEMO endorses high impact procedure change	<p>If AEMO endorses a high impact procedure change AEMO must notify stakeholders and seek submissions on the high impact change.</p> <p>AEMO must also provide stakeholders with the IIR and procedure change itself and instructions on how to lodge a submission and the closing date which must be at least 20 business days.</p> <p>Any stakeholders wishing to lodge a submission can do so using the process as set out in the instructions.</p> <p>AEMO must also provide the submission received to the PCC within 10 business days from the closing date.</p> <p>If the submissions contain an objection the PPC must make a determination whether to whether to ignore the objection and therefore recommend to AEMO to progress the change or recommend to AEMO the change be abandoned, or recommended alternative amendments.</p> <p>Having received the PCC recommendation AEMO is to make a determination whether to whether to ignore the objection and therefore recommend to AEMO to progress the change or recommend to AEMO the change be abandoned, or recommended alternative amendments.</p> <p>If AEMO decides to make an alteration then with 5 business days AEMO must notify stakeholders that AEMO will alter the proposed change and seek submission on the change which includes the IIR and procedure change itself and instructions on how to lodge a submission and the closing date which must be at least 10 business days.</p>	<p>This clause is replaced by new clause 383.</p> <p>See comments in 396. The serial check points with the PCC has been removed. The new process involves the same level of PCC input in a way that is more dynamic and less rigid creating process efficiency.</p> <p>It is worth noting that over the past 10 years there has only ever been one high impact change.</p>
-----	--	--	---

		<p>Any stakeholders wishing to lodge a submission can do so using the process as set out in the instructions.</p> <p>If the submissions does not contain an objection to the, the procedure change committee must recommend the submission of the endorsed procedure change for approval by the AB and provide a copy of the report to AEMO.</p>	
400A	Submission for approval	<p>Places an obligation on AEMO to consider whether to submit a change to the AB within 20 business days.</p> <p>Places an obligation on AEMO if AEMO decides to abandon</p>	Other than the words “proposed procedures” replacing the words “endorsed clause change” the new clause 383 (4) and 384 (5) is substantially the same as 400A.
401	Approval	Places an obligation on AEMO to notify all participants, pipeline operators, prescribed persons and interested persons should the AB provide a notification that the AB has approved a change.	Other than a new obligation on AEMO to publish updated procedures on its website and the words “proposed procedures” replacing the words “endorsed clause change” the new clause 386 is substantially the same as 401.
402	Amendments of documents relating to the procedures	Places an obligation on AEMO to amend any subsidiary documents as a result of the AB approving a change and notify all affected persons of any such amendments.	Other than two clause cross reference numbers being replaced and the words “proposed procedures” replacing the words “endorsed clause change” the new clause 387 is substantially the same as 402.
2	Definition - Alternative amendment	Means an amendment to a recommended procedure change under clause 399A(7), clause 400(4)(b) or clause 400A(1)(b).	This definition is deleted as the definition is no longer required. The new process contemplates everything as a procedure change and no longer considers isolated sub processes like “alternate amendment”, “recommended procedure changes”, “endorsed procedure change” etc.
2	Definition - Approving body	Means the person to whom an endorsed procedure change must be submitted for approval under the Energy Coordination Act 1994 (WA).	This definition is retained with a minor modification which is to replace the words “endorsed” with “proposed”. The new process contemplates everything as a procedure change and no longer considers isolated sub processes like “alternate amendment”, “recommended procedure changes”, “endorsed procedure change” etc.
2	Definition - Endorsed procedure change.	Means a high impact or low impact recommended procedure change endorsed by AEMO under clause 399(1)(a).	This definition is deleted as the definition is no longer required. The new process contemplate everything as a procedure change and no longer consider isolated sub processes like “recommended procedure changes”, “endorsed procedure change” etc.
2	Definition - In-progress procedure change.	Means (a) a proposed procedure change or recommended procedure change that has not been rejected by AEMO under clause 394(5) or clause 399(1)(b); or (b) an endorsed	This definition is deleted as it is not required in the proposed drafting.

		procedure change that has not been rejected by the approving body following its submission to that body under clause 400A(3)(b).	
2	Definition - Impact and implementation report	Means a report under clause 379 from AEMO to the PCC on a proposed procedure change.	This has been retained with a minor amendment to reference the new clause number.
2	Definition - Interested person	Means, in relation to a matter: (a) a government representative; or (b) Economic Regulation Authority; or any other person that (as applicable) the Economic Regulation Authority, considers has a legitimate interest in the matter or should be consulted in relation to the matter.	This has been retained with a minor amendment to add AEMO as an entity that can consider whether a person has a legitimate interest in the matters being consider. With the PCC moving to “open” type committee, this amendment will allow AEMO to decide whether a person claiming to be an interested person can attend a PCC meeting. See also comment under clause 383.
2	Definition – Participant	Means each of a user and a network operator.	Minor grammatical change identified during this review but unrelated to the broader change.
2	Definition – Procedure change committee.	Means the committee established under clause 383.	This has been retained with a minor amendment to reference the new clause number.
2	Definition - Procedure change outline.	Means a report under clause 378B.	This definition is deleted for the reason explained in clause 378B.
2	Definition - Procedure change request.	Means a notice under clause 378(2) from a participant, pipeline operator, prescribed person or interested person to AEMO requesting amendment to a procedure specified in the request.	This has been retained with a minor amendment updating the reference to the new clause number and removing who can provide a PCR which is covered in the new clause 379 .
2	Definition - procedure change withdrawal request	Means a notice under clause 378A(2) requesting the withdrawal of a procedure change request from the procedure change process in Chapter 9.	This definition is deleted for the reason explained in clause 378A.
2	Definition - proponent	Means a person who lodges a procedure change request under clause 378(1).	This has been retained with a minor amendment to reference the new clause number.
2	Definition - recommendation report.	Means a report under clause 380 from the PCC to AEMO.	This definition is deleted as it is no longer required for the reason explained in clause 380.
2	Definition - recommended procedure change.	Means an amendment to the procedures as determined by AEMO under clause 396A, clause 397 or clause 398(5).	This has been deleted as the definition is no longer required. The new process contemplates everything as a procedure change and no longer consider isolated sub processes like “recommended procedure changes”, “endorsed procedure change” etc.