

STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT FORM– SUMMARY SECTION
 (For Stakeholder to complete and return to AEMO. The PPC is to accompany this form)

This section will be completed by AEMO			
Issue Number	BB PPC 15-002		
Impacted Jurisdiction(s)	VIC, TAS, NSW, QLD, SA, ACT		
Proponent	COAG Energy Council Secretariat	Company	N/A
Proponent e-mail	energycouncil@industry.gov.au	Proponent phone	(02) 6243 7788
Affected Gas Market(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retail ▪ Wholesale ▪ Bulletin Board 	Natural Gas Services Bulletin Board (GBB)	Date proposal sent to AEMO	02/10/2015
Industry Consultative forum used	GBB Redevelopment Group	Other Working Groups used	N/A
Short Title	Gas Bulletin Board Wallumbilla Demand Zone		
Other key contact information	Simon Newman (02) 6243 7176		

STAKEHOLDER DETAILS			
This section will be completed by the Stakeholder			
Company	APA Group	Contact Person (who prepared this assessment)	John Jamieson
Date Assessment completed	4/12/2015	Contact Person Phone	0417795805
Contact Person e-mail	John.Jamieson@apa.com.au		

STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT – DETAILED RESPONSE SECTION

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SECTION

1. Provide a brief description of impact in terms of what applications / programming modules / business processes your organisation needs to change	Changes will require a one off system modification to establish and program for the daily forecast and actual flow data for each of the new zones and inclusion of the BWP in pipeline files.
2. Are there any customer impacts?	Confidential customer flow data could be made public on single shipper pipelines coming into Wallumbilla - issue for Shippers.
3. The likely implementation effect of the change(s) on stakeholder. (eg; Risk assessment, regulator framework etc)	The change will require additional reporting obligations, however systems, processes and procedures are in place and impact will be largely be limited to one off system changes
4. In terms of importance, using a scale from 1 to 10 (1 less important, 10 extremely important) how important is this change for your organisation taking into account the industry as a whole?	From an industry perspective this change is important to remove current confusion around Bulletin Board flows, in particular SWQP flows at Wallumbilla – rating 7

ESTIMATED COSTS ASSESSMENT SECTION

5. What are your organisations estimated costs to implement (e.g. Business process and/or IT Systems)?	Estimated costs to implement as a standalone change would be in the order of \$100k.
--	--

<p>6. What (if any) are the ongoing yearly costs to operate and maintain these changes? (e.g. 3 staff for old system or 4 for new system, the incremental costs would be 1 staff member to move to new system, not 4 staff members)</p>	<p>Ongoing costs are likely to be relatively minor, incremental cost to validate audit and maintain existing systems for providing Bulletin Board data.</p>
<p>7. In relation to the estimated costs are there any specific comments you wish to include?</p>	<p>As with any system changes the more they can be grouped into a single change process the more efficient the process will be and the lower the cost. It would appear that there are a number of change processes being undertaken at present and consolidation of all changes into one process will significantly reduce the cost for all participants (and the operator).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">BENEFITS ASSESSMENT SECTION</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">TANGIBLE BENEFITS</p>	
<p>8. If the proposed changes were implemented, briefly describe your organisation's initial benefits (if any).</p>	<p>Tangible direct benefits are likely to be minimal</p>
<p>9. What is the initial dollar return should the proposed changes be implemented?</p>	<p>Nil</p>
<p>10. Briefly describe what (if any) ongoing yearly benefits to your organisation?</p>	<p>Nil</p>

11. What are the ongoing yearly benefits (if any) in terms of dollars and the period (number of years) for this?	Nil
INTANGIBLE BENEFITS	
12. If the proposed changes were implemented, briefly describe the intangible benefits you think will accrue to your organisation and / or industry as a whole.	Better information availability to trading participants should increase ability to source and ultimately transport gas. Transparency supports market trading activity.

Additional Comments:

1. With the introduction of the new zone at Wallumbilla consideration should be given to either modifying or removing zone 540023 as data supplied in this zone will either be double counted or not portray anything useful. The key piece of information will be publication of net flow for each pipeline in or out of the Wallumbilla compound. Zone 540023 could be modified or replaced with a new zone that portrayed real demand at Ballera, Roma, Tarbat & Cheepie (i.e. remove QGP, RBP, CRWP & BWP flows as these are not 'real demand').
2. A point was raised during the initial workshop regarding the potential for APA to be a data provider for other facility operators. Whilst this may be technically possible for some information (i.e. flows) other information such as capacity, line pack status and maintenance notifications would not be known by APA and would still require reporting by individual facility operators. APA would be concerned by any proposal to split reporting obligations that would place additional obligations on APA.