

Hi AEMO/CSIRO,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft GenCost/ISP modelling.

I have a few suggestions I would like to contribute:

1. Don't use near-term emissions targets to constrain the scenarios or back-calculate coordinated CER storage or other contributions (rather use modelling to inform/recommend possible near-term targets/guidance). We don't know that the current near-term targets are sensible based on the latest information and potential generation mixes.
2. Please calculate the cost of coordinated CER storage and factor it in to system comparisons.
3. Please calculate the Full System Costs of scenarios (some generation mixes will require less transmission and storage than others and this needs to be considered properly). How do we know we are taking the best approach if we haven't looked at the whole picture?
4. Test for technological bias. The expectation is that Australia's government agencies are impartial, apolitical, transparent and in no way technologically biased. Actual and/or perceived technology biases may reduce the effectiveness and value of the process.
5. Consider systems that include different types of nuclear reactors in the Full System Cost comparisons and investigate outcomes as a function of price. To not consider these scenarios on the basis that nuclear is currently banned in Australia may be taken as a failure to review Australia's options without technology bias (given that nuclear is a key element of the energy strategies/decarbonisation strategies in much of the developed and developing world).
6. Ensure that growing data centre electricity demand is considered as it is likely to have a significant influence on demand.

Thank you for considering these suggestions.

Dr Sarah Lawley

(note: these comments/suggestions are independent, not representing the views/interests of any past or present employers)