



Attachment 1 Stakeholder feedback template

This template has been developed to enable stakeholders to provide their feedback on the proposed service points, zones and, where relevant, pipeline segments for the initial set of facilities that are expected to be subject to the reforms. The template also contains a number of specific questions that AEMO and the GMRG would like feedback on.

AEMO and the GMRG strongly encourage 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. Further context for the questions can be found in the consultation paper.

1. General Comments

The introduction line for Section 15 for the PCA reads 'AEMO has been advised by SEA Gas that it intends to register the SEA Gas Pipeline as two separate facilities'. This is not quite correct, as the 'SEA Gas Pipeline' is not an actual pipeline, but is the label given to a subset of the PCA pipeline on the Gas Bulletin Board and has never included the PCI. (Part of the PCA and the entire PCI falls within the Port Campbell Zone on the GBB). The enhancements to the GBB in late September will be reflective of the PCA, PCI and Mortlake pipelines and references to the 'SEA Gas Pipeline' will be removed. SEA Gas intend on registering two pipelines for the CT/DAA platform and will be seeking an exemption from the AER for the Mortlake pipeline.

Changes to the suggested zones for the PCA and PCI pipelines are provided as response to your questions on the following pages. SEA Gas has intentionally not provided comment on other pipeline configurations.





2. Connection Point Names

SEA Gas have workshopped the proposed zones internally and identified some missing flow paths and errors in what has been drafted.

We have also considered what are the most suitable labels to use for connection points where similar points exist on multiple pipelines. We propose the following name changes to points listed in the document. We will be using these names on the upgraded Bulletin Board and on our website.

Pipeline	Current Name	New Name
PCA	Minerva West – PCA	Minerva – PCA
PCA	Langley	Langley – PCA
PCA	UFM 2/3	Otway – PCA
PCA	UGS	lona
PCI	Minerva East	Minerva – PCI
PCI	Langley	Langley – PCI
PCI	UFM 2/3	Otway – PCI
PCI	MIJ-001	MIJ-001 – PCI
PCI	UFM 4	Otway UFM 4





3. Response to Questions

	Questions	Feedback			
Pip	Pipelines				
1.	 Port Campbell to Adelaide Pipeline: Do you agree with the proposed service points, zones and pipeline segments? Do you agree with the proposed specification of the delivery zone incorporating both STTM custody transfer points and non-STTM points? If not, please explain why not. Do you agree with the proposed specification of the backhaul receipt and backhaul delivery points on the PCA? If not, please explain why not and set out what service points you think backhaul services should be available between and why. 	 There are some pipeline zones and segments that need to be added along with repositioning of service points to accommodate the flows described below Gas withdrawn from Cavan can be back hauled to any delivery point upstream. It can also be forward hauled to the GPG's that are downstream of this connection point. So, we consider that it may be necessary to separate DZ-03 into 3 zones. The first including only Jervois and Bolivar, so that they can receive BH flows, as well as FH deliveries from RZ-01. The second Cavan as a delivery The third delivery zone containing Quarantine, TIPS and Pelican Point. A receipt zone may be required for Cavan to allow FH flows to GPG (but BH to be used for all delivery points upstream). Note that receipt from Cavan is still a notional withdrawal from the STTM, haulage direction is determined based on where the delivery point is. Iona delivery is missing from DZ-01 for FH (it can receive physical flow from Minerva – PCA, Langley – PCA or Otway – PCA) To achieve the concerns highlighted in the previous point, we think that it may be necessary to split the zone and isolate the STTM transfer point so to that FH and BH to the other points currently listed in that zone can occur The following delivery points need to be added as Back Haul Delivery Points from Cavan (in addition to Poolaijelo, Langley and Iona) Bolivar and Jervois to a new BH segment Naracoorte to BS-01 			





Qu	uestions	Feedback
2. Po 4. 5. 6.	zones and pipeline segments? Do you agree with the proposed specification of the delivery zone incorporating DWGM interface points? If not, please explain why not.	We have identified the following adjustments are required to proposed service points and segments There are a couple of typo's in the document with regards to Service Points in section 16.2 M-UGS is listed as a delivery in RZ-04 but should be a receipt M-UGS is listed as a delivery in RZ-04 a second time, but should be DZ-04 MIJ-001 – PCI Delivery is listed in DZ-03 but should be in DZ-05, as DZ-03 is Otway Minerva – PCI is missing as a delivery in DZ-01 There are missing pipeline segments from RZ-01 to deliver to DZ-04 at M-UGS Delivery; and RZ-04 to deliver to DZ-02 at MPSWCP Delivery We don't have any issue with the proposed delivery zone incorporating DWGM interface points We have identified that not all BH pipeline segments have been defined. The following delivery points need to be added as possible BH options from SWP Minerva – PCI to BS-01 MPSWCP to a new BS-02 MIJ-001 – PCI to a new BS-03 M-UGS to a new BS-04