



Attachment 2

Stakeholder feedback template

The template below has been developed to enable stakeholders to provide their feedback on the questions posed in the Consultation Paper and any other issues that they would like to provide feedback on. The GMRG strongly encourages stakeholders to use this template, so that it 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.

1. Consultation Paper questions

	Questions	Feedback
3.4 Questions on the overall legal and regulatory framework		
1.	Do you believe the proposed amendments to the NGL, Regulations and NGR implement the design of the capacity trading reforms effectively? If not, why not?	<p>As currently drafted, the framework contains many ambiguities and assumptions which raise questions and create considerable uncertainty for market participants. This uncertainty goes to the effectiveness of the reforms and raises significant commercial risks for service providers. Our specific concerns are detailed in the remainder of this submission.</p> <p>There are several other unintended consequences that arise from Epic's GTAs and the operation of the proposed amendments which we have commented upon in the relevant sections below.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the reforms cannot be completed without the further procedures to be developed by AEMO. Epic would be grateful for an opportunity to review this submission (if necessary) following our review of AEMO procedures.</p>
2.	Do the market bodies have adequate powers to do what they need to do to facilitate the outcomes sought by the reforms?	AER and AEMO have significant powers under this legislative framework. Epic submits that these powers must be exercised with caution based on the intent of the reforms.
3.	Do you agree with the GMRG's recommendation with regard to which rules are classified as civil penalty and/or conduct provisions (see Appendix A)? If not, why?	Epic submits that Rule 650 should not be classified as conduct provisions where a breach is the result of the determination of services as transitional firm quantities (refer to submission at question 24).
4.	Are there any changes to the NGL, Regulations or NGR that you consider are necessary to ensure parties are unable to game or undermine the intended objective of the reform package?	



	Questions	Feedback
5.	Are any other transitional rules not currently included in Schedule 5 required? If so, what are they and why are they required?	
4.1.1 Exemptions		
6.	<p>Having regard to the objectives of the capacity trading reforms and the Energy Council's approval of the GMRG's recommendation on coverage of the auction, do you agree with the proposal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apply the same exemption criteria to the obligation to publish a standard operational agreement and the auction? If not, why? ▪ Replace the single end-user facility criterion, with a single shipper criterion? If not, why? 	
7.	<p>Do you think the following definition of 'Part 24 compression service facility' will achieve the objective of capturing stand-alone compressors, such as the Moomba, Ballera, Wallumbilla and Iona compression facilities, but excluding other compression facilities (e.g. compression facilities that form part of the pipeline that are used to provide an integrated service and upstream compression facilities? If not, please explain what amendments you think need to be made to this definition.</p> <p><i>Part 24 compression service facility means a compression service facility that is or may be used to transport natural gas between a transmission pipeline operating at lower pressure and a transmission pipeline operating at higher pressure in order to facilitate the flow of natural gas between two or more receipt or delivery points where the receipt or delivery points are located on different transmission pipelines</i></p>	
8.	Do you agree with the proposal to allow facilities with a nameplate rating less than 10 TJ/day and single shipper facilities, up to 60 business days to develop and offer a standard operational agreement? If not, why?	Epic agrees that at least 60 business days is appropriate.
9.	Do you agree with the proposal to allow a single shipper exemption to be revoked if another shipper enters into an operational TSA with the service provider? If not, please explain why.	
4.1.2 Governance model for the Code		



	Questions	Feedback
10.	Do you agree with the proposal to allow the AER to play a more proactive role in overseeing modifications to the Code? If not, please explain why.	<p>The AER should not make recommendations for the Code without industry wide consultation given their core function as the Regulator.</p> <p>AER have significant powers under this legislative framework. Any modifications made by the AER must be made with caution and with industry consultation.</p>
11.	Do you agree with the proposed composition of the OTS Code Panel, which will comprise: two service providers, two shippers (one of which must be a large end-user) and AEMO? If not, please explain why not and the changes you would suggest be made to the composition of the OTS Code Panel.	<p>The composition of the OTS Code Panel may introduce greater power to AEMO by providing it a casting vote as the shippers and service providers are likely to disagree and vote against each other. AEMO's casting vote must be exercised with caution and with industry consultation.</p>
4.1.3 Measures to address contractual limitations in facility agreements		
12.	Do you agree with the proposal to use a request and negotiate framework, rather than a standard form agreement model or more prescriptive provisions in the NGR to overcome the limitations on capacity trading in facility agreements? If not, please explain why.	<p>This model is preferable to a standard form agreement or more prescriptive NGR provisions as it allows enough flexibility to ensure each contract is adapted in a way that works for its specific drafting. However, the principles in Rule 642 do need to be capable of unambiguous translation into facility agreements.</p> <p>It also needs to be clear that 'enabling' the sale of transportation capacity is limited to removing contractual impediments and does not require the service provider to agree to changes to the nature of the services provided so as to allow the user to trade more commercially attractive capacity by for example improving MHQ flexibility where this was not previously included in the facility agreement.</p> <p>Epic does not agree that Rule 640(1) should be a conduct provision. Whether or not an amending agreement gives effect to the principles in Rule 642(2) will always be a matter of interpretation in the specific circumstances of a particular facility and a particular primary facility agreement. Making it a conduct provision will impose a potentially disproportionate penalty on a service provider that has prepared an amending agreement in good faith on the basis of its understanding of the principles in Rule 642, but is later found to have interpreted the principles in a different way.</p>
13.	Do you think the 30 day period allowed for service providers to respond to a shipper seeking an amending agreement is appropriate? If not, why?	<p>A service provider is likely to receive a number of requests under Rule 640 around the same time and each will need to be assessed taking into account the requests of other facility users. To provide an amending agreement that gives effect to the requirements of Rule 640(2), the service provider may need additional time to assess the</p>



	Questions	Feedback
		<p>operational and technical requirements for the purposes of ensuring the reasonableness principle in Rule 642(2)(d) is met..</p> <p>Further time should be allowed to enable reasonable investigation by the service provider regarding operational and technical requirements. It also needs to be clarified that the negotiations in good faith under Rule 640(3) occur after the amending agreement has been delivered and not during the 30 day time period.</p>
14.	Do you agree with the principles that service providers will be required to give effect to when amending the facility agreement in rule 642?	See comments at question 12.
15.	Do you agree with the proposal to require service providers to comply with the change in receipt and delivery point provisions in rule 643?	
16.	<p>Do you agree with the proposal in rule 643(6) to restrict the ability of service provider's to make its consent on a receipt or delivery point change conditional on obtaining the consent of a third party but only:</p> <p>(a) where the transportation service provider would be in breach of contract if it gave effect to the request without the consent of the third party; and</p> <p>(b) if the third party is another transportation facility user or an associate of another transportation facility user, the requirement to obtain that person's consent arises under a contractual provision entered into before 3 January 2018.</p> <p>If not, why?</p>	
4.1.4 Governance arrangements for the specification of zones		
17.	Do you agree with the GMRG's proposed change to the governance arrangements for the specification of zones? If not, please explain why not and set out the arrangements that you think should be employed.	
18.	Do you agree with the specification of the principles that AEMO would be required to have regard to when determining the allocation of service points to zones? If not, please set out why not and any amendments you would propose to these principles.	



	Questions	Feedback
19.	Do you agree with the information disclosure obligations that service providers would be subject to under the NGR?	
20.	Do you think any additional guidance on the specification of zones is required in the NGR?	
4.1.5 Other matters		
21.	Do you think the proposed service provider cost recovery arrangements provide sufficient protection against the risk of 'gold plating' or 'cost shifting'? If not, please explain why and identify any other measures you think should be employed.	
5.1.1 Grandfathered rights		
22.	Do you think the proposal to limit the availability of grandfathered rights to gas fired generators for use at their generation plant is appropriate? If not, please explain why	
23.	Do you think the proposed two-year transitional period for grandfathered rights is appropriate? If not, please explain why.	
24.	Are there any other limitations that you think should be placed on the availability and/or use of grandfathered rights?	<p>Epic is concerned about the risk of claims under Rule 650(2) as a conduct provision, if it assesses the existence of a transitional firm quantity in a different way. This exposes service providers to both primary users and auction participants who may dispute the service providers' determination of transitional firm quantities.</p> <p>Epic submits there should be a preliminary process under which the AER makes a determination (at service providers' request) that a service qualifies as a transitional firm quantity. It also submits that Rule 650(2) should not be a conduct provision in relation to transitional firm quantities.</p> <p>In the alternative, where there are no provisions allowing prior AER approval, Epic submits there should be provision which allows service providers an ability to rectify the situation prospectively prior to any penalties (civil or conduct) being imposed.</p>
5.1.2 Contract path specification		



	Questions	Feedback
25.	<p>Do you agree with the GMRG's proposal to use the hybrid model for forward haul and compression services? If not, please explain why and in doing so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ set out the approach you think should be employed; and ▪ why you think this approach is more consistent with the objectives of the capacity trading reform package, the NGO and the Energy Council's Vision. 	
26.	Do you agree with the proposal to allow AEMO to determine the backhaul receipt and delivery points to be included in the auction? If not, please explain why	
27.	If AEMO is to determine the backhaul points to be included in the auction, do you think any principles need to be included in the NGR to guide this decision, or should it just be carried out by reference to the Part 25 objective and the NGO?	
5.1.3 Methodology used to calculate auction quantity limits		
28.	Do you agree with the proposal to require the methodology to be used to calculate the auction quantity limits to be specified in the Auction Procedures? If not, why?	
29.	Do you think any additional principles need to be included in the NGR to guide AEMO's development of this methodology? If so, please specify the principles and why you think they are required.	<p>There is a difference between the quantities of natural gas that 'can' be transported, injected or withdrawn and the quantities that it is reasonable and prudent to transport, inject or withdraw taking into account pipeline integrity, maintenance activities and planning and other safety or operational factors.</p> <p>As such, service providers require discretion to be able to safely and reliably operate the pipeline. The drafting of Rule 653(4) and (7) and the definition of 'operational capacity' do not currently achieve this.</p>
5.1.4 Other matters		
30.	Do you think the balance that has been struck between the various legal and regulatory instrument is appropriate? If not, what changes do you think need to be made to achieve a better balance?	



	Questions	Feedback
31.	Do you think there are any contractual or other legal impediments to prevent auction facility operators giving effect to the results of the auction and auction service priorities? If so, what are they and how do you think they could be addressed?	<p>The standard market timetable should contain provision for two nomination cut off times (one for auction services and a separate nomination cut off time for other services). The current rules (Rule 678(2)) provide for one cut off time for all services (i.e. 3:00pm) but this does not work for auction services because the auction does not complete until 4:40pm. Nominations for auction services can therefore not occur until after 4:40pm.</p> <p>Failure to address the issues raised in the above paragraph will result in service providers being unable to comply with clause 4.6 of the OTSA (scheduling).</p>
32.	<p>Do you think information on intra-day curtailments to capacity sold in the auction should be published on the Bulletin Board during the gas day? If so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What benefit do you think it would provide? ▪ Do you think the obligation to report this information should be limited to material curtailments (e.g. where the capacity sold in the auction is curtailed by more than 10%)? 	
33.	Do you think information on the grandfathered rights that have been scheduled ahead of the auction should be published on the Bulletin Board after the gas day? If so, what benefit do you think it would provide?	Epic's position is that this is commercially sensitive data; publishing single company flows, and should not be published on the Bulletin Board. Further, this is a significant departure from previous AEMO practice.
34.	Are there any other types of information that you think could be published that have not already been identified, which would allow auction participants to better understand the risks?	
7.1 Allocation arrangements		
35.	Do you have any concerns with allocation agents that operate at points through which gas is injected into or withdrawn from a Part 24 facility being required to provide AEMO with the information set out in Table 7.1?	
36.	Is there other information regarding allocation arrangements that should be published to ensure these agreements do not act as a barrier to trade?	
8.1 Transitional arrangements		



	Questions	Feedback
37.	Are the provisions in the NGL and Part 26 of the NGR sufficient to trigger change of law provisions and enable changes required to existing contracts to implement the harmonisation of the gas day start time and, as applicable, the nomination cut-off time? If not, why?	
38.	<p>With regard to the information required to be published by facility operators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you think transitional rule 4, Part 6 (Schedule 5) will facilitate coordination between interconnected facilities and AEMO without being overly burdensome on facility operators? If not, why? ▪ Is the 30 June 2019 cut-off date for publication appropriate? If not, when should this information be required to be published and why? 	
9.1 Key timings		
39.	Do you have any concerns with the timings outlined Chapter 9? If so, what are they and how do you suggest the timings are adjusted?	
40.	<p>In the event the capacity trading reforms are applied in the Northern Territory, do you believe the timings set out in Table 9.4 are appropriate? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Part 18 of the NGR uses 'NT application date', defined as the date falling 90 days after the date on which the first NT interconnector is commissioned, to determine when Part 18 applies to facilities in the NT. Following this 90 day period, BB facilities that are also NT facilities have 20 business days to apply to AEMO to register under Part 18. In practice, this means that NT auction facilities may be subject to the capacity auction (which commences on the date falling 80 business days after commissioning), prior to publishing information on the Bulletin Board. Should the Part 18 obligations come into effect for NT auction facilities prior to the commencement of the auction? 	





2. National Gas Laws Amendments (Capacity Trading and Auctions)

Amendment	Issue	Feedback
Schedule 1	Amendment of National Gas Law	
1	Section 2 (1), definition of "Bulletin Board information"	
2	Section 2 (1), various new definitions	
3	Section 2 (1), definition of "initial National Gas Rules"	
4	Section 2 (1), definition of "Natural Gas Services Bulletin Board"	
5	Section 8 (3)	
6	Section 27 Functions and powers of the AER	
7	Section 74 Subject matter for National Gas Rules	
8	Section 74 (1) (aab)–(aad)	
9	Section 74 (3) (fb)	
10	Sections 83B–83D	
11	Section 91A— AEMO's statutory functions	
12	Section 91A (1) (gb) and (gc)	
13	Chapter 2, Part 6, Divisions 2C–2E	
14	Chapter 2, Part 6, Division 6, Subdivisions 3 and 4	
15	Section 91GG Disclosure of protected information for safety, proper operation of the market etc	
16	Section 91H Obligations under Rules or Procedures to make payments	
17	Section 218 AEMO's obligation to maintain Bulletin Board	
18	Section 219 AEMO's other functions as operator of Natural Gas Services Bulletin Board	
19	Section 223 Obligation to give information to AEMO about natural gas and natural gas services	
20	Section 223A	
21	Section 224 Person cannot rely on duty of confidence to avoid compliance with obligation	
22	Chapter 7A	For the purposes of 'change in law' provisions in contracts, the status of the Operational Transportation Service Code as a statutory instrument needs to be clarified. New s.91BRQ(1) states that the Capacity Transfer and Auction Procedures are a form of



		statutory instrument, but s. 228G is silent as to whether or not the Code is a statutory instrument.
23	Section 294G	
24	Section 322 Service provider may enter into agreement for access different from applicable access arrangement	
25	Schedule 1-Subject matter for the National Gas Rules	
26	Schedule 1, items 55T	
27	Schedule 1, items 68A–68G	
28	Schedule 1, item 69A	
Schedule 2	Amendment of National Gas Regulations	
1	Regulation 5A Definition of compression service facility	
2	Regulation 10 Maximum civil monetary liabilities	
3	Regulation 10 (1) (dc) and (dd)	
4	Regulation 10 (1) (e)	
5	Regulation 10 (2)	
6	Regulation 10 (2) (d) and (e)	
7	Regulation 10 (3), definition of “ <i>prescribed amount</i> ”	
8	Regulation 10 (3), definition of “ <i>relevant event</i> ”	
9	Regulation 10 (3), definition of “ <i>relevant event</i> ”	
10	Schedule 2 Exclusions from definition of pipeline	
11	Schedule 3 Civil penalties	
12	Schedule 4 Conduct provisions	



3. National Gas Rules

Part 15A Registered Participants

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
Division 3	Participant fees	
135C	Definitions	
135CA	Development of participant fee structure	
135CC	Components of participant fees	
135CF	Budgeted revenue requirements	



Part 18 Natural Gas Services Bulletin Board

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
Division 1	Interpretation and application	
141	Interpretation	
Division 2	Bulletin Board	
147	AEMO to maintain BB Register	
Division 3	Register and registration	
158A	Obligation to register as BB allocation agent	
158B	Obligation to register BB allocation point	
158C	Registrations for capacity transaction reporting	
158D	Appointment of capacity transaction reporting agent	
160	AEMO to register	
161	Revocation of registration	
Division 4	Information standard and related obligations	
165	Standard for information or data given under this Part or the BB Procedures	
Division 5	Information to be provided by BB reporting entities	
168	Nameplate rating information	
170A	Allocation methodology and agreement	
174	[Not used]. – Deletion of Secondary trade date for BB pipelines	
190A	Obligation to report	
190B	Reporting by the GSH Operator	
Division 7	Publication of information by AEMO	
195A	Publication of capacity transaction information	
195B	Publication of capacity auction information	



Part 22 Gas Trading Exchange

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
Division 1	Preliminary	
533	Definitions	
Division 2	Operator	
534	Fees recoverable by AEMO	
536	Determination of payments on close out	
536A	Payments where primary facility agreement is terminated	



Part 24 Facilitating capacity trades and the capacity auction

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
Division 1	Preliminary	
591	Application	
592	Structure of this Part	
593	Definitions and interpretation	
594	Part 23 does not apply	
Division 2	Operational Transportation Service Code	
595	Objective and effective date	
596	Content of the Code	
597	Standard operational transportation services and auction services	
598	Standard terms and facility specific terms	
599	Establishment and operation of the OTS Code Panel	
600	Functions of the Operational Transportation Service Code Panel	
601	Code modification proposals	
602	Consultation by the OTS Panel	
603	AER response to OTS Code Panel recommendations	
604	Code modifications	
605	Principles for making Code modification decisions	
606	Members of the OTS Code Panel	
607	Nomination, election and appointment of members	
608	Obligations of OTS Code Panel members	
609	Meetings of the OTS Code Panel	
Division 3	Exemptions and registration	
610	Scope of exemptions	
611	Exemptions granted by the AER	
612	Exemption conditions	
613	Revocation	
614	Making and form of application	



615	Decision on application	
616	Decision to vary or revoke an exemption	
617	AEMO to maintain register and publish guide	
618	Registration of transportation service providers	
619	Obligation to register Part 24 facilities	
620	Multiple transportation service providers for a Part 24 facility	
621	Change of transportation service provider	
622	Application for registration	
623	AEMO to register applicants and their facilities	
624	Revocation of registration	
Division 4	Matters for the Capacity Transfer and Auction Procedures	
625	Information about contracts	
626	Service point and pipeline segment specifications	
627	Allocation to zones	
628	Principles for determining zones	
629	Transportation service point register and information about zones	
630	Interface with the STTM and the DWGM	
Division 5	Obligations of transportation service providers relating to standard form agreements	
631	Obligation to publish	
632	Content of standard operational agreements	
633	Amendments to standard operational agreements	
634	Recovery of standardisation costs	
635	AER review of standard form agreements	
636	Requests for standard operational agreements	
637	Offers for standard operational agreements	
Division 6	Other service provider obligations	
638	Giving effect to operational transfers	
639	Service continuity for primary service termination or suspension	
640	Amendment of facility agreements	It will be very important that a service provider can be certain the amending agreement that it is required to deliver complies with Rule 640(2). This means that Rule 640 and the principles in Rule 642 must be capable of very clear application to all existing



		facility agreements. Epic submits that it would be better if Rule 640(2)(a) was rephrased so that it required an amending agreement to make amendments to the facility agreement that are necessary to permit the transportation facility user to sell the transportation capacity the subject of the facility agreement for use under an operational transportation service agreement. Please see also comments below on Rule 642.
641	New facility agreements	For the reasons stated above it would be better if this rule required provisions that 'permit' operational transfers. The term 'enable' is capable of an interpretation that is too broad.
642	Principles for terms to facilitate sale by operational transfer	Rule 642 is focussed on enablement rather than removal of contractual impediments to operational transfers. The principles need to make it clear that there is no obligation to improve the nature of the transportation services provided under a facility agreement so as to make operational transfers more commercially attractive. For example, a transportation facility user may consider that an increase in MHQ flexibility would enable it to trade capacity more easily whilst still meeting its own commercial needs.
643	Changes to pipeline service points	



Part 25 Capacity Auction

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
Division 1	Preliminary	
645	Objective	
646	This Part	
647	Definitions and interpretation	
648	Pipeline classification	
649	Auction information standard	
Division 2	Capacity auction	
650	Auction services	
651	Auction service priority principles	
652	Capacity auction design principles	
653	Auction quantity limits	
654	Application and information	
655	Giving effect to auction results	
656	Establishment and operation of the capacity auction	
657	Auction Procedures and auction agreement	
658	Suspension and termination of an auction participant	
659	Fees recoverable by AEMO	
660	Auction amounts payable by auction participants	
Division 3	Market conduct and nomination rules	
661	General requirements	
662	Conduct in relation to auctions	
663	Nominations and renominations must not be false or misleading	
664	AER monitoring	
665	Facility operators to keep nomination and scheduling records	
666	Renomination records of transportation facility users	
Division 4	Payment of capacity auction revenues	
667	Billing period settlement amounts for facility operators	
668	Final statements	



669	Payments	
670	Settlement queries and disputes	
671	Revised statements	
672	Payment of adjustments	
673	Maximum total payment in respect of a billing period	
674	Interest on overdue amounts	
675	Application of GST	



Part 26 Standard market timetable

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
676	Application of this Part	
677	Definitions and interpretation	
678	Standard market timetable	



Schedule 5 Transitional Provisions for the introduction of the capacity trading reforms

Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
Part 1	Transitional arrangements for Part 15B	
1	Definition	
2	Initial Procedures	
Part 2	Transitional arrangements for Part 18	
1	Definitions	
2	Commencement of secondary reporting obligations	
3	Allocation agents and allocation points on the commencement date	
4	Former remote pipelines	
Part 3	Transitional arrangements for Part 24	
1	Definitions	
2	Code modifications	
3	Northern Territory exemption	
4	Transitional Part 24 exemptions	
5	Registration in relation to Part 24 facilities on the Part 24 commencement date	
6	Initial transportation service point register	
7	Capacity trading platform commencement	
Part 4	Transitional arrangements for new Part 25 (other than compression reporting)	
1	Definitions	
2	Capacity auction start date	



Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
3	Protected services	<p>As currently drafted these provisions do not clearly achieve their stated objective that existing 'as available' and 'authorised overrun' services should rank ahead of the auction product for a transitional period. For example an authorised overrun service that meets the definition of transitional firm quantity will be 'firm' for the protected rights transition period but it will not necessarily be a 'firm forward haul service', 'firm backhaul service' or 'firm compression service' within the meaning of Rule 651(1)(a)(i).</p> <p>The ambiguity arises because there is no definition of 'forward haul service' and the indications in the Rules as drafted are that authorised overrun services are to be treated as a separate service from the underlying transportation service to which they relate (see the definitions of 'firm' and 'lower tier service' in Rule 647 and 'standard firm' in schedule 5, Part 4 r3).</p> <p>This could be rectified by adding a new paragraph (c) to schedule 5, part 4, r 3(1) which states 'any transportation service provided or to be provided in respect of a transitional firm quantity will be treated as if it was a firm forward haul service or firm backhaul service'.</p> <p>EESA also considers that a more appropriate date for paragraphs (c)(i) and (ii) would be 19 March 2018. Negotiations for new and amended GTAs are generally undertaken over several months and the proposed date of 3 January 2018 risks excluding from the transitional regime services that would otherwise meet the definition of transitional firm quantity, that were being provided in practice but for which the final contractual provisions formalising the service had not yet been executed.</p>
4	Facility operator nomination and scheduling records	
5	Renomination records	
Part 5	Transitional arrangements for reporting by compression service facilities	
1	Definitions and interpretation	
2	Application	
3	Information standard and related matters	
4	Capacity Transfer and Auction Procedures	
5	Nameplate rating information	
6	Detailed facility information	
7	Gas day start times	
8	Short term capacity outlooks	
9	Linepack/capacity adequacy indicator	



Draft Rules	Issue	Feedback
10	Nominated and forecast use of compression facilities	
11	Daily production data	
12	Publication by AEMO	
Part 6	Transitional arrangements for the standard market timetable	
1	Definitions	
2	Use of standard market timetable	
3	Information about gas market transition	
4	Information about natural gas facility transition	



4. Operational Gas Transportation Agreement Code

Clause	Issue	Feedback
Part 1	This code	
1	Introduction	
2	Definitions and interpretation	
3	Contents of this Code	
Part 2	Form of agreement – operational transportation services agreement	
1	Agreement documents	
2	Definitions and interpretation	
3	Agreement details	
Part 3	Standard terms - operational and commercial terms	
1	Definitions and interpretation	
2	Services	
3	Service Standards	
4	Nominations and Scheduling	<p>Clause 4.7(e) requires a service provider to notify shipper as soon as practicable whether and to what extent a service provider accepts or rejects a renomination for a service. This is not consistent with current standard practice. We currently schedule renominations at set interval times and we would seek an amendment to clause 4.7(e) to allow the current practice to continue.</p> <p>Failure to make this adjustment will result in unnecessary cost to the service providers in implementing the changes.</p>
5	System Use Gas	
6	Hourly Limitations	



Clause	Issue	Feedback
7	Curtailement	<p>Clause 7.2 is problematic for a number of reasons.</p> <p>It requires non-firm services to be provided to a higher standard than is currently the case. In order to preserve operational integrity, a service provider must be able to exercise its curtailment rights for non-firm services without first needing to assess its rights to do so or its own contribution (if any) to the underlying causes. Non-firm services should be able to be interrupted in the specified priority order for any reason where there is insufficient capacity to satisfy all nominations. That is the well understood nature of non-firm products and reflected in their price, and terms and conditions in primary facility agreements.</p> <p>Clause 7.2(b) also creates unnecessary ambiguity by imposing a special provision as to the treatment of one particular type of breach of the agreement whilst remaining silent about others. If a service provider breaches its obligations under clause 3(a) and loss arises, the shipper will have a cause of action subject to the terms of the agreement and the operation of common law.</p>
8	Park Account	
9	Maintenance	
10	Gas Quality	
11	Pressure and Temperature	
12	Imbalance	
13	Unauthorised Overrun	
14	Use of Delivery Points and Receipt Points	
15	Metering and Apportionment	
16	Title, Risk, Responsibility and Co-ordination	
17	Liability	
18	Force Majeure Events	
19	Charges and Payment	
20	GST	
21	Standing, Insurance and Credit Support	
22	Suspension and Termination	
23	Dispute Resolution	
24	Assignment/Novation	
25	Representations and Warranties	



Clause	Issue	Feedback
26	Confidentiality	
27	Notices	
28	Bilateral Trades	
29	Miscellaneous	
Part 4	Description of services – operational TSA	
1	Traded Forward Haul Service	
2	Traded Park Service	
3	Traded Compression Service	
4	Forward Haul Auction Service	
5	Backhaul Auction Service	
6	Compression Auction Service	
Part 5	Requirements for facility specific terms – operational TSA	
1	General	
2	Definitions in Facility Specific Terms	
3	Other Services	
4	Scheduling	
5	Priority Principles	
6	System Use Gas	
7	Hourly Limitations	
8	Pressure and Temperature	
9	Charges	
10	Imbalance	
11	Odourisation	
12	Metering Principles	
13	Operational Communications	
14	Compressor Operation	
15	Compression Services	
16	Receipt and Delivery Points	
17	Trading – other entitlements	
18	Accommodating Differences in Gas Days	



Clause	Issue	Feedback
19	Specific Facility Issues	