

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>value the RCM seems the logical place for this, other options can be explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="300 331 1166 400">○ Mrs Papps noted that in the Statement the reference to Clause 2.5.2	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="300 253 1182 450">○ Mr Arias noted that swept up in high emissions and sought to clarify whether there would be consideration of the actual utilization of the capacity in the energy market. Mr Arias noted that the guiding principles of the RCM Review are similar to the WEM Rules Objectives and asked if they would be adjusted. <li data-bbox="300 472 1182 701">○ Mr Thomas noted that in terms of capacity versus actual output, this will be something the Minister is looking for in the detailed design to deliver on the policy intent that he has outlined. The complexity will need to be worked through as this Statement is about a transition to a low emissions power system. The actual energy output will need to be factored in this and other mechanisms and is something that we cannot shy away from. <li data-bbox="300 723 1214 887">○ Ms Guzeleva noted that one of the objectives for the RCM Review is to meet the WEM objectives, and there would be a need to examine how the objectives for the RCM Review might need to change. In the Statement there is intent to incorporate the design of policy in the RCM Review. <li data-bbox="300 909 1209 969">○ Ms White sought to understand how the WEM Objectives to avoid discrimination against technologies fits with the Statement. <li data-bbox="300 992 1193 1088">○ Mr Thomas noted that the Objectives are enshrined in legislation and taking this Statement forward will rely on those Objectives being amended in legislation under Project Eagle. <li data-bbox="300 1111 1219 1462">○ Ms White noted that the Statement is framed as incentivising investment in new technologies and that this made sense on a principle level but sought clarification on the retrospective application of the policy, noting that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 1261 1219 1321">amending the RCM as a result of the review would work on a forward-looking basis; <li data-bbox="443 1344 1174 1404">existing incumbents have made investment decisions based on the RCM framework as it was at the time; and <li data-bbox="443 1426 1099 1462">it is important to apply consistent policy principles. <li data-bbox="300 1485 1121 1538">○ Mr Thomas noted the two limbs of the draft Statement - the penalties for high emissions techn 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>considered in light of the policy implementation. Mr Thomas noted that the session was very useful in determining an expanded list of things to work through, but emphasised the need to finalise the Statement with the Minister, with the rest to follow and be considered in the deeper design at a later stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Chair sought the views of the MAC on the Statement. ○ Mr Huxtable noted that he was generally supportive but noted that, while the Statement does not preclude other options outside the 	

Item	Subject	Action
o	The Chair noted that time was of the essence and late feedback may not make its way into the process of finali	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="300 248 1206 555">○ Mr Sharafi provided a statement that AEMO will support whatever policy the government puts together. However he noted two concerns regarding:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="395 367 1177 434">the need to implement this in a way that does not lead to an early exit of generators, creating reliability issues; and<li data-bbox="395 454 1201 555">the impact on AEMO's functions, noting that AEMO clears the market based on a zero sum outcome. Therefore, holding penalties to redistribute them will change that principle.<li data-bbox="300 571 748 595">○ Ms White supported the points	