



Draft Five Year Plans for the
Victorian Network
(July 2023- June 2028)

Stakeholder Engagement
Report

27 June 2022

kpmg.com.au

Prepared for
AusNet Services

Consultation Report

Context and Purpose

As part of a regulated process, AusNet Services (AusNet) is planning future investment priorities and services for the Victorian gas distribution network for the regulatory reset period from July 2023 to June 2028.

These priorities and services will be documented in the businesses' Final Plan (otherwise known as an Access Arrangement).

Customer and stakeholder engagement is an important part of this process to help ensure investment priorities reflect customer and stakeholder needs now and in the longer term, and to ensure the strategy has their support.

The business is committed to delivering plans that are:

- Capable of acceptance by customers and stakeholders
- Underpinned by effective customer and stakeholder engagement
- Deliver for current and future customers.

AusNet is collaborating with Australian Gas Networks (AGN) and MultiNet Gas Network (MGN) on one joint engagement program in advance of the submission of their Final Plan in Victoria. The businesses' approach to meeting these objectives includes engaging with a range of stakeholders across a variety of mechanisms, as detailed in the *'Engaging Victorians on the future of our networks' Engagement Plan* which was delivered in July 2021 following an extensive consultation period.

On 19 February 2021, the businesses published their Draft Engagement Plan for a six week consultation period. The Draft Engagement Plan was distributed to key stakeholders and published on their respective websites before the Final Engagement Plan was delivered.

The businesses' staged engagement approach was:

Stage 1: **Research and Strategy** (complete)

- Meetings with key stakeholders
- Established a Victorian Gas Network Stakeholder Roundtable (VGNSR)
- Engaged with Retailer Reference Group (RRG)
- Developed a Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Stage 2: **Developing Draft Plans** (complete)

- Key stakeholder input into developing proposals through the VGNSR and RRG
- Held iterative customer workshops across Victoria with key customer segments
- Future of Gas dedicated engagement activities
- Engaged with major customers

Stage 3: **Consultation on the Draft Plans** (complete)

- Published Draft Plans for AGN, AusNet and MGN and consulted stakeholders and customers on proposals
- Customer workshops to consult on Draft Plans
- Dedicated stakeholder engagement on the Future of Gas

Stage 4: **Refinement and Ongoing Engagement** (current)

- VGNSR and RRG workshops
- Future of Gas engagement activities
- Meetings and briefings with AER Consumer Challenge Panel
- Submission of Final Plans for AGN, AusNet Services and MGN

This report documents feedback from engagement with VGNSR and RRG, relating to AusNet only. A separate report has been prepared for AGN and MGN.

Consultation Report

Context and Purpose

AusNet Services, in conjunction with AGN and MGN, engaged KPMG to independently obtain feedback from VGNSR and RRG on key components of the Draft Plans, the overall engagement process and any other matters of interest. Two engagement sessions, independently facilitated by KPMG, were held with key stakeholders from VGNSR and RRG.

The original scope of work entailed two engagement workshops to be held with stakeholders combined from both VGNSR and RRG. A revision to the approach was agreed with the businesses and stakeholders following an initial workshop on 13 April 2022.

The revised approach entailed two deep dive presentations being delivered by AusNet, AGN, and MGN to the VGNSR and RRG separately. These presentations reflected stakeholders' feedback to date and to highlight updates to the Draft Plans in response.

Following these presentations, KPMG held two engagement workshops with the VGNSR and RRG individually. The VGNSR workshop was held on 16 May 2022 and the RRG workshop was held on 24 May 2022. One interview was held separately with a VGNSR group member at their request due to their unavailability for the designated workshop.

All sessions were conducted virtually via videoconference in response to social distancing preferences regarding COVID-19 and geographical distribution of participants.

At each workshop, summaries provided by the businesses on key components of the Draft Plans were displayed to participants. The key components for AusNet were as follows:

Workshop 16 May 2022 with VGNSR

- Accelerated depreciation
- Demand forecasts
- Capex (mains replacement and connections)
- Step changes
- ICT expenditure
- Cost of debt, inflation rate, CPI

Workshop 24 May 2022 with RRG

- Terms and Conditions
- Future of Gas
- Accelerated Depreciation
- Demand forecasts
- Capex (mains replacement and connections)
- Step changes
- ICT expenditure
- Cost of debt, inflation rate and CPI

Participants were invited to provide feedback and ask questions. As part of all workshops, KPMG facilitated discussion with the group to allow participants to explore key areas for further feedback. This feedback is captured and reflected in this report. All feedback has been anonymised.

The independent workshops were an opt-in process for participants. The feedback gathered and documented in this report is therefore reflective of the views of those who participated and may not represent a wider cohort's views.

In the context of the rapid change and policy uncertainty the Gas sector is facing, some stakeholders presented views regarding the future use of gas networks and associated policy issues. It is noted that while the policy uncertainty frames the context in which the gas networks operate, the purpose of this engagement was to obtain and document feedback on the substance of the proposed Draft Plans over the next five year regulatory period.

Representatives from the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) and Consumer Challenge Panel (CCP) attended the workshops to observe. Members of AGN, MGN and AusNet were present at the start of workshops to outline the purpose and provide a brief summary of changes made to Draft Plans following consultation to date, as discussed in detail in deep-dive sessions held in the week prior to the workshops. AGN, MGN and AusNet representatives departed the workshop prior to gathering feedback from stakeholders. An attendance list for all workshops is provided at the end of this report.

The feedback in this report was documented and circulated to participants to ensure it accurately and comprehensively reflected participant feedback.

Consultation Report

Victorian Gas Network Stakeholder Reference (VGNSR) Feedback

VGNSR Stakeholder Feedback

VGNSR feedback on the engagement process was positive overall and stakeholders stated they felt they were heard and engaged with. The integrated engagement approach adopted by AusNet, AGN and MGN was positively received and stakeholders would like to see this repeated in future engagement programs.

Overall, while the process was viewed positively, stakeholders noted that the Draft Plans were not yet capable of acceptance. Primarily, this was due to policy uncertainty and the likelihood of Plans needing to change once policy directions are made. The Draft Plans have been developed in an environment of political and economic uncertainty with businesses awaiting the development of the Gas Substitution Roadmap by the Victorian Government.

Stakeholders provided detailed feedback on a range of key components of the Draft Plan and made recommendations for further iterations of the Plan.

Stakeholders noted that, unless specifically identified, feedback was common across the three businesses. Whilst there was broad agreement on a number of issues, stakeholders acknowledged the difficulty in seeking a universally acceptable outcome on all issues. They did note that AusNet appear to have responded more to their concerns, by way of changes to the Draft Plan.

VGNSR feedback focused on these key areas:

- The impact of policy uncertainty on the ability to accept a Plan that may be subject to change once the Victorian Government provides policy clarity, particularly the Gas Substitution Roadmap
- The tension between the proposal of accelerated depreciation with capex and hydrogen readiness expenditure.

Stakeholders recognise that the AER will undertake detailed analysis and assessment of AusNet’s detailed proposal.

Topic	Stakeholder Feedback
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most stakeholders are not currently able to accept the Draft Plans due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – policy uncertainty, particularly in regards to the Gas Substitution Roadmap, with one stakeholder noting that they are at a “holding point rather than a landing point” – stakeholders noted that in addition to State policy uncertainty, there is also uncertainty created by the challenging national and global political and economic environment. • Some stakeholders indicated that they wish to see the business response to final policy direction by the Victorian Government, before they could accept the Draft Plans. • Some stakeholders stated that they were unable to accept the Draft Plans due to insufficient change in key areas of the Draft Plan, namely in the area of accelerated depreciation. Specifically, the inclusion of accelerated depreciation while at the same time spending to accommodate new connections, mains replacement and in some circumstances hydrogen readiness. • One stakeholder stated that new and significant increases in expenditure have the potential to increase stranding risk of infrastructure, posing risks for both new and existing customers. • Those same stakeholders indicated that whilst they agreed that it would be preferable to allow time to accommodate the decision on the Victorian Gas Substitution Roadmap, consumers may elect to electrify in the absence of policy certainty. • One of the above stakeholders was not willing to indicate whether the plan was capable of acceptance as they see this as the job of the regulator, particularly given differing levels of expertise and interests of stakeholders.

Continued on following page.



Consultation Report

Victorian Gas Network Stakeholder Reference (VGNSR) Feedback

Topic	Stakeholder Feedback
Overall (continued.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders recognised the difficulty in seeking a universally acceptable outcome amongst a diverse group of stakeholders on complex issues. Stakeholders acknowledged the cumulative pressure on upward prices and the desire to protect consumers as much as possible from price increases, wherever possible.
Accelerated Depreciation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders stated that there appears to be an unresolved tension in the Draft Plans between accelerated depreciation on one hand and increased capex and hydrogen readiness expenditure on the other hand that is difficult to reconcile. Some stakeholders stated that they were unable to accept accelerated depreciation while networks are being augmented and investment is being made in hydrogen readiness. These stakeholders stated they were not opposed to accelerated depreciation <i>per se</i>, however applying accelerated depreciation while also increasing connections and investing capital expenditure was not supported. Some other stakeholders stated that the above tension between accelerated depreciation and capex investment increased stranding risks for consumers, which in turn may be reflected in increased prices and / or a reduction of future network incomes thereby restricting their ability to fund essential spending. One stakeholder stated that they disagree with the suggestion that accelerated depreciation is a good solution in both a future of gas scenario as well as a transition to electricity future scenario, qualifying they considered it would only be appropriate in response to electrification and as part of a holistic approach to winding down the network. Some stakeholders agreed that their feedback for accelerated depreciation to be removed from the plans has not been adopted in the Draft Plan, given AusNet has revised up the amount of investment being recovered by accelerated depreciation by a further \$20million. One stakeholder queried whether consumer advocates have enough knowledge and understanding to assess the proposed level of accelerated depreciation and as a result queried whether the businesses' can claim support for the proposal.
Demand forecasts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific comments received.
Capex (mains replacement and connections)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of stakeholders shared the view that they were seeking more information on the narrative and evidence on the requirement to replace mains on the basis of safety. One stakeholder specifically sought advice from Energy Safe Victoria, the Victorian Government's technical regulator. Stakeholders displayed a disinclination for capex for hydrogen readiness due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uncertainty regarding the future of hydrogen in Australia uncertainty regarding the introduction of and ability of distribution networks to carry hydrogen competition with an already available electrification pathway a view that consumers should not be funding hydrogen readiness work Stakeholders shared the view that expenditure on mains replacement is not supported on the basis of hydrogen readiness alone. One stakeholder indicated that there may be support for high priority uses for hydrogen which does not warrant investment in network reticulation. One stakeholder expressed concern that the narrative regarding mains replacement appears to have changed over time, initially justified on the basis of hydrogen readiness and then shifting to an emphasis on safety being the driver.

Continued on following page.

Consultation Report

Victorian Gas Network Stakeholder Reference (VGNSR) Feedback

Topic	Stakeholder Feedback
Capex (mains replacement and connections) (continued.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One stakeholder stated that spend may be revised again by businesses once the Gas Substitution Roadmap is finalised and so it is difficult to accept the current position until there is clearer policy direction.
Opex (Priority Services Program (PSP) and Education Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of stakeholders held the view that the response from AusNet on the reduction of the Priority Services Program (PSP) by \$0.9million was a positive change. This was viewed as favourable over the unchanged expenditure position of AGN and MGN to PSP. Whilst supportive of efforts to provide additional support to vulnerable consumers, one stakeholder queried the implementation methodology of the PSP, specifically the use of a register of vulnerability, and how customer data might be protected. In that context, some stakeholders stated that while they endorsed the establishment of a PSP, they were unclear how this was different to existing schemes and they did not support additional allocated revenue. Some stakeholders also expressed concern over consumers funding Education Program spend as the spend was difficult to accept as separate from business as usual marketing spend. One stakeholder qualified their support of the above position by stating that there would be a stronger case for spend on an Education Program if the policy direction was clear on the transition to renewable gases. One stakeholder expressed concern over the appropriateness of a private company being involved in education programs in schools. Further to this, other stakeholders stated that this type of program should be managed by an independent third party. One stakeholder acknowledged the removal of a number of step changes, including in relation to bushfire insurance and IT, following earlier opposition to inclusion.
Productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One stakeholder expressed concern over the modelling used to forecast future productivity, stating that past performance may not be the best guide to determining future productivity, particularly with falling demand, and may not be a good guide to what should be expected from an efficient businesses in a competitive market.
Feedback on stakeholder engagement approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of stakeholders appreciated the consultative process AGN, MGN and AusNet have undertaken in the development of Draft Plans. The process of integrating the engagement activities across AusNet, AGN and MGN was positively received and stakeholders would like to see this repeated in the future. The integrated process has allowed stakeholders to have more visibility across the three businesses, enabled easier comparisons between Draft Plans and provided an opportunity for cumulative feedback. Stakeholders noted that the Draft Plans of the businesses broadly complement each other and are not contradictory. Stakeholders were complementary of the involvement of representatives from the businesses in the overall engagement process. One stakeholder indicated that the number and length of meetings was greater than they had anticipated and whilst appreciative of the effort by the businesses to engage, this could be reviewed and refined in the future.

Continued on following page.

Consultation Report

Victorian Gas Network Stakeholder Reference (VGNSR) Feedback

Topic	Stakeholder Feedback
Other matters raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholders made the following suggestions for AusNet to consider for further iterations to the Draft Plans:<ul style="list-style-type: none">— There was a suggestion by one stakeholder, with support from another, to detail policy assumptions in the Draft Plan and create line of sight to the pathways resulting from those policy assumptions. The rationale for detailing policy assumptions and links to pathways was that it would enable greater visibility of what will change when policy directions are made— There was also a suggestion that the business may consider adding a profile to the Draft Plan of the risks borne by consumers versus the businesses, the reasonableness of these risks, and a justification as to why risk has been allocated accordingly.

Consultation Report

Retailer Reference Group (RRG) Feedback

RRG Feedback

RRG feedback on the overall engagement process was constructive. Retailers appreciated the integrated consultative process by AusNet, AGN and MGN, given the businesses are managing similar issues. This joint engagement process is also viewed as a more efficient use of retailer time.

Overall, retailers were generally satisfied that their feedback had been accurately and adequately captured by the businesses in the “what we’ve heard” documentation. However, some retailers stated the response to their feedback, in so far as it effected change in the Draft Plan, was insufficient.

Retailers were in agreement that the current Draft Plans are not capable of acceptance, primarily due to concerns regarding the tension between accelerated depreciation and spend on capex and opex.

Retailers provided detailed feedback on a range of key components of the Draft Plan as detailed below and also made recommendations for further iterations of the Plan.

Retailers noted that, unless specifically identified, feedback was common across the three businesses.

In this workshop, stakeholder feedback predominantly focused on these key areas:

- accelerated depreciation
- terms and conditions
- the overall engagement process

Retailers recognise that the AER will undertake detailed analysis and assessment of AusNet’s detailed proposal.

Topic	Retailer Feedback
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current engagement process is viewed as an improvement to historical approaches to engagement in so far as the integration of the consultation process across AusNet, MGN and AGN created efficiencies and should be continued. • Retailers felt the integrated approach enabled better comparison between AGN, MGN and AusNet, particularly given the similar detail between the three businesses’ Draft Plans. • Retailers appreciated workshops being held in a group environment as it provided an opportunity to develop ideas and feedback together, rather than in isolation. • In terms of process, retailers said their views have been adequately captured through the “what we’ve heard documents”. • The majority of retailers stated that the response to their feedback was insufficient in parts, in so far as it did not effect the desired change to the Draft Plan. An example of this was the increase by AusNet of the amount of investment being recovered by accelerated depreciation by \$20million, contrary to feedback previously provided to remove it. • Retailers indicated that the plans are not currently capable of acceptance primarily due to concerns regarding the tension between accelerated depreciation and spend on capex and opex. The retention of the Priority Services Program (PSP) was also highlighted as a key issue.

Continued on following page.

Consultation Report

Retailer Reference Group Feedback

Topic	Retailer Feedback
Terms and Conditions (Continued.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One retailer noted that AusNet’s proposed requirements exceeded the agreed process with Buildpacks under Retail Market Procedures, as it places a mandatory obligation on the provision of information, some of which retailers may not obtain e.g. customer phone number and email address. Their preference would be for terms and conditions to point to existing market processes to enable more consistency in regards to approach and timing. • One retailer shared the view that the credit support requirements on retailers should be consistent with the credit support arrangements prescribed in NECF jurisdictions.
Accelerated Depreciation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retailers noted that the retention of accelerated depreciation is the core issue in relation to the Draft Plans, specifically with regard to the increased expenditure on mains replacement and network augmentation. • Retailers were united in their view that the retention, and increase, of accelerated depreciation is contrary to the feedback they have provided to date to remove it. • There was agreement among retailers that accelerated depreciation has not been adequately justified and they consider it cannot exist in parallel with expansion goals and growth in expenditure in the short term. • One retailer queried whether price stability could be achieved through alternative expenditure and cost reduction efforts, rather than utilising accelerated depreciation. • There was a view expressed that the narrative regarding the need for accelerated depreciation is inconsistent between AGN, MGN and AusNet and is creating confusion as to the rationale for its inclusion in the Plans. For example, retailers stated that AusNet were perceived as justifying accelerated depreciation as a means to mitigate asset stranding risk, which is a view at odds with expansion goals in the short term, whilst AGN and MGN were perceived as utilising accelerated depreciation for this purpose as well as being a means to mitigate intergenerational risk and enable more competitive pricing in the future. The latter view was perceived by one retailer to be more palatable. • One retailer wanted to understand the motivations regarding the different narratives and whether it was a technical or philosophical point of difference.
Demand forecasts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments received.
Capex (mains replacement and hydrogen readiness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retailers expressed a desired for more detail to justify the mains replacement expenditure. • Some retailers felt that there was insufficient detail to enable them to provide educated feedback, and some felt that they were being asked by the businesses to accept the proposed expenditure on the basis that is a safety requirement, without the detailed supporting evidence. • Retailers requested more evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where and why replacement is proposed • whether the proposed replacement is a ‘must have’ versus ‘nice to have’ safety requirement • leaks by volume of leak and risk posed.

Continued on following page.

Consultation Report

Retailer Reference Group Feedback

Topic	Retailer feedback
Capex (mains replacement and hydrogen readiness) (continued.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further to the above, retailers requested greater visibility and reassurance that mains replacement is not being undertaken in preparedness for hydrogen readiness, with some retailers stating that spend on hydrogen readiness was not appropriate until policy direction was set and the future of hydrogen was made clear. • Retailers were united in their concern on the increase in expenditure on mains replacement when pursuing accelerated depreciation, as the latter was perceived as reflecting uncertainty regarding future viability of the network.
Opex (Priority Services Program (PSP), renewable gas education)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some retailers expressed a desire for more detail on the Priority Services Program (PSP), namely around the types of activities being proposed under the program and where spend is being allocated. • One retailer enquired as to whether more could be done to reduce the spend on PSP, given close to 20% of the proposed spend was readily reduced in the latest iteration of the Draft Plan. • There was also a view held by one retailer that the PSP may be business-as-usual expenditure.
Other matters raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retailers agreed that AusNet may want to consider engaging with them on an annual basis throughout the access arrangement period, to enable the provision of more regular updates and real-time feedback, and in turn alleviating pressure on the current engagement process. • Retailers expressed a desire for more detail in relation to the depth of analysis provided by the businesses in the forums preceding the independent workshops. Examples given included on the breakdown and rationale of expenditure for mains replacement. • One retailer expressed the view that they are reliant on the AER's expertise and ability to make deeper enquiries than is capable by retailers. This was disagreed with by another stakeholder who believed these forums should provide such opportunity to retailers. • Retailers requested the opportunity to reconvene once policy directions were made clear in order to understand the implications on the Plans, prior to the Final Plans being handed down. • Retailers shared the view that it would be useful for the AER and networks to reconvene to explain the AER response to the Plans and the final position.

Consultation Participation

Combined VGNSR and RRG Workshop 14 April 2022

Stakeholder	Organisation	Reference Group	Meeting 16 May 2022
Andrew Richards	Energy Users Association of Australia	VGNSR	Apology
Gary Davies	Origin Energy	VGNSR	Attended
Travis Worsterling	Energy Australia	VGNSR	Attended
David Calder	Alinta Energy	VGNSR	Attended
Nick Bosco	Peet	VGNSR	Apology
Gavin Dufty	St. Vincent de Paul Society Victoria	VGNSR	Apology
Jarrod Lenne	Victorian Council of Social Service	VGNSR	Apology
Jon Onley	Australian Industry Group	VGNSR	Apology
Mark Grenning	Energy Users Association Australia	VGNSR	Attended
Ross Jameison	SIT Gas/GAMAA	RRG	Attended
Matthew Giampicollo	Simply Energy	RRG	Attended
Emma Chessell	Brothers St Laurence	RRG	Attended
Randall Brown	Momentum	RRG	Attended
Mark Riley	AGL	RRG	CHECK!!
Robert Lo Giudice	Alinta Energy	RRG	Apology
Emma Bristow	AGL	RRG	Apology
Con Noutso	Lumo/Red Energy	RRG	Attended
Matthew Pearce	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Grace Smith	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Natasha Hayes	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Brendan Li	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended
Stephen Dunne	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended
Richard Boo	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended
Slavko Jovanoski	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended
Dale Johansen	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Apology
Kenny Yap	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Roselle Mailvaganam	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Isaiah Robinson	ACCC	N/A – observer	Attended
Lisa Blake	ACCC	N/A – observer	Attended
Helen Bartley	Consumer Challenge Panel	N/A – observer	Apology
Robyn Robinson	Consumer Challenge Panel	N/A – observer	Apology

Members of the AGN and MGN executive and staff also attended the workshop.



Consultation Participation

VGNSR Workshop 16 May 2022

Stakeholder	Organisation	Reference Group	Meeting 16 May 2022
Ross Jameison	SIT Gas/GAMAA	VGNSR	Attended
David Markham	Australian Energy Council	VGNSR	Attended
Andrew Richards	Energy Users Association of Australia	VGNSR	Apology
Tennant Reed	Australian Industry Group	VGNSR	Attended
David Bryant	Brotherhood of St. Laurence	VGNSR	Attended
Gary Bath	Master Plumbers	VGNSR	Apology
Nick Bosco	Peet	VGNSR	Apology
Gavin Dufty	St. Vincent de Paul Society Victoria	VGNSR	Apology
Jarrod Lenne	Victorian Council of Social Service	VGNSR	Apology*
Jon Onley	Australian Industry Group	VGNSR	Apology
Mark Grenning	Energy Users Association Australia	VGNSR	Apology*
Matthew Pearce	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Natasha Hayes	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Brendan Li	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Stephen Dunne	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Richard Boo	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Slavko Jovanoski	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Dale Johansen	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Apology
Roselle Mailvaganam	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended
Lisa Blake	ACCC	N/A - observer	Attended
Ron Ben-David	Consumer Challenge Panel	N/A – observer	Attended
Helen Bartley	Consumer Challenge Panel	N/A - observer	Apology

*Due to an inability to attend the scheduled workshop, feedback was obtained directly at a time outside of the workshop.

Members of the AGN and MGN executive and staff also attended the workshop.

Consultation Participation

RRG Workshop 24 May 2022

Stakeholder	Organisation	Reference Group	Meeting 24 May 2022
Matthew Frost	Tango Energy	RRG	Attended
Randall Brown	Momentum	RRG	Attended
Robert Lo Giudice	Alinta Energy	RRG	Attended
David Calder	Alinta Energy	RRG	Attended
Con Noutso	Lumo/Red Energy	RRG	Attended
Mark Riley	AGL	RRG	Attended
Matthew Giampiccolo	Simply Energy	RRG	Apology
Alex Fleming	Sumo Power	RRG	Apology
Emma Bristow	AGL Australia	RRG	Apology
Gary Davies	Origin Energy	RRG	Apology
Ashlei Neos	Alinta Energy	RRG	Apology
Matthew Pearce	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Natasha Hayes	KPMG	N/A – facilitator	Attended
Brendan Li	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Stephen Dunne	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Richard Boo	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Lynley Jorgensen	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Slavko Jovanoski	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A – observer	Attended
Robyn Robinson	Consumer Challenge Panel	N/A – observer	Apology
Dale Johansen	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Apology
Roselle Mailvaganam	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended
Lisa Blake	ACCC	N/A – observer	Attended
Isaiah Robinson	Australian Energy Regulator	N/A - observer	Attended

Members of the AGN and MGN executive and staff also attended the workshop.



Contacts in relation to this document:

Dr Matthew Pearce

Partner

T: +61 8 8236 3471

E: mpearce1@kpmg.com.au

Inherent Limitations

This report has been prepared as outlined in the Context and Purpose Section. The services provided in connection with this engagement comprise an advisory engagement, which is not subject to assurance or other standards issued by the Australian Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and, consequently no opinions or conclusions intended to convey assurance have been expressed.

The findings in this report are based on a qualitative study and the reported results reflect a perception of Australian Gas Networks (AGN), MultiNet Gas Networks (MGN) and AusNet Services (AusNet) but only to the extent of the sample surveyed, being the Victorian Gas Network Stakeholder Roundtable Group and Retailer Reference Group. Any projection to the wider stakeholder base is subject to the level of bias in the method of sample selection. No warranty of completeness, accuracy or reliability is given in relation to the statements and representations made by, and the information and documentation provided by AGN, MGN, AusNet and stakeholders consulted as part of the process.

KPMG have indicated within this report the sources of the information provided. We have not sought to independently verify those sources unless otherwise noted within the report.

KPMG is under no obligation in any circumstance to update this report, in either oral or written form, for events occurring after the report has been issued in final form.

The findings in this report have been formed on the above basis.

Third Party Disclosure

This report is solely for the purpose set out in the Scope Section and for AGN's information, and is not to be used for any purpose not contemplated in the engagement letter or to be distributed to any third party without KPMG's prior written consent.

This report has been prepared at the request of AGN in accordance with the terms of KPMG's engagement letter dated 4 April 2022 and executed on 13 April 2022. Other than our responsibility to AGN, neither KPMG nor any member or employee of KPMG undertakes responsibility arising in any way from reliance placed by a third party on this report. Any reliance placed is that party's sole responsibility.

KPMG.com.au



©2022 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

The information contained in this document is of a general nature and is not intended to address the objectives, financial situation or needs of any particular individual or entity. It is provided for information purposes only and does not constitute, nor should it be regarded in any manner whatsoever, as advice and is not intended to influence a person in making a decision, including, if applicable, in relation to any financial product or an interest in a financial product. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

To the extent permissible by law, KPMG and its associated entities shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, defects or misrepresentations in the information or for any loss or damage suffered by persons who use or rely on such information (including for reasons of negligence, negligent misstatement or otherwise).

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Document Classification: KPMG Confidential