

# Improving guidance to support cost-benefit analysis in network investment

## What cost-benefit analysis underpins network investment?

In the National Electricity Market (Market), when a network business is considering making a large investment, it must apply a cost-benefit analysis to select the best way to meet that need for the investment, called an 'identified need'.

This 'best way' must have the highest net benefit across the Market, whilst meeting the required service standards. We call this cost-benefit analysis the regulatory investment test, or 'RIT'. There are two types of RIT, one for the transmission network (the RIT-T) and one for the distribution network (the RIT-D).

## Promoting the interests of electricity consumers

When properly applying our cost-benefit analysis, network businesses will effectively assess all credible options that could meet the needs of their networks. After making this assessment, they can only select the option that maximises the net economic benefit across the Market. This reduces the risk that consumers will pay for inefficient investments.

We see this as contributing to the National Electricity Objective (NEO) to promote efficient investment in, and efficient operation and use of, electricity services for the long-term interests of consumers of electricity.

Considering all credible options promotes competitive neutrality, which promotes selecting the most efficient investment. This also encourages efficient outcomes in the longer-term by allowing the contestable market to develop without bearing unnecessary risks arising from inefficient investment.

Our cost-benefit analysis further promotes investment efficiency by imposing transparency and accountability on major investment decisions. This contributes to the NEO to the extent that other efficiency incentives under regulatory regime are imperfect or the economic interests of network businesses differ from what maximises the net economic benefit across the Market.

## What is our guideline review about?

We have separate guidelines for the RIT-T and RIT-D (guidelines) where we provide practical guidance to help network businesses apply their cost-benefit analyses consistently and effectively.

We have been updating our guidelines. This follows a recommendation that the Council of Australian Governments Energy Council made after completing a review of the RIT-T

in February 2017. This also follows a new rule the Australian Energy Market Commission made in July 2017 to extend our cost-benefit analysis framework to replacement expenditure projects.

The draft guidelines reflect, where possible, the perspectives our stakeholders have offered throughout this review. We received a number written [submissions](#) on an Issues Paper we published in February 2018. Also, a number of stakeholders provided their views in a public forum we held in March 2018. A summary note of the input we received is available on the project page for this review on the [AER website](#).

## Promoting better engagement

Our proposed updates to the guidelines respond to feedback we have received on the quality of consumer and non-network engagement during the RITs. We now place a greater emphasis on the value of early, continuous engagement, recognising that the RITs occur in a broader network planning context. This includes recognising the value of transparency, including when providing user-friendly information in annual planning reports.

We have also introduced guidance on consumer engagement during the RITs. This provides high-level principles and draws on our current 'consumer engagement guidelines for network service providers'.

## Helping navigate policy and market changes

We have provided updated guidance to assist network businesses apply the RITs in the current changing regulatory and market environment. This includes improved guidance on how to account for:

- Market-wide impacts:

While the RITs have always required network businesses to value how their proposed investments affect other parties and other regions, the need for this task is ever growing. The draft guidelines acknowledge that the Australian Energy Market Operator has recently published its inaugural integrated system plan (ISP). We provide guidance on how network businesses can consider the ISP to inform their cost-benefit analysis so they can more effectively account for market-wide impacts.

- Policy changes:

We are proposing to update our current guidance on how to take government policy into account when apply a RIT. This includes guidance on treating compliance costs, calculating cost savings in meeting mandated targets, and considering

# Improving guidance to support cost-benefit analysis in network investment

potential policy developments when exploring different reasonable scenarios.

- System security:

While the RITs can capture the value of system security, such as the impact of high impact, low probability events, there had been a demand for more guidance in this area. We have heard this demand, and have provided clear guidance on how network businesses can account for the impact of high impact, low probability events within their RIT cost-benefit analysis.

## Guiding the assessment of efficient replacement projects

Following a rule change we requested, the RITs now apply to large replacement projects, rather than just augmentation projects. Replacement projects are those whereby transmission and/or distribution infrastructure is in poor condition and needs to be retired.

To get the most out of this rule change, we have extended our current guidance and worked examples to assist network businesses in applying the RITs in this new area.

Following stakeholder submissions, we have clarified that network businesses should value proposed replacement projects against a 'business as usual' base case. This is where the network businesses continues to operate with its existing infrastructure until it is no longer feasible to do so.

## Can the analysis capture social policy objectives?

Since electricity consumers in the Market ultimately fund network investments, our cost-benefit analysis aims to improve Market outcomes. That is, our cost-benefit analysis captures Market benefits, rather than broader policy goals (for example, regional employment benefits).

However, our cost-benefit analysis is sufficiently flexible to work alongside the broader policy context. It recognises that it is fit-for-purpose for the relevant beneficiaries, rather than electricity consumers, to fund broad social benefits.

Our cost-benefit analysis achieves this by recognising that when a party from outside the Market (say, a government or government body) puts funding towards an investment, this will be treated as an external capital contribution that increases that investment's net economic benefit under the cost benefit analysis.

## How else are we supporting better network investment decisions?

Improved guidance only goes so far to encourage better outcomes for electricity consumers. As such, we are taking a holistic approach to encourage efficient network investment.

- Improving information

Network businesses have good information on the strengths and limitations of their networks. By sharing this information, non-network businesses are able to develop ways to assist network businesses in meeting the needs of their customers. Following the repex rule change, network businesses must provide asset retirement and de-rating information in their 'annual planning reports'.

We have also been improving the consistency and useability of the planning information network businesses provide. Last year, we published an information template to help distribution businesses provide this information in a fit-for-purpose format. We are currently developing a similar template for transmission businesses.

- Improving incentives

We have recently introduced a demand management incentive scheme. This will encourage distribution businesses to undertake a transparent market testing process and to manage demand as part of its preferred option when doing so is efficient.

- Encouraging compliance

Network businesses, or AEMO in the case of Victorian transmission planning, are responsible for applying the RIT cost-benefit analysis. In contrast, we actively monitor, assess and provide guidance on how network businesses apply the RITs. We also have a dispute resolution role where network businesses have misapplied a RIT under the National Electricity Rules or have made a manifest calculation error.

We plan to take a more active role on reporting RIT compliance breaches. Doing this will provide transparency and identify any systemic concerns that arise. This is particularly important because, after the repex rule change, RITs have become more common and many network businesses are applying them for the first time.

We can also encourage network businesses to apply an effective cost-benefit analysis by considering this information when setting their revenue allowance. Each regulatory period, we consider a range of information when forecasting what level of capital expenditure would be efficient. RITs are typically useful for informing these decisions, and we plan to have greater regard to this information in future decisions.