

Our ref: ERC0404
28 February 2025

Lynette LaBlack

By email: lynettelablack@live.com

Dear Ms LaBlack

Response to objection to the use of an expedited process for the rule change request on removing the requirement to publish transmission information guidelines

I refer to the objection from you to the Australian Energy Market Commission (Commission) dated 13 February 2025, in relation to the use of an expedited process for the rule change on *removing the requirement to publish the transmission information guidelines*.

The Commission has carefully considered your objection in light of the relevant test for the use of the expedited process in the National Electricity Law (the NEL).

For the reasons set out in the Appendix to this letter, the Commission has decided that the reasons you have given in the request for the Commission not to use the expedited process are misconceived or lacking in substance. This is the relevant test in the NEL, as described in the Appendix.

Accordingly, the Commission has decided to continue with the expedited rule change process and not to switch to the standard rule making process.

The Commission thanks you for your interest in this project. We appreciate the time that you have taken to provide us with your views.

Yours sincerely



Anna Collyer
Chair
Australian Energy Market Commission

Appendix

Relevant provisions of the National Electricity Law

The AEMC's decision to use an expedited process for the rule change on *Removing the requirement to publish transmission information guidelines* was on the basis that the rule change request was a request for a non-controversial rule. That is, a rule that is unlikely to have a significant effect on the national electricity market (NEM).¹

Under the National Electricity Law (NEL) the AEMC must not use the expedited process for a rule change if:

- a) the AEMC receives a written request not to do so; and
- b) the reasons set out in that request are not, in its opinion, misconceived or lacking in substance.

If the AEMC is of the opinion that the reasons given in a request not to use the expedited process are misconceived or lacking in substance, the AEMC must make a decision to that effect and give the person its reasons, in writing, for that decision without delay.²

The AEMC has come to this opinion, after considering the reasons in your objection in the context of the meaning of a non-controversial rule.

Your basis for objection and our decision.

In your objection, you considered that the rule change will increase prices, and that it is inconsistent with the National Electricity Objective.³ You submitted that it was controversial, as it is likely to significantly increase prices for consumers and diminish the objectives of the NEL.

The Commission is of the opinion that this issue is lacking in substance. This is because there is no reasoning or evidence given that substantiates the claim that it will have a significant effect on the NEM.

No nexus is drawn or apparent between the assertions in the objection and the rule change request.

¹ National Electricity Law, section 87.

² National Electricity Law, section 96(4).

³ National Electricity Law, section 7.