

MINUTES

Meeting number: 42

Venue: Rūnanga, Electricity Authority, Level 7, AON Centre, 1 Willis Street, Wellington

Time and date: 9.00am until 4.10pm, Thursday 16 March 2023

Members Present

- Hon Heather Roy (Chair)
- Ben Gerritsen
- Barbara Elliston
- Chris Ewers
- Mike Underhill
- Nanette Moreau
- Nathan Strong
- Paula Checketts

Apologies

- Phil Gibson

In attendance

Name	Title	Agenda item # attended
<u>Electricity Authority (Authority):</u>		
Sarah Gillies	Chief Executive	#4-17 (from 9.20am - 4.10pm)
Grant Benvenuti	Principal Advisor, Market Policy	#4-17 (from 9.20am - 4.10pm)
James Blake-Palmer	Senior Analyst, Policy (Secretariat)	#1-2 and #4-17 (from 9.00am-9.05am and 9.20am - 4.10pm)
Andrew Millar	GM, Policy	#3-11 (from 9.20am – 12.50pm)
Nicholai Mumford	Senior Legal Counsel	#6 (from) 9.30am-9.45am
Chris Otton	Manager - Operations Policy	#8 (from 10.30am-11.10am)
Allen Davison	Senior Analyst, Policy	#8 (from 10.30am-11.10am)
<u>Other:</u>		
John Clarke	General Manager, Grid Development, Transpower (as grid owner)	#6a (from 10.01am-10.25am)
Mark Ryall	GM Grid Delivery, Transpower (as grid owner)	#6a (from 10.01am-10.25am)
Stephen Jay	GM Operations, Transpower (as system operator)	#9 (from) 11.10am-11.50am
Mark Herring	Market and Business Manager, Operations, Transpower (as system operator)	#9 (from 11.10am-11.50am)

Name	Title	Agenda item # attended
Matthew Copland	Power Systems Manager, Operations, Transpower (as system operator)	#9 (from 11.10am-11.50am)
Margaret Cooney	Chief Customer Officer, Octopus Energy NZ	#11 (from 12.10pm - 12.50pm)
Brett Woods	Head of Regulatory and Government Relations, Contact Energy	#12 (from 1.20pm-2.00pm)
Tim Boyce	Head of Wholesale Market, Contact Energy	#12 (from 1.20pm-2.00pm)
Rob Prest	Commercial Development Manager, Simply Energy	#12 (from 1.20pm-2.00pm)
Luke Cartmell-Gollan	Commercial Operations Manager, Simply Energy	#12 (from 1.20pm-2.00pm)
Bruce Turner	Strategic Advisor, Fonterra	#13 (from 2.00pm-2.40pm)
Linda Mulvihill	GM, Energy & Climate, Fonterra	#13 (from 2.00pm-2.40pm)
Tony Oosten	Energy and Climate Manager, Fonterra	#13 (from 2.00pm-2.40pm)
Greg Skelton	CE, Wellington Electricity Limited	#14 (from 2.45pm- 3.30pm)

The meeting opened at 9.05am, James Blake-Palmer joined the meeting at 9.05am.

1. Attendance and apologies

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed members to the 42nd meeting of the Security and Reliability Council (SRC). A quorum was established.
- 1.2. The Chair noted the apology from Phil Gibson
- 1.3. The Chair noted Nathan Strong attended remotely (but was unable to attend items #1 and #2, due to technology issues with the Authority's connection).

2. Changes to disclosure of interests

- 2.1. The Chair reviewed the interests register.
- 2.2. Ben Gerritsen noted from 1 April 2023 Firstgas Group will become owner of Eastland Networks.
- 2.3. Nanette Moreau noted the Consumer Advocacy Council (CAC) will be submitting on the Market Development Advisory Group's (MDAG's) work and the Authority's work on Winter 2023.
- 2.4. Mike Underhill asked for item #6 in the register against his name to be deleted, as the relevant review has been completed.
- 2.5. There were no further changes disclosed. The Chair approved members to act despite those declared interests.
- 2.6. The Chair reminded members of their confidentiality obligations regarding the presentations, pending publication of SRC papers.

James Blake-Palmer left the meeting at 9.10am.

3. Members-only session

- 3.1. The members discussed their priorities for the meeting.

Sarah Gillies, Grant Benvenuti, Andrew Millar and James Blake-Palmer joined the meeting at 9.20am.

4. Minutes of previous meeting

- 4.1. The minutes of the 26 October 2022 SRC meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record.

The Chair moved. All members approved.

5. Correspondence

- 5.1. The Chair noted the correspondence including the letter sent to the Authority and the Authority's reply.

6. Action list and updates

- 6.1. The secretariat provided an update on the action list and members briefly discussed the updates section.
- 6.2. Members appreciated the background information on recent storm events, including Cyclone Gabrielle.
- 6.3. A member noted they heard about the Authority's Winter 2023 consultation late and would appreciate earlier updates from the Authority. The secretariat noted all consultation is included in the Authority's weekly Market Brief and the secretariat will arrange for all members who don't already receive Market Brief notifications via email to do so in future.
- 6.4. A member noted it was positive to hear the tree regulations will finally be reviewed and the SRC should encourage haste in this important work. The Chair asked whether the Authority would support a submission from the SRC. Sarah Gillies said she will raise this in principle with the Board at their March meeting and update the SRC Chair. Subject to approval from the Board, the Chair asked Nanette Moreau and the secretariat to prepare content for a draft submission for circulation among members.

Nicholai Mumford joined the meeting at 9.30am.

- 6.5. Members received an update on the Authority's interpretation of its additional objective, noting it is about dealings participants have with consumers and is not intended to impact how participants deal with each other.
- 6.6. Comments from attendees included:
- a. The changes clarify what the Authority can do in areas where there may previously have been doubt,
 - b. There have been no changes to the Electricity Industry Participation Code (the Code) arising from the additional objective. The Amendment Act that introduced the additional objective also moved certain parts of

Part 3 of the Electricity Industry Act into the Code, enabling the Authority to efficiently make appropriate changes.

Action 1: Secretariat to arrange for members, who are not currently signed up to receive Market Brief, to receive it weekly via email from the Authority.

Action 2: Subject to approval from the Board, on whether it would be appropriate for the SRC to provide its own submission, Nanette Moreau to work with the secretariat on a draft submission on the tree regulations review.

Nicholai Mumford left the meeting at 9.45am.

6a. Cyclone Gabrielle discussion

- 6a.1 Members held a general discussion on recent storm events, particularly Cyclone Gabrielle, noting recent media commentary, reports from the system operator and the presentation from the grid owner.

7. Risk Radar

- 7.1. The Chair explained the basis for the risk radar and its purpose to support the SRC's forward work programme and avoid gaps.
- 7.2. The Chair facilitated comments from members and attendees, covering both short-term and longer-term risk.
- 7.3. Members' comments included:
 - a) The need for storms, especially extreme events, to be included as a persistent risk to security and reliability,
 - b) Earthquake risk and wild weather are front of mind, including impacts of solar storms on vital equipment,
 - c) There is significant interest in the different design standards various transmission and distribution assets are built to (for example, building to a 1 in 250 vs 450-year event) and how such resilience decisions are being made,
 - d) There is some outstanding work going on to restore and rebuild post Gabrielle, and there is a need to continue this at a fast pace,
 - e) There are concerns about a dry winter and the potential for blackouts, as are occurring in Australia, impacting businesses and households,
 - f) L4 (loss of industry knowledge and personnel) is more a medium-term risk, as it could manifest over the next 5 years, with a long tail and impact planned work programmes and investment,
 - g) The Commerce Commission's regulatory reset presents an opportunity to improve security and reliability, needing good information from industry to support it,
 - h) Cyber security, and information security generally, have been brought into focus as a result of recent storms and attacks from hackers,
- 7.4. Attendees' comments included:
 - a) Consensus with the concerns raised by Members, including:

- i. The Authority is engaging with the Commerce Commission on areas of mutual interest, to ensure an appropriate understanding of risks affecting the sector and an efficient approach by regulators to address them.
- ii. The transition raises both short- and long-term risks to security of supply that need to be well managed.

John Clarke and Mark Ryall joined the meeting at 10.01am

- 7.5. The Chair introduced grid owner representatives to the meeting, noting the invitation was to give the SRC an opportunity to hear from the grid owner on initial reporting following recent storms in Auckland and Northland and Cyclone Gabrielle.
- 7.6. The Chair thanked the grid owner for the slides, which were taken as read, enabling discussion and Q&A.
- 7.7. The discussion noted the following points:
 - a. Grid owner assets are built to modern standards, but they are dealing with a legacy of sites not built to those standards, including Redclyffe. Modern design standards incorporate the expected effects of climate change.
 - b. The events have prompted a wider discussion on how resilience is valued, and Transpower is seeking explicit resilience funding, as part of the funding submission for the next regulatory control period (RCP4)
 - c. The events have had the positive outcome of growing relationships between those involved in the restoration and rebuild.
 - d. Fibre-optic resilience is a key aspect of future resilience, and there are ongoing discussions with telecommunications providers.
 - e. The Starlink satellite internet platform has been very helpful but is not a long-term solution.
 - f. The Hawkes Bay floodplain has three substations on it. There are 12 substation sites across the country noted as vulnerable or susceptible, which includes the three in the Hawkes Bay. The grid owner has work plans to address all of these, noting some will be easier, such as redirecting a nearby culvert to ensure resilience.
 - g. The approach is to get the Hawkes Bay back up and running, for an interim period of 2-3 years, then look collectively at what the region's specific resiliency needs are for the longer term.
 - h. The Whirinaki substation was built to support PanPac Forest Products Limited's (PanPac's) electricity needs, so its resilience should align with PanPac to avoid a situation where consumers pay for greater resilience than is needed.
 - i. In response to a member question about the need to work with the local lines companies to ensure plans align, the grid owner noted they are working closely with Unison, including on longer term initiatives. The grid owner also noted they needed to align their plans with distributors' budgets, especially when work was not anticipated.

- j. The grid owner has comprehensive insurance and reinsurance and is preparing its claim for submission.
- k. A member noted the design standards were insufficient for some sites and the Electricity Networks Association (ENA) are looking at bringing a group together to look at the issue.
- l. A member noted the legislated supply obligations for distribution companies needs to be looked at, to enable non-network solutions (NNS) to be part of the available options for certain sites, as part of a resilient rebuild.

John Clarke and Mark Ryall left the meeting at 10.25am

Chris Otton and Allen Davison joined the meeting at 10.30am

8. Authority paper – Demand Response in the wholesale market

- 8.1. The Chair welcomed Chris Otton and Allen Davison from the Authority, to the meeting.
- 8.2. Chris Otton introduced the Authority paper, which was taken as read. Points noted include:
 - a) The shift toward more dynamic market settling, with real-time pricing (RTP) to better reflect large industrial use and improved system co-optimisation.
 - b) Dispatch notification is a market service for system-operator approved participants up to 30 MW of response.
 - c) The Authority's review of regulatory settings for distributors is looking at how best to support the inclusion of third-party aggregators.
 - d) The value of demand response to the power system has been recently assessed (Sapere Research) in the region of \$7 Billion, by way of deferred investment in poles and wires.
 - e) Success will be indicated by the numbers and types of participants involved, and the volumes of demand response bid into the market.
- 8.3. Members discussed the paper. Comments and questions raised included:
 - a) Existing ripple control is not the most precise tool for demand response; there is a need to get the contractual arrangements in place behind the scenes to ensure an appropriate range of options are available.
 - b) The need to engage with household consumers, including through their retailers and through other agencies such as third part aggregators and demand flex providers, with the right level of automation to promote continued engagement.
 - c) EV batteries will likely be a large part of the future of demand response, more so than hot water ripple control.
 - d) Are there any equivalent programmes overseas? An Authority representative responded that overseas demand response is centred

around a 'pay for action' type of scheme, rather than a dispatch notification to avoid high prices.

- e) Demand response raises the issue of access to metering data and concerns around equity and privacy.
- f) An Authority representative noted Vector Metering, Influx and Intellihub are metering equipment providers (MEPs) looking at products to obtain the necessary data, for example power quality data, to support a range of demand response options.
- g) The Authority is operating on the basis data is owned by the consumer, who can decide to contractually share that with other entities. Work on this issue may be included in future regulatory change relating to the consumer data right (CDR) package of consumer law reform.
- h) A member noted a recent industry consultant report on the value of demand may be available to members on a confidential basis.

Action 3: Secretariat to see if a copy of the report on the value of demand response is available and, if so, provide this to members ahead of the SRC's June meeting

Chris Otton and Allen Davison left the meeting at 11.10am

Stephen Jay, Matt Copland and Mark Herring joined the meeting at 11:10am

9. System operator – modelling and responding to changes in demand

- 9.1. The Chair welcomed representatives from the system operator, noting the significant work on restoration and repair in areas affected by Cyclone Gabrielle.
- 9.2. Matt Copland led the system operator presentation on evolving demand response. Points noted include:
 - a) The system operator has experienced a significant upsurge in connection enquiries, from an average of approximately 6 p.a. to 140 this year. Reasons cited include increased electrification, removal of the Regional Coincident Peak Demand (RCPD) charge and increased interest from flexibility service providers
 - b) The system operator analyses demand response across different time horizons from years to real time, with input from a Tesla load forecast tool.
 - c) Distributed Energy Resource (DER), a form of demand response, is not affecting the load forecast yet, due to low volumes. This is set to change with RTP supporting real time system management through increased visibility of demand and supply being available to the system operator.
- 9.3. Members discussed the paper. Comments and questions raised included:
 - a) With the many entities involved in flexibility services; how does the system operator ensure the system works together? Increased visibility.

- b) There is a need to avoid issues in coordination; who is doing what? There is an educative function for the system operator to help people understand how they can participate, and how participants can control their assets whilst responding to signals from the system operator to ensure their services are designed to meet system needs, aligned with risks of non-performance.
- c) The system operator is currently seeking feedback on its 2023 security of supply assessment.
- d) What has the feedback been so far? The principles are being well received.
- e) What is the estimated value of demand response? Industry reports suggest this is approximately \$7 Billion.
- f) What are the roadblocks? There needs to be a coordinated approach across various streams (such as the flex forum, new entrant companies), connecting the need to the solution, and the ability to scale and implement, as appropriate. Pilots need to be designed to inform decisions on how to scale up.
- g) What assistance is needed from regulators? There needs to be a move away from the previous focus on simply understanding peaks and building more to meet them. A greater understanding of the role of variable demand and how the market will provide these services (that are not procurable by the system operator outside the market) is needed. This is where regulatory change is occurring to support services such as dispatchable demand and dispatch notification.
- h) What does the interface between the system operator and distributors look like? Demand response provides a huge opportunity for greater understanding between the system operator and distributors to engage and share information.
- i) Load duration curves are not currently published and help inform investors? The system operator produces load duration curves and notes their usefulness in assisting DER providers structure their solutions. The system operator will consider publishing them in future, acknowledging there are no privacy issues with publishing information at GXP level.
- j) Is the system operator getting enough information? There's never enough; for example, in Australia there are issues arising from installing inverters without two-way functionality and assets that do not ride through faults. Pro-active standards being in place before the work goes in would support visibility and reduce issues such as those that occurred when irrigation pumps in the South Island did not have soft start and caused overheating transformers on the distribution network.
- k) How will demand response be included in future system operator security of supply assessments (SOSA)? The system operator will include additional sensitivities for the next SOSA, noting this depends

on receiving quality information from distributors to support a reliable sensitivity in the analysis.

- l) Distributors are not providing adequate price signal to make the savings that reports suggest are available. This makes it difficult to turn them into real market propositions. Access is key.
- m) There is a need for standards for embedded equipment that will support common quality and fault ride-through. These need to be implemented now, before it is too late and the system security is put at risk, such as what happened in South Australia.
- n) The Authority's Future Security and Resilience (FSR) workstreams and 9 August recommendations aim to address this through collaboration and with support from MBIE on relevant standards.

Stephen Jay, Matt Copland and Mark Herring left the meeting at 11:50am

10. Wrap up discussion on agenda items #8 and #9

- 10.1. Members discussed the Authority and system operator papers and presentations and considered what advice to provide to the Authority.

Margaret Cooney joined the meeting at 12:10pm

11. Octopus Energy presentation

- 11.1. The Chair introduced Margaret Cooney from Octopus Energy.
- 11.2. The presentation included Octopus Energy's experience with demand response in the UK and New Zealand contexts. Points of discussion with members included:
 - a) Octopus Energy's services include *Kraken Flex*, a web-based tool whereby users take on board a profile, utilising various market signals to engage, with the aim of reducing costs for the end consumer and the benefit of adding capacity security to the power system.
 - b) In Octopus Energy's experience, engagement with consumers and addressing their questions is essential to early and sustained engagement. When done properly this can promote ongoing engagement, even when financial returns reduce below previous levels. There is a real and ongoing need to demonstrate the value.
 - c) Octopus is seen as an outlier in the UK market, as it is not actively seeking customers, which sets it apart from other major retailers.
 - d) In the UK, engagement was supported by the government offering low carbon initiatives, for example to promote a move away from domestic gas toward heat pumps.
 - e) In New Zealand there is significant variability in how distributors control demand. A key component to support consumer engagement in demand flexibility and services is to ensure efficiency and a level playing field for retailers operating across multiple networks.
- 11.3. Members discussed the paper. Comments and questions raised included:

- a) Are demand response products commercially viable? The commercial success of DER relies on a full value stack as it is marginal relying on energy cost savings alone. It is essential to contract with EDBs to ensure the full commercial success.
- b) What are the current barriers to rolling out demand response products in New Zealand and how can these be addressed? Octopus is an electricity retailer as well as providing DER but is not currently actively seeking new customers as the wholesale cost of electricity is out of step with the retail price. In the UK vertically integrated gentailers must demonstrate the retail division is acting independently. This ensures operational separation, and they are taking on market risk in the same way as an independent retailer.

Andrew Millar left the meeting at 12.50pm

The meeting broke for lunch at 12.55pm and reconvened at 1.20pm

Margaret Cooney left the meeting at 1.18pm

Brett Woods and Tim Boyce from Contact Energy and Rob Prest and Luke Cartmell-Gollan, from Simply Energy, joined the meeting at 1.20pm

12. Contact Energy – Presentation on demand flexibility

- 12.5. The Chair welcomed representatives from Contact Energy and Simply Energy who took members through the presentation. Points noted in the discussion include:
 - a) The focus has been on the interruptible load market across the commercial and industrial sector, as that sector has the most potential to engage and deliver savings and efficiencies for the power system, and as a provider there is a need for scale to make it commercially viable.
 - b) There is a need to stack value streams from the DR and also to offer other services to the customer. DR products are more viable with industrial and commercial sites as they are able to contract for longer timeframes, up to 10 years.
 - c) A key benefit is the ability to offer DER services even if the customer is with another retailer, however it is proving difficult to reach agreements with other retailers.
 - d) Ripple control and batteries provides enough infrastructure to promote demand response and engage with the residential sector, but retail customers tend to change retailers more often (1-3 years). DR is viable in the commercial/industrial space but retail mass-market is not there yet and can't offer the value until this market is more mature.
 - e) Current offerings average approximately 20MW in the reserves market, with nothing automated for the wholesale market at this point.
- 12.6. Members discussed the paper. Comments and questions raised included:
 - a) When asked about the size of the market, presenters noted they believed it is approximately 10% of peak demand, approximately 700MW.

- b) When asked about potential regulatory impediments, it was noted some of the impediments include a lack of joined up thinking, where there is not one entity owning the demand response and multilateral contracts are needed to bring benefits to many whilst avoiding price-fixing. There are many participants getting a little bit of value each so there needs to be some coordination or to align the full value stream. This likely needs the regulator to get involved to avoid Commerce Act issues.
- c) Presenters noted there's a spectrum of price-incentivised consumers, but the full range is needed to support uptake in demand response for premises. DR is easier when there is storage (heating, refrigeration etc), and is harder and more expensive if production is shut down (i.e. the customer expects more recompense), so shut down is viable only for SIR not peak shaving.
- d) A member noted Contact had pursued opportunities where there was an established market; would they consider pursuing wholesale market opportunities if these were available. The answer was yes.
- e) Presenters noted when ripple control was used by Transpower it can dampen market signals and reduce the dispatch of high-priced marginal generation. It should be used in advance of the peaks not during peaks.
- f) The presenters noted they see flexibility trading as separate from electricity retailing, customers need more support to choose retailers without affecting their flexibility services. There needs to be a centralised, retailer agnostic market set up for flexibility services.

Brett Woods and Tim Boyce from Contact Energy and Rob Prest and Luke Cartmell-Gollan, from Simply Energy left the meeting at 1.55pm

Bruce Turner, Linda Mulvihill and Anthony Oosten joined the meeting at 2.00pm

13. Fonterra presentation on demand response

- 13.1. The Chair welcomed representatives from Fonterra and introduced their presentation.
- 13.2. Linda Mulvihill led the presentation. Points noted from the presentation and resulting discussion include:
 - a) Fonterra have clearly outlined decarbonisation targets of achieving a 30% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030. They have a range of potential options to achieve this, including electrification and demand response.
 - b) The previous approach from industry has been to build for peaks, which is an issue for the dairy industry and Fonterra, as there is a need to keep milk processing going, given its shelf life and the harmful impact on livestock of any delays. As a result of this, Fonterra considers 24 hours as 'long duration' when it relates to demand response.

- c) While Fonterra is a major user of electricity, its options are not the same as other industrial producers as milk is time critical and storage is difficult. Storage-type loads are ripe for demand response.
- d) There is limited opportunity for demand curtailment during milking season, which has prompted Fonterra to look at other solutions, such as thermal energy storage to improve energy efficiency in steam demand.
- e) Electricity demand response requires additional investment, so this needs to compete internally against other projects with higher internal rates of return (IRRs), often these other projects increase output production.
- f) For the dairy sector to engage further in demand response, there needs to be a clear value proposition, an indication of the \$ per MW/h to compare with other available options to decarbonise.

Bruce Turner, Linda Mulvihill and Anthony Oosten left the meeting at 2.40pm

Greg Skelton joined the meeting at 2.45pm

14. Wellington Electricity presentation on demand response

- 14.1. The Chair welcomed Greg Skelton to the meeting and introduced the presentation.
- 14.2. Greg Skelton ran through a presentation, drawing on themes from the paper previously circulated. Points noted included:
 - a) Demand response is consumer driven, so it changes the approach industry has used historically. All distributors are considering how to include demand response on their networks but approaches and speeds of implementation differ widely.
 - b) Wellington Electricity learned significantly from the EV Connect trial where it partnered with a broad spectrum of participants.
 - c) Wellington Electricity partners with *Greensync* to manage visibility of EV's on the Wellington Electricity network. Visibility of the low voltage network, above 2.5KW per ICP, is still an issue for distributors that needs to be addressed.
 - d) One key challenge is the variability in advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) penetration and functionality across various distribution networks and the need for both ripple control and increased bandwidth (to 4G). This means there is a lack of commonality impacting uptake of demand response.
 - e) There needs to be an increase in monitoring of frequency changes to minimise the impact of spikes and drops in frequency caused by supply side issues like broken neutrals and demand side issues brought about by service offerings such as retailer power shout periods beginning and ending.
 - f) Another key issue is the need for distributors to be interposed between Transpower and DR customers within the networks to prevent power

quality issues as the distributor is responsible for the voltage and power quality.

- g) In response to a question about the benefits of demand response, it was noted the key benefit is in the delaying of investment. In Wellington Electricity's case, there is the added incentive to get things right early to be ahead of when decarbonisation results on large scale moves away from reticulated gas for residential space and hot water heating. Wellington Electricity has approximately 53,000 residential gas users on its network.
- h) In response to a question about where the money needs to come from, it was noted distributors will be including views in their submissions to the Commerce Commission on the Commission's review of the input methodologies.

Greg Skelton left the meeting at 3.30pm

15. Wrap up discussion on agenda items #11- #14

- 15.1. Members discussed the papers and presentations from Octopus Energy, Contact Energy (with Simply Energy), Fonterra, and Wellington Electricity and considered what advice to provide to the Authority.

16. Next meeting's substantive papers

- 16.1. The Chair introduced the item and outlined the proposed themes for the Q2 and Q3 2023 meetings.
- 16.2. The Chair noted the number of proposed presenters for the Q2 meeting may be too many and asked for input on how the list could be refined.
- 16.3. A member suggested the inclusion of FINCAP or the Consumer Advocacy Council (CAC), potentially in place of the New Zealand control Systems Security Information Exchange (CSSIE) which could align better with the cyber and information security theme proposed for Q4. If FINCAP or CAC are included, the focus should be on consumer's willingness to pay for increased levels of reliability.
- 16.4. The Chair and secretariat are to review the final agenda and agree the presenters.
- 16.5. A member noted the need to clearly frame the scopes for presenters, so the SRC is receiving information about the security and reliability implications and aspects relevant to industry associations.
- 16.6. Members agreed, providing a series of questions for presenters (thematically linked where possible) helps their preparation.
- 16.7. The secretariat noted inclusion of Cyclone Gabrielle will draw together various information streams on event reporting, learnings, and future resilience planning. The SRC agreed with the secretariat's suggestion, there would also be value in hearing from *Te Waihangā*, The New Zealand Infrastructure Commission.

17. Forward work programme

- 17.1. The Chair introduced the forward work programme, noting there had been no changes to the themes pillars since the previous meeting.
- 17.2. The Chair proposed a particular focus for the August strategy session could be the risk radar, to ensure this continues to align with the SRC's perception of risk and is framed appropriately. Members agreed.
- 17.3. The Chair proposed a change of theme for the Q4 meeting of '*technology and information security*', as there are relevant security and reliability issues that may fall outside cyber security. Members agreed.

The meeting ended at 4.10pm

DRAFT