
SALGA comments: IRP base case

Internal Document – Suggested next steps

April 2017

In conjunction with SALGA and in consultation with some municipal representatives and drawing on information from a workshop, at which an initial report and detailed presentation were presented, the consultant has drawn up material for three submissions, namely:

1. SALGA comments: IRP base case Submission - Summary of key messages and priority requests (2pp)
2. SALGA comments: IRP base case Submission – Executive summary (6pp)
3. SALGA comments: IRP base case Submission – Detailed Analysis (24pp)

These documents, available from SALGA, were developed from a number of supporting detailed note documents discussed intensively with SALGA and others over the pressured submission timeframe.

Following a 3 months consultation process with municipalities and the submission of comments to the Department of Energy on the IRP, the technical team working with SALGA on providing the comments suggest the following next steps. It is a core recommendation that local government and the IRP team should engage proactively in the IRP process, and preparation of this scenario would be a priority and provide a platform for such engagement.

Recommendations going forward

Acknowledging the content of the three reports above, the following steps are recommended.

1. SHORT TERM
 - a. Establish SALGA/municipal IRP workgroup¹
 - i. At the very least, establish a high-level steering team to monitor overall IRP process and key dates and potential for engagement, and identify where the process poses specific risks for municipalities and consider actions to mitigation these
 - ii. Use 'Key messages' document and specifically 'Priority Requests' in that document to construct an agenda for engaging further with IRP process
 - iii. Follow-up actively with DoE/IRP-team on their responses to SALGA IRP submissions. It has been the experience in the last IRP (and appears with this one too) that considerable flexibility both in the process and the content of the plan are possible, but that this relies on pro-active and persistent engagement

¹ This can start with a 'coalition of the willing': those LGs that have the capacity and that have identified the risks to their electricity distributors, cities/towns and economies of not engaging actively with IRP. Moving forward much of the less-capacitated LG will depend on a few more capacitated LGs to lead and assist.

which is informed by good information and analysis of the conflicting stakeholder interests and local government interests.

- b. Establish a work programme to feed key data into IRP process
 - i. Collate data and submit to IRP team
 - 1. Share existing data (including the three reports above) and plans (e.g. City energy statuses, energy plans, ...) in formal communications with IRP-team and requesting formal responses to specific items
- c. Establish joint work-groups with DoE/IRP team
 - i. A DoE/Local Government steering committee
 - ii. A technical working group with municipal technical staff and IRP modelers
 - iii. A scenario team to plan engagement on scenario formulations, assessments and production of the Policy Adjusted Scenario²
- d. Establish a technical work-group to build a Local Government scenario as per Appendix A below. Ideally it would work in conjunction with the IRP modelers technical group
- e. Convene meetings with potential groups having overlapping interests
 - i. Identify these interests in conjunction with representatives of these groups
 - ii. Formulate areas, especially in the development of either/and the Local Government scenario and other group's scenarios where further formal submissions can be made in the IRP2016 process and/or engagements with IRP team can be arranged.

2. MEDIUM TERM

- a. Use structures above to identify crucial capacity and data needs for next IRP.
 - i. Internal municipal capacity
 - ii. Data/information
 - iii. Research/analysis
- b. Formulate a plan to develop these resources

²That municipalities represents >40% of demand and potential collaborations with EIUG should provide motivations and support for this (along with issues raised in the three reports)