## JGN Tariffs Stage Three

## Customer Engagement

## Tariff Customer Forum Two



Tuesday 9 April 2024

## Acknowledgement of Country

We acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the lands upon which we operate and recognise their continuing connection to land, waters, and culture.

We pay our respects to their Elders past, present, and emerging.

Pictured: artwork by Aboriginal artist Chern'ee Sutton from Mount Isa for our Group's Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan

## What we've done so far and what to expect in this workshop



Aim of this session : To loop back to you with detailed costings for the tariff options we discussed in Stage 2.

## Your guides from bd infrastructure



Rachel Fox Lead facilitator


## Lachlan Nicholson

Forum support


Andre Kersting
Gas Networks
Regulation Manager


Jenny Hardman Engagement Support and Communications

Lay Na Lim
Senior Regulatory Advisor
 Lead

Merryn Spencer
Engagement Lead
Your guides from Jemena

## Ground rules



Be ready to be challenged


Everyone has their say


Listen, don't interrupt


Keep contributions relevant to the subject


Be respectful

## Using Groupmap

## https://join.groupmap.com/A66-D64-2D3

Use your browser or your phone please log on!
The link is also in the chat!

## Group discussion

- How's everyone been?
- What have you been thinking about? Did you find the homework straightforward?



## Update and your questions answered

## Andre Kersting

Gas Networks Regulation Manager


## Context

Tariffs can't do two things at once

Focusing on affordability, equity and fairness


Minimising the impact on the winners and losers


Consider our forecasts

Think about impacts on different customer groups

Consider the role of the retailer

Total volume market gas consumption (PJ)
This chart compares the actual and forecast consumption from our network against the total consumption across the whole of NSW and the ACT as reported and forecast by the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) in the 2023 Gas Statement of Opportunities (GSOO).


## New connections

Core has forecast further reductions in the number of new customers connecting to our network over the 2025-30 period, driven by lower residential and commercial development and changes to planning rules encouraging electrification in new buildings.

## Gas consumption per connection

Consumption per connection fell sharply during 2015-20.
This trend of reducing consumption per connection has continued into the current period, noting that 2020, 2021 and 2022 were impacted to varying degrees by COVID and resulting shutdowns influencing changes in consumption patterns for residential and commercial customers.



## Forecast factors we have considered

## Residential



## Increasing solar and battery storage

Growing trend toward replacement of gas heating with reverse cycle air-conditioning when appliances are due to be replaced or during renovation

Growing trend in use of alternative water heating technologies

## Advances in dwelling construction standards which

favour alternative energy sources

## Commercial

Electrification of new buildings and NSW planning laws favouring electrification

Continuing advances in energy efficiency

Growing trends in using alternative
water heating technologies and reverse-cycle air conditioning


## Advances in building and appliance efficiency and

 lower levels of appliance penetration (lower water and or space heating penetration) resulting in lower gas consumption.
## Questions

What questions do you have?


## Hybrid Three Bill Impacts

Spencer Little

Gas Networks Pricing Lead


## Quick reminder: Jemena's proportion of the overall bill



## Residential customer bill impacts - 5\% threshold

|  |  | $\pi$ |  | 50/50 sharing ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5\% outperformance |  | 7\% outperformance |
| Customer type |  |  | Annual consumption | Average annual network bill | Bill change \$ (\%) | Bill change \$ (\%) |
| $8$ | Cooking only | 2 GJ | \$117 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 0.96 \\ (-0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| $0$ | Small home (cooking and hot water) | 7.5 GJ | \$261 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.13 \\ (-0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Larger home (cooking and hot water) | 15 GJ | \$323 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.64 \\ (-0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| $3$ | All gas home (cooking, hot water and heating) | 25 GJ | \$399 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 3.25 \\ (-0.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Key takeaway: Customers are slightly better off under the 7\% outperformance scenario.

## Residential customer bill impacts - 3\% threshold

|  |  | $\pi$ |  | 50/50 sharing ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5\% outperformance |  | 7\% outperformance |
| Customer type |  |  | Annual consumption | Average annual network bill | Bill change \$ (\%) | Bill change \$ (\%) |
| $8$ | Cooking only | 2 GJ | \$117 | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 1.03 \\ (-0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -\$ 2.10 \\ & (-1.8 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Small home (cooking and hot water) | 7.5 GJ | \$261 | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.30 \\ (-0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 4.70 \\ (-1.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Larger home (cooking and hot water) | 15 GJ | \$323 | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.84 \\ (-0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 5.81 \\ (-1.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| $3$ | All gas home (cooking, hot water and heating) | 25 GJ | \$399 | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 3.51 \\ (-0.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 7.16 \\ (-1.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Key takeaway: Customers benefit under both outperformance scenarios.

## Residential customer bill impacts - 5\% threshold

|  |  | $\boxed{\square}$ | $\$$ | 60/40 (customer/network) sharing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5\% outperformance |  | 7\% outperformance |
| Customer type |  |  | Annual consumption | Average annual network bill | Bill change \$ (\%) | Bill change \$ (\%) |
| $8$ | Cooking only | 2 GJ | \$117 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 1.15 \\ (-1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| No | Small home (cooking and hot water) | 7.5 GJ | \$261 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.56 \\ (-1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Larger home (cooking and hot water) | 15 GJ | \$323 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 3.17 \\ (-1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\sqrt{3}$ | All gas home (cooking, hot water and heating) | 25 GJ | \$399 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 3.91 \\ (-1.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Key takeaway: Customers are very slightly better off compared with the 50/50 sharing ratio option, because they are bearing more risk.

## Residential customer bill impacts - 3\% threshold


Key takeaway: Customers benefit the most under these options, with an average bill saving of $2.2 \%$ if outperformance reaches $7 \%$.

## Residential customer bill impacts - 5\% threshold

|  |  | $\pi$ |  | 40/60 (customer/network) sharing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5\% outperformance |  | 7\% outperformance |
| Customer type |  |  | Annual consumption | Average annual network bill | Bill change \$ (\%) | Bill change \$ (\%) |
| $8$ | Cooking only | 2 GJ | \$117 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 0.76 \\ (-0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non | Small home (cooking and hot water) | 7.5 GJ | \$261 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 1.71 \\ (-0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Larger home (cooking and hot water) | 15 GJ | \$323 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.11 \\ (-0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\sqrt{y}$ | All gas home (cooking, hot water and heating) | 25 GJ | \$399 | - | $\begin{gathered} -\$ 2.60 \\ (-0.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Key takeaway: Customers still benefit but slightly less than the 60/40 option, because customers are now bearing less risk.

## Residential customer bill impacts - 3\% threshold


Key takeaway: Customers again benefit under both outperformance scenarios, but slightly less than under the 60/40 sharing ratio option.

## Residential customer bill impacts - 3\% threshold

| Customer type |  | Annual consumption | Average annual network bill | Bill change \$ (\%) | Bill change \$ (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : | Cooking only | 2 GJ | \$117 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1.24 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2.53 \\ (2.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Small home (cooking and hot water) | 7.5 GJ | \$261 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2.77 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5.65 \\ (2.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Larger home (cooking and hot water) | 15 GJ | \$323 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3.42 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 6.98 \\ & (2.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| $1$ | All gas home (cooking, hot water and heating) | 25 GJ | \$399 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4.22 \\ (1.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 8.62 \\ & (2.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ |

Key takeaway: This is the worst outcome for customers when actual volumes are lower than expected, i.e. underperformance, as bills will increase.

## In terms of consultation results on tariff structures, overall, small business customers preferred the 5\% threshold and 50:50 sharing. Their reasons

 given included giving a more balanced approach that works for their industry or business. For large customers, there were no negative responses on the proposed tariff structure variation mechanism, some asked about the timing of the chargeable demand reset process and if there is some contribution or negotiation with that process, and for access to data.

Large business reflections


"The devil's in the detail in terms of the operationalization of the process. But in principle, you know, we understand that you know this. This is a feasible approach going forward, some sort of hybrid."

manage risk should be taken into account as
"I think interesting to see how this plays out, especially the fluctuations from one year to the next, and to see how that sort of is perceived, I guess, but customers, and how we're going to, you know, insulate that in our products, and
contracts."
"Very clear processes for customers. Because we're going to have some customers that start off with greater than 200 [GJ] and maybe half that plan shuts down for a year (...) we want a position to be able to move them up to a different tariff quite

## Questions

We will break into groups for some group discussion on what you've heard.

- Group 1: Merryn
- Group 2: Jenny
- Group 3: Rachel



## Voting

Consider all you've heard tonight.
As individuals, vote on the options.
You'll need to describe the reasons why you voted that way (for example give a description in your vote) because we want to understand what you've said and why!

## Questions:

- What's your level of comfort with 50:50 sharing of volume risk? (like - loathe scale)
- What's your level of comfort with the 40 (customer) : 60 (network) sharing of volume risk? (like - loathe scale)
- What's your level of comfort with the 60 (customer) : 40 (network) sharing of volume risk? (like - loathe scale)
- What's your level of comfort with 3\% threshold? (like - loathe scale)
- What's your level of comfort with the 5\% threshold? (like - loathe scale)
- Why did you vote that way?

Regarding voting results for the sharing threshold, small business customers preferred the $5 \%$ threshold overall. Their reasons included giving a more balanced approach works for their industry or business.

What's your level of comfort with the 3\% threshold?



Loathe it 0\%
"Based on the past history, mostly we are around over usage and so its more advantageous. $5 \%$ is mode ideal though."
 and as long as there isn't a major under or over performance, the final bill should represent a figure that is anticipated."

"Mitigate the risk with the given level of un-certainty regarding the high level of cost of living."

"I do prefer the balanced approach to these matters. I think my choice would reflect my industry."

## What's your level of comfort with the 5\% threshold?



In terms of sharing volume risk, small business customers preferred the 50:50 sharing overall, followed by the 40 (customer):60 (Jemena) sharing options.
Reasons included that is was fair for all and a more balanced way to share risk with a partnership approach.

What's your level of comfort with 50:50 sharing
of volume risk?



What's your level of comfort with the 60
(customer):40 (network) sharing of volume risk?

## Love it 0\%

Like it 0\%


"Feel that this
"Feel that this distracts from sharing."
"Why would Jemena expect it's customers to bear a bigger portion of the risk? Unfair!!"

> "May be not very much suitable for my business in long run."

## "I think this doesn't represent a balanced approach. It starts to

 detract."What's your level of comfort with the 40
(customer):60 (network) sharing of volume risk?


"My sentiment as stated previously is that it feels as though being a 'partnership' still a fairer option.
"I think this split is a more equitable outcome. Very hard to follow through on the retailers being transparent with business customers."

