



Capacity Investment Scheme (CIS) Tender 3: National Electricity Market (NEM) – Dispatchable Capacity Stage A - Project Bid Q&A Responses

This document provides a compilation of responses to de-identified questions received from Registered Proponents for CIS Tender 3: NEM – Dispatchable capacity (**CIS Tender 3**). New Q&As are added to this document in chronological order and shaded in pale green. All Q&As are allocated to categories aligning with the Q&A form: Eligibility Criteria; Merit Criteria (MC) 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits; MC 2 – Project deliverability and timetable; MC 3 – Organisational capability to deliver project; MC 4 – First Nations engagement; MC 5 – Community engagement; draft Project Documents; and other.

All responses and correspondence by AEMO regarding the Q&A Process in CIS Tender 3 are subject to the Tender Conditions set out in Section 4 of the CIS Tender 3 [Tender Guidelines](#) (published 13th November 2024).

Important notice: Registered Proponents are reminded of Sections 4.5 (No warranty), 4.6 (No representations), 4.13 (Requests for clarification and further information) and 4.19 (Proponent to perform own due diligence) of the Tender Guidelines. AEMO and the Australian Government reserves its rights not to respond to any question or request. The responses provided are for information purposes only and neither AEMO or the Australian Government make any warranties or representations with respect to the completeness, accuracy, adequacy or currency of the responses. The responses do not take into account individual circumstances and Registered Proponent’s should ensure they perform their own due diligence.

Version Release

Version	Release date	Changes
1	26/11/2024	Release 1 including 6 responses
2	27/11/2024	Release 2 including 5 additional responses
3	28/11/2024	Release 3 including 9 additional responses
4	03/12/2024	Release 4 including 14 additional responses
5	06/12/2024	Release 5 including 16 additional responses
6	09/12/2024	Release 6 including 6 additional responses
7	10/12/2024	Release 7 including 8 additional responses
8	11/12/2024	Release 8 including 10 additional responses
9	12/12/2024	Release 9 including 4 additional responses
10	16/12/2024	Release 10 (final release) including 3 additional responses

Project Bid Q&A

Q&A Release 10		Distributed 16/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
79	Draft Project Documents	<p>Could you please expand on requirement on the Eligibility requirement (15.1.a.iii.(B)) in the CIS Agreement - Would a virtual offtake agreement be considered eligible, if the fixed annual fee payable by the counterparty is for the energy arbitrage component only? (i.e. ancillary services revenue not part of the wholesale contract)?</p>	<p>The suggested structure is not likely to meet the eligibility requirement stipulated in clause 15.1(a)(iii)(B). As per clause 15.1(c), the Australian Government may waive this requirement at its discretion, following the process outlined in other elements of clause 15.</p> <p>As part of the Project Bid submission, Proponents may submit a Returnable Schedule of indicative departures from the draft Project Documents, including the rationale for each indicative departure (refer to Section 2.2 of the Tender Guidelines).</p> <p>Proponents can then provide contract departures as part of their Stage B Financial Value Bid, including a rationale for the departure and further details on how the commercial intent of this clause in the pro-forma CISA is intended to be met. Refer to the Tender Guidelines for information about how departures from the proforma Project Documents will be assessed.</p>
80	Draft Project Documents	<p>How shall we interpret clause 8.1 performance of obligation (c)(ii), “operate and maintain the Project so as to optimize the amount of energy and timing of energy exported at the Connection Point to correspond with Peak Periods” in the context of a battery asset?</p> <p>For context, battery assets may be limited or constrained in their daily or annual MWh throughput which is defined in the OEM's warranty. Operationally, this means that the Operator will need to adhere to the warranty requirements. Additional cycling in Peak Periods may necessitate cycling less in non-Peak Periods, meaning that 8.1(c)(iii) may not be achievable.</p> <p>Does clause 8.1(c)(ii) overwrite clause 8.1(c)(iii) if the two clauses are in conflict?</p>	<p>Under clause 8.1 (b) of the CISA, Project Operators are required to operate and maintain the Project in accordance with Good Industry Practice and as a reasonable and prudent operator.</p> <p>Clause 8.1(c) of the CISA then requires the Project Operator to use reasonable endeavours to operate and maintain the Project to meet each of the objectives described in clauses 8.1(c)(i) to (iv). Each of these objectives are important to the Australian Government and none of them has a priority over any of the others. However, by using the phrase “reasonable endeavours” the Australian Government has accepted that not all of the objectives can be completely achieved by the Project Operator at the same time and still comply with clause 8.1(b). Accordingly, a reasonable and prudent operator will be required to operate the Project so that the Project Operator achieves a reasonable balance between each of the objectives in clause 8.1(c).</p>

Capacity Investment Scheme (CIS) Tender 3

Project Bid Q&A Responses

Q&A Release 10		Distributed 16/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
81	Draft Project Documents	CISA - Item 22 in Reference Details. Export Capacity is defined with units of MW but the drafting in item 22 refers to Export Capacity in MWh. Please confirm the reference to MWh in item 22 is a typographical error.	<p>The Cost Change Threshold (item 22 in Reference Details) should be equal to: \$2,000,000 + (\$10,000 x the numerical value of the Storage Capacity in MWh as at COD as specified in Reference Detail 4), up to a maximum of \$7,500,000, adjusted in accordance with clause 1.5 ("Adjustment for indexation").</p> <p>The drafting in the proforma CISA released as part of Stage B of this Tender will reflect this updated drafting.</p>

Q&A Release 9		Distributed 12/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
75	Other	In a prior CIS Tender, we noted that the Tender Process Deed Poll did not include standard trustee provisions (e.g., limitation of liability). Given the high likelihood that the Proponent will act as a trustee of a trust, is the Australian Government amenable to including equivalent provisions to Clause 26.4 from the CISA in the Tender Process Deed Poll?	The Australian Government has noted this feedback and will consider it.
76	Draft Project Documents	With regards to 'Opt-out' provisions in clause 14 of the CISA, does the Project have to have its first year as 'Support Year' given Opt-out period defined in 14.1.d.(i) seems to require the period to commence no earlier than the start of the second Operations Year? How should the project opt out if it has secured sufficient revenue for the first 5 years, for example?	<p>The opt-out period can commence no earlier than the second Operations Year.</p> <p>As part of the Project Bid submission, Proponents may submit a Returnable Schedule of indicative departures from the draft Project Documents, including the rationale for each indicative departure (refer to Section 2.2 of the Tender Guidelines).</p> <p>In Stage B under Merit Criteria 7, Proponents may bid commercial departures from the proforma Project Documents.</p>

Q&A Release 9		Distributed 12/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
77	Eligibility Criteria	<p>Under EC 16 – Vic, there is possibility that a project is classified under minor utility installation when connecting to voltage level up to 66kV.</p> <p>This land use definition at Clause 73.03 of the Victoria Planning Provisions include a battery connected to a section of electricity network operating with a nominal voltage not exceeding 66,000 volts. This exempts the project from requiring a planning permit. Please clarify that such exempt projects are eligible.</p>	<p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that Projects which proceed to merit assessment are appropriately progressed to support a competitive bid.</p> <p>Proponents should provide documentation to demonstrate the advanced planning progression of their Project in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of EC 16 or, if an exemption is sought, with the policy intention of EC 16.</p>
78	Draft Project Documents	<p>CISA - Item 4 in Reference Details. We are required to provide a fixed Storage Capacity profile for each Support Year and Operations Year. This could be quite limiting if a flexible cycling warranty is available from the BESS supplier, with a degradation profile that varies depending on actual cycling each year. It could also limit our ability to operate optimally in response to market conditions. Will the Commonwealth consider allowing flexibility in the degradation profile?</p>	<p>As part of the Project Bid submission, Proponents may submit a Returnable Schedule of indicative departures from the draft Project Documents, including the rationale for each indicative departure (refer to Section 2.2 of the Tender Guidelines).</p> <p>In Stage B under Merit Criteria 7, Proponents may bid commercial departures from the proforma Project Documents. Refer to the Tender Guidelines for information about how departures from the proforma Project Documents will be assessed.</p>

Q&A Release 8		Distributed 11/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
65	Draft Project Documents	Regarding the Net Operational Revenue (NOR) defined in the CISA. Are any Transmission Use of System (TUOS) / Distribution Use of System (DUOS) charges incurred by the BESS to charge, allowed to be netted off of NOR?	<p>Under the proforma Dispatchable CISA, any costs, charges, tariffs or other amounts paid or incurred by Project Operator under or otherwise pursuant to a Connection Contract are expressly excluded from being a Permitted Cost (see paragraph (i) of the definition of Permitted Costs in the proforma Dispatchable CISA).</p> <p>This means that costs incurred by Project Operator in respect of any Transmission Use of System (TUOS) and/or Distribution Use of System (DUOS) charges under a Connection Contract will not be considered a Permitted Cost and will therefore not be subtracted from the Operational Revenue for a period in determining the Net Operational Revenue for a that period.</p>
66	Other	Section 4.23 allows the Proponent to withdraw or revoke a Bid while Section 4.29 states the Proponent is bound by its Bid following the submission of Financial Value Bid. Would there be any liability imposed on the Proponent with respect to its withdrawal of the Bid? Is there a deadline on which the Proponent can withdraw its Bid without incurring liability?	<p>The acknowledgements and agreements made by the Proponent under Sections 4.29(a)-(b) of the Tender Guidelines are made 'subject to Section 4.23'.</p> <p>This means that if a Proponent withdraws or revokes its Bid under Section 4.23, it will not continue to incur liability in respect of Section 4.23(a)-(b) of the Tender Guidelines.</p> <p>The acknowledgement and agreement made by the Proponent under Section 4.29(c) that (among other things), it has had full access to, fully considered, and has satisfied itself of, all relevant legal advice and matters relevant to its decision to offer to enter into the documentation included in the Proponent's Financial Value Bid continues to apply even if a Proponent withdraws or revokes its Bid under section 4.23.</p> <p>Under Section 4.1 of the Tender Guidelines, participation by a Proponent in the Tender Process is subject to the Proponent complying with and being bound by the Tender Guidelines. The obligations on the Proponent under Section 4.1 continue to apply more broadly even if a Proponent withdraws or revokes its Bid under Section 4.23.</p>

Q&A Release 8		Distributed 11/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
67	Draft Project Documents	<p>CISA Clause 15.1(a)(iii) of the CISA refers to an Eligible Wholesale Contract requiring the Project Operator to sell the rights to dispatch (at the counterparty's discretion and control) part, or all of the Export Capacity of the Project in the NEM.</p> <p>Would a virtual toll where the Project Operator controls dispatch of the Project, but is required to comply with the counterparty's directions meet this criteria?</p>	The intention is that a virtual tolling arrangement could meet this criteria.
68	Draft Project Documents	<p>In clause 15.1 (a) (iii) (A) of the CISA, does an annual fee which is escalated meet the definition of a fixed annual fee?</p>	An annual fee which is escalated from year-to-year would meet this definition. This requirement intends to ensure that the annual fee in any given year is a fixed amount.
69	Draft Project Documents	<p>In clause 15.1 (iii) (C) of the CISA, does the definition which "requires the counterparty to pay all costs attributable to the Project's participation in the NEM commensurate with the proportion of the Export Capacity of the Project that it controls;" include costs for FCAS causer-pays, Participant Fees, connection fees? Are there any other costs included in this category?</p>	<p>We would anticipate that FCAS causer-pays, Participant Fees and connection fees would be included under 15.1 (iii) (C).</p> <p>It is anticipated that there may be other costs included in this category.</p>
70	Draft Project Documents	<p>Can the fixed annual fee (clause 15.1 (a) (iii) (A) of the CISA) be progressively paid in weekly or monthly instalments?</p>	The fixed annual fee can be paid in weekly or monthly instalments.
71	Eligibility Criteria	<p>We are seeking to clarify that a Project that is exempt from requiring a Planning Permit in Victoria will still satisfy EC 16.</p> <p>If we include a confirmation letter of exempt status sent to the Department of Transport and Planning as a part of our submission, will this fulfil EC 16?</p>	<p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that Projects which proceed to merit assessment are appropriately progressed to support a competitive bid.</p> <p>Proponents should provide documentation to demonstrate the advanced planning progression of their Project in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of EC 16 or, if an exemption is sought, with the policy intention of EC 16.</p>

Q&A Release 8		Distributed 11/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
72	Eligibility Criteria	As at the submission of the Project Bid, our Project might not have received the planning requirements under Table 6 of the Tender Guidelines to satisfy EC 16. Given that the planning for this Project is materially progressed, would the intent of EC16 is still satisfied.	<p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that Projects are appropriately progressed through the relevant planning process to support a competitive Bid.</p> <p>Proponents should provide documentation to demonstrate the advanced planning progression of their Project in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of EC 16 or, if an exemption is sought, with the policy intention of EC 16.</p> <p>In accordance with the Tender Conditions set out in Section 4 of the Tender Guidelines, AEMO has the discretion to accept, reject or refuse to consider any Bid that does not comply with the requirements of the Tender Guidelines.</p>
73	Eligibility Criteria	<p>In accordance with Eligibility Criteria 16, a project specific SEARS has been lodged as of November 2024.</p> <p>While we are confident that SEARS will be issued for the Project, we are unlikely to receive project-specific SEARS prior to the Project Bid submission date. Given that SEARS has been materially progressed and is expected to be received shortly, would AEMO Services consider granting special dispensation if it's not back by the Project Bid closing date?</p>	Please see the response to Question 72.
74	Other	Are the NSW Renewable Energy Sector Board Plan: local content targets applicable for Projects in NSW only?	In Stage B under Merit Criteria 9, non-NSW Bids that can demonstrate commitments similar to those outlined in the NSW RESB Plan (Table 9 of the Tender Guidelines) will be assessed favourably.

Q&A Release 7		Distributed 10/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
57	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form question: “<i>Withstand short circuit ratio at the connection point.</i>”</p> <p>Is the SCR being requested in the Project Bid form, the minimum SCR at the connection point for stable operation of the generator?</p>	<p>Yes, it is the minimum SCR at the connection point, sufficient to enable the plant to operate stably and remain connected.</p> <p>See the System Strength Impact Assessment Guidelines V2.2 section 7.2.1 for further details.</p>
58	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Referring to section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form:</p> <p>Can the values be modified at a later stage as those values are subject to further assessment and discussion with AEMO/NSP during the connection process?</p>	<p>Under section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form, please provide values that are a best estimate given in good faith. The values submitted in Stage A will form the basis of AEMO’s Stage A assessment, and thereby, a Proponent may not amend its Bid after it has been submitted (as per Section 4.22 of the Tender Guidelines).</p>
59	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Referring to section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form:</p> <p>For “Maximum fault current contribution (MVA) at the connection point”, is it about the maximum fault current contribution of the plant for a 3 phase short-circuit fault at the POC (i.e., GPS S5.2.8)?</p>	<p>Under section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form, the “Maximum fault current contribution (MVA) at the connection point” is about the maximum fault current contribution of the plant for a 3 phase short-circuit fault at the POC.</p>
60	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Typically, <i>maximum fault current contribution (MVA) at the connection point</i> is given in kA. Can AEMO please confirm the voltage assumption required for this to be converted to MVA?</p>	<p>Voltage assumption should be 1 pu (per-unit).</p>

Capacity Investment Scheme (CIS) Tender 3

Project Bid Q&A Responses

Q&A Release 7		Distributed 10/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
61	Eligibility Criteria	Our Project consists of two new dispatchable assets split over two connection points, under one or two SPVs. If we have a single SPV owning both assets, can we submit and bid only one of the Projects and not the other?	It is a matter for the Proponent to select its preferred bidding configuration before registering and submitting a Project Bid. As per Question 13, if both dispatchable assets have separate connection points, then each dispatchable asset will be considered a separate Project and, as per Eligibility Criteria 7, will require separate Special Purpose Vehicles.
62	Eligibility Criteria	We have two dispatchable assets behind separate connection points. Can we submit these as one Project with one SPV?	As per Question 13, if both dispatchable assets have separate connection points, then each dispatchable asset will be considered a separate Project and, as per Eligibility Criteria 7, will require separate Special Purpose Vehicles.
63	Draft Project Documents	Is there a preferred method to provide a list of departures from the Draft CISA during this stage of the tender process?	As part of the Project Bid submission, Proponents may submit a Returnable Schedule of indicative departures from the draft Project Documents, including the rationale for each indicative departure (refer to Section 2.2 of the Tender Guidelines). This Returnable Schedule can be uploaded in section 10 of the Project Bid form, available to registered Proponents via the Online Portal.
64	Other	Clarifying that there is no bond required for submitting a package into Stage B? If required, what are the specific terms (amount, timing, form etc.)?	There is no requirement for a bond in Stage B.

Q&A Release 6		Distributed 9/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
51	Eligibility Criteria	What is the definition of "Ultimate Holding Company"?	This is intended to have the meaning given in the <i>Corporations Act 2001</i> .

Q&A Release 6		Distributed 9/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
52	MC 4 – First Nations engagement & MC 5 – Community engagement	Are NSW projects expected to apply to become members of the Energy & Water Ombudsman NSW if we do not qualify for membership?	Proponents are only expected to apply for, or maintain, membership of the approved independent ombudsman scheme under the <i>Electricity Supply Act 1995 (NSW)</i> to the extent Proponents qualify as a member.
53	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Is there any place for us to submit a technical clarification note to outline the basis of the numbers in Section 5 Merit Criteria 1?	Under Merit Criterion 1 of the Project Bid Form there are several technical numerical questions about the specifications of the Project, which are used to form a quantitative assessment of the Project’s contribution to system reliability and system benefits. If a technical clarification of information submitted in the Project Bid is required, please use the ‘ <i>CIS T3 Notification or Clarification to AEMO Services</i> ’ form within the Online Portal.
54	Other	Our project is located within Renewable Energy Zone, but will connect to the existing transmission line. Should the answer to the question of "the project is located in REZ" be Yes? or No?	If your Project is located with a Renewable Energy Zone, please answer ‘Yes’ in the Project Bid form question “Is your Project located within a declared Renewable Energy Zone (REZ)?” Within other areas of the Project Bid form, including section 6.1.5 Network connection approval process it can indicated that the Project will connect to an existing transmission line.
55	Other	Are redacted agreements showing project name, scope of agreement and signing page only adequate for proof rather than full agreements?	In line with Question 27, reasonable redactions of sensitive information as required is expected to be acceptable. Proponents should consider the “what is assessed”, “what is required” and “what we are looking for” tables in the Tender Guidelines to determine what information should be included. As per Section 4.13 <i>Clarification of a Bid</i> of the Tender Guidelines, the Australian Government and AEMO may seek further information from Proponents in relation to any Bid submitted.

Q&A Release 6		Distributed 9/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
56	Draft Project Documents	Under what circumstances would the Commonwealth waive the requirement that an Eligible Wholesale Contract is not with a counterparty which is a Related Body Corporate of the Project Operator? What factors would it take into account?	<p>We are unable to give an indication of what the Australian Government deems an Eligible Wholesale Contract.</p> <p>As outlined in the market briefing, contracts that are not automatically deemed eligible (including related party contracts) may be deemed eligible by the Australian Government. The Australian Government will be more likely to exercise its discretion to deem a contract to be eligible where the following has been demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contract has a direct relationship with the dispatch capabilities and operational constraints of the CISA asset. • There is liquidity and price transparency evident in the market, allowing prices and terms to be benchmarked. • Risk allocation is transparent, and risk is equitably allocated to the parties most able to price and manage the risk. <p>Successful Proponents are invited to approach the Australian Government at any time during the CISA term to determine whether a given contract can be deemed eligible under this framework.</p> <p>Proponents should seek legal advice in regard to treatment of Eligible Wholesale Contracts in the draft CISA.</p>

Q&A Release 5		Distributed 06/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
35	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Where a Project has not yet completed grid studies, can a Proponent use best estimates to respond to the questions in MC 1, or should it input “-9999” unless 100% certain that the responses will not change?	Best estimates given in good faith are acceptable.

Q&A Release 5		Distributed 06/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
36	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Project Bid form question: <i>“Provided level of synthetic inertia (MWs)”</i>.</p> <p>Inertia settings are configurable and can be tuned for each project to achieve various performance targets. How do AEMO want Proponents to respond to this question when project specific tuning has not been completed yet? Can a range of possible inertia levels be provided?</p>	<p>A single value is required, Proponents should provide their best estimate of the upper end of the expected range of capabilities.</p>
37	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>System restart ancillary services were not included in our initial project design as they did not appear to be a requirement. Can AEMO provide a definition of what they consider system restart ancillary services to include? Does answering yes to this question create an obligation to provide this service if a bid is successful?</p>	<p>We specifically mean that the generating system has “black start capability” as defined in the glossary of the National Electricity Rules.</p> <p>This question seeks to understand potential plant capabilities only. It does not create an obligation to participate in system restart processes, only to identify whether projects have the potential to participate.</p>
38	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form question: <i>“MVA rating of the Project at the connection point.”</i></p> <p>AEMO can you please confirm if this is CUO rating or nameplate rating?</p>	<p>This question is referring to the maximum MVA that the generating system can contribute to the connection point during normal steady state operation, in accordance with their Schedule 5 reactive power obligations (s5.2.5.1).</p> <p>For example, for a generating system with a maximum steady state active power contribution at the connection point of 100 MW, that can achieve the s5.2.5.1 automatic access standard of supplying or absorbing 0.395 x Rated Active power (i.e. 39.5 MVA_r), the MVA rating at the connection point would be 107.5 MVA.</p>
39	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form question: <i>“MVA rating of the Project at the connection point.”</i></p> <p>Is this to be the registered rating of the generator or the name plate rating of the plant?</p>	<p>Please see the response to Question 38.</p>

Q&A Release 5		Distributed 06/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
40	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Section 5.2.2 <i>Voltage Control</i> of the Project Bid form question: <i>“Expected reactive power capabilities (MVAR) when producing maximum active power output.”</i> Is this when the BESS is discharging/generating?</p>	For a BESS this means when discharging.
41	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Section 5.2.2 <i>Voltage Control</i> of the Project Bid form question: <i>“Expected reactive power capabilities (MVAR) when producing or discharging minimum active power (or consuming/charging maximum active power).”</i> Minimum active power, is this at 0 MW or when a BESS is consuming/charging to maximum active power?</p>	<p>If the BESS can discharge continuously from maximum down to 0 MW, then reactive capability at 0 MW is appropriate. This question is mainly intended to distinguish for a plant that can have a non-zero minimum generation level, below which they have a discontinuous drop to 0 MW.</p>
42	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Section 5.2.2 <i>Voltage Control</i> of the Project Bid form would be best demonstrated and answered by attaching a reactive power capability diagram/graph with P(MW) on the y-axis and Q(MVAR) on the x-axis. Is it acceptable and possible to attach graphs of this detail in support of answering this section?</p>	<p>AEMO requires numerical answers for reactive power capability at the specific active power levels requested. We understand that a full reactive capability curve may be substantially more complex in reality. However, to make practical quantitative comparisons across different technologies, we are considering a subset of important operating conditions only.</p>
43	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Referring to section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form: For "<i>MVA rating of the Project at the connection point</i>", is it about the project nameplate rating, taking into account all generating units?</p>	Please see the response to Question 38.

Q&A Release 5		Distributed 06/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
44	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Referring to section 5.2.1 <i>Voltage Control</i> of the Project Bid form: What is the maximum temperature to be considered for the reactive power capabilities? Inverter-based generators (including BESSs) often have temperature derating which limits their reactive power capabilities at higher temperature (e.g., 40 or 50 degree Celsius).	Best estimates given in good faith are acceptable.
45	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Section 5.2.1 <i>System Strength</i> of the Project Bid form question: “MVA rating of the Project at the connection point.” Is this value calculated based on Pmax Qmax as per the proposed GPS?	Please see the response to Question 38.
46	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	With reference to the FCAS in Sections 5.2.3 (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) in the Project Bid form, is the maximum capability the Maximum Cap MW or the maximum Enablement that a BESS can register for in each FCAS market?	It is the maximum capability in MW that the plant can register for in each FCAS market, not the maximum enablement level.
47	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Referring to section 5.2.3 <i>Frequency Control</i> of the Project Bid Form: Do the questions refer to the maximum capability a plant can register under each FCAS category as per AEMO FCAS requirements/guidelines (taking into account the minimum droop, control deadband, etc.)? Or is it referring to the maximum enablement level?	Please see the response to Question 46, it is the maximum capability in MW that the plant can register for in each FCAS market, not the maximum enablement level.

Q&A Release 5		Distributed 06/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
48	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Referring to section 5.2.3 <i>Frequency Control</i> of the Project Bid Form:</p> <p>With projects which have not finalised GPS yet, the frequency drop may be changed during AEMO/TNSP review and GPS negotiation, should the proponent use the minimum droop as per AEMO FCAS requirements (1.7%) to calculate the maximum capability for FCAS?</p>	Best estimates given in good faith are acceptable.
49	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Referring to section 5.2.3 <i>Frequency Control</i> of the Project Bid Form:</p> <p>With regards to inertia, for grid forming BESSs the level of synthetic inertia which can be provided depends on the GFM control mode selected and the settings such as inertia constant which may not be finalised until it receives AEMO 5.3.4A approval. In that scenario, should the project's proponent select unknown as an answer?</p>	Proponents should provide their best estimates of expected capability, and where a range of values is expected subject to mode selection - provide the upper end of the expected range. Proponents should select 'unknown' in cases where the capability to provide synthetic inertia is not yet known, or the range of expected values are not yet known.
50	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	<p>Referring to section 5.2.4 <i>System Restart Services</i> of the Project Bid form:</p> <p>For BESS projects which are still in commercial negotiation with suppliers and weighing up whether having system restart capability is beneficial to the project or not, should the Proponents select unknown as the answer to this question?</p>	This question is seeking to understand the expected capabilities of the plant. Proponents should select 'unknown' where no decision has yet been made about such capabilities.

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
21	MC 2 – Project deliverability and timetable	In the Project Bid form Proponents need to specify the date in which equipment manufacturers and construction contractors will be secured. If the Proponent will procure an EPC contractor, do we just outline when the EPC contract is expected to be executed?	In the Project Bid form, please provide the target date that you expect to secure the contracts.
22	MC 2 – Project deliverability and timetable	<p>Can you explain exactly what this MC 2 question in the Project Bid form means?</p> <p><i>"Is the Project required to comply with any Commonwealth and State/Territory legislation relating to First Nations communities and interests, Traditional Owner Groups and cultural heritage requirements"</i></p> <p>Don't all projects have to comply with Commonwealth and State/Territory legislation?</p>	<p>Commonwealth and State legislation relating to First Nations communities and interests is included in the assessment of MC 2 and MC 4. Importantly, this is beyond the State/Territory legislation requirements set out in EC 16 and Table 6 of the Tender Guidelines that all Projects must comply with.</p> <p>The first question in Section 6.1.8 of the Project Bid form requires Proponents to self-identify if their Project is required to comply with any Commonwealth and State legislation relating to First Nations communities and interests, Traditional Owner Groups and cultural heritage requirements. Any legislation that falls under this category that the Proponent is, or will be, required to comply with should be considered when responding to this question.</p> <p>Similarly, the second question in Section 8.1 of the Project Bid form requires Proponents to provide an overview of the approach to First Nations community engagement. As per the guidance note on this question, this should include any applicable requirements set out in First Nations Commonwealth and State/Territory legislation in the relevant jurisdiction, as applicable.</p> <p>The "What is Required" column on Page 23 of the Tender Guidelines provides some examples of legislation that might apply, however it is expected Proponents are aware of any applicable legislation relevant to their Project.</p>

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
23	Eligibility Criteria	Does the 2-hour minimum storage duration required under EC 10 apply to the start of the life of the battery, or does it apply across the duration of the contracted CISA period (i.e. requiring a longer duration at the start of life to account for any degradation)?	<p>Proponents will be required to confirm compliance with the Eligibility Criteria (including EC 10) as part of its Project Bid submission.</p> <p>EC 10 then applies contractually at the time of registration through the CISA. The capacity of the Project in its first Operations Year (which commences on the Commercial Operations Date) must be such that it can be able to dispatch its registered capacity continuously for a minimum duration of 2 hours.</p> <p>Proponents are encouraged to refer to the draft CISA, published on AEMO Services website, for more information.</p>
24	Other	<p>For a big project, say 500 MW, which of the following options would the CIS consider favourable?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracting half the capacity (e.g., 250 MW) with CIS. Splitting the project into two 250 MW projects and contract on of them with CIS. Reducing the capacity to 250 MW. 	Please see the response to Question 11. For completeness, as outlined in Question 6, contracted percentage is not a Bid Variable in this Tender.
25	Other	For a 500 MW, 2-hour project, would it be acceptable to operate it as a 4-hour dispatchable project by reducing the Point of Connection (POC) to 250 MW and running the two 250 MW components sequentially to provide 4-hour dispatchability to the grid?	Please see the response to Question 11.

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
26	Eligibility Criteria	<p>With reference to Eligibility Criteria 7, Section 2.2.1 of the Tender Guidelines and section 4.24 of the Tender Conditions, we are seeking guidance on the proposed Bid Entity in the context of a Staged Project.</p> <p>Our project is a two staged project, with Stage 1 being an existing dispatchable asset, and Stage 2 being a new dispatchable asset. They will share a common connection point and connection works, common existing infrastructure and common land.</p> <p>Please confirm if it will be acceptable, and will not render the Bid and Project ineligible under the Tender 3 Process, if the Bid Entity for the Project (i.e. for Stage 2, the new dispatchable asset) is the same SPV as used for Stage 1 (i.e. for the existing dispatchable asset).</p>	<p>EC 7 states that the Proponent must propose one Bid Entity, which may be the Proponent, and which, at the time of the execution of the CISA, must be an SPV which only carries on the Project, the Associated Project (if applicable), and the existing dispatchable asset (if applicable), and conducts no other business.</p> <p>The reference to the “existing dispatchable asset (if applicable)” in paragraph (b) of EC 7 is applicable where a Staged Project intends to use the same SPV for both the existing dispatchable asset and the new dispatchable asset (the Project).</p> <p>Proponents are encouraged to provide adequate information in their Project Bids to allow AEMO to assess that EC 7 is satisfied by the proposed arrangements.</p>
27	MC 2 – Project deliverability and timetable	<p>The question references the question in the Project Bid Form “<i>Attach evidence of construction contracting</i>”. Because contracts contain commercially sensitive information, will redacted contracts be considered?</p> <p>What information within a construction contract is considered essential for it to be evidence? Some contracts can run to 500 pages.</p>	<p>For the question “<i>Attach evidence of construction contracting</i>” in the Project Bid form, reasonable redactions of sensitive information as required is expected to be acceptable. Proponents should consider the “what is assessed”, “what is required” and “what we are looking for” tables in the Tender Guidelines to determine what information should be included.</p> <p>As per Section 4.13 <i>Clarification of a Bid</i> of the Tender Guidelines, the Australian Government and AEMO may seek further information from Proponents in relation to any Bid submitted.</p>

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
28	Eligibility Criteria	<p>If a ready-to-build project is currently ineligible due to size, but we secure support letters and confirmations from the NSP and local council to expand it to meet the eligibility criteria, would this be acceptable?</p>	<p>A Project must, at the time of registration, have a capacity of not less than 30 MW (EC 10). As part of the Tender process, a Proponent is submitting a Bid to contractually commit to delivering a Project at the capacity specified in its Bid.</p> <p>As per EC 14 and EC 16, the Project must be in receipt of a connection enquiry response (if applicable) and received a project assessment decision from the relevant planning authority under applicable State or Territory legislation.</p> <p>The policy intention of Eligibility Criteria 14 and 16 is to ensure that Projects are appropriately progressed to support a competitive Bid. Proponents are encouraged to provide adequate information in their Project Bids to allow AEMO to assess that EC 14 and EC 16 are satisfied in relation to the Project.</p> <p>Where the Eligibility Criteria are satisfied, MC 2 will assess a Project's progress and feasibility to reach financial close and commercial operations.</p>
29	Eligibility Criteria	<p>The development application process for our Project has commenced however the Scoping Report is still in early draft and will not be issued until after the submissions response date.</p> <p>Further to the development application, the Project is in the process of signing a Connection Process Agreement (after completing the enquiry process) and we have advanced commercial discussions with prospective OEMs with a binding commitment deed for a framework agreement expected to be finalised with the preferred supplier this year.</p> <p>Can you please confirm if our project would be considered ineligible on the basis of the not yet lodging a Scoping Report or would other project advances such as those identified above be factored into the consideration?</p>	<p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that projects are appropriately progressed through the relevant planning process to support a competitive bid.</p> <p>Refer to Table 6 of the Tender Guidelines for the State/Territory specific requirements for EC 16. Projects that don't meet the specific stages identified in Table 6 may not be considered eligible.</p> <p>Proponents should provide documentation to demonstrate the advanced planning progression of their Project in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of EC 16 or, if an exemption is sought, with the policy intention of EC 16.</p>

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
30	Other	<p>We have a Hybrid Project that includes a solar component and a BESS component. We submitted the solar component in an earlier tender, that we are awaiting the outcome of. Are we able to submit the BESS component in Tender 3?</p>	<p>Hybrid Projects are co-located generation and storage assets where both assets share a common connection point. The Proponents of Hybrid Project may enter into either a Generation CISA or a Dispatchable CISA, but not both.</p> <p>A Hybrid Project that is currently participating in Tender 1 is eligible to participate in this Tender 3 process, subject to satisfying the Eligibility Criteria.</p> <p>If a Proponent of a Hybrid Project is seeking a CISA for the generation component in Tender 1, and is then awarded a CISA under the Tender 1 process, both the generation and dispatchable components of the Hybrid Project will then be considered ineligible under EC 17 in this Tender 3 Process.</p> <p>Section 2.2.1 of the Tender Guidelines provides information on the definition, treatment, and eligibility of Hybrid Projects.</p>
31	Eligibility Criteria	<p>Our BESS project is located in NSW within a development zone and its development approval pathway does not include a SEARS as a deliverable/milestone.</p> <p>We have a Scoping Report developed for the Project, which received an official response from the NSW Department of Planning, Housing & Infrastructure detailing the documentation and assessment requirements for the Project having regard for the impacts in the Scoping Report and the studies, design and consultation undertaken by the NSW Government. The response is similar to a SEARS.</p> <p>Can AEMO Services confirm that this response qualifies as a "project assessment decision" for the purpose of EC16?</p>	<p>The policy intention of Eligibility Criterion 16 is to ensure that projects are appropriately progressed through the relevant planning process to support a competitive bid.</p> <p>Refer to Table 6 of the Tender Guidelines for the State/Territory specific requirements for EC 16. Projects that don't meet the specific stages identified in Table 6 may not be considered eligible.</p> <p>Proponents should provide documentation to demonstrate the advanced planning progression of their Project in order to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of EC 16 or, if an exemption is sought, with the policy intention of EC 16.</p>

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
32	Eligibility Criteria	Our project has received a SEARs for a battery, but we are looking to increase this to a larger size and duration. Can we submit a larger size as part of the CIS and still satisfy EC 16?	<p>As part of the Tender process, a Proponent is submitting a Bid to contractually commit to delivering a Project at the capacity specified in its Bid. As per EC 16, the Project must have received a project assessment decision from the relevant planning authority under applicable State or Territory legislation. For Projects in NSW, this means that the Project must have received a SEARs at the time of submission of the Project Bid (if applicable).</p> <p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that Projects which proceed to merit assessment are appropriately progressed to support a competitive bid. Proponents are encouraged to provide adequate information in their Project Bids to allow AEMO to assess that EC 16 is satisfied in relation to the Project.</p> <p>Where the Eligibility Criteria are satisfied, MC 2 will assess a Project's progress and feasibility to reach financial close and commercial operations.</p>
33	Eligibility Criteria	In Table 6 of the Tender Guidelines for EC 16 it refers to the PDI Act for South Australian Projects. We note that there has been a change in the South Australian development application process.	<p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that projects are appropriately progressed through the relevant planning process to support a competitive Bid.</p> <p>For South Australia projects, the Tender Guidelines outlines the eligibility requirements in relation to Part 7 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (SA) (PDI Act). It is expected that additional information will be issued to Proponents to clarify that an application for a licence under Part 4 of the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act 2024 (SA) that has been lodged in relation to the Project is expected to also meet the eligibility requirement of EC 16.</p> <p>Projects in South Australia are expected to meet one of these requirements, not both.</p>

Q&A Release 4		Distributed 03/12/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
34	Eligibility Criteria	For South Australia, the new DA process splits into two components: License Application and SEO Application. Do both need to be completed to be eligible under EC 16?	<p>The policy intention of EC 16 is to ensure that Projects are appropriately progressed through the relevant planning process to support a competitive Bid.</p> <p>For Projects in South Australia, the Tender Guidelines outlines the eligibility requirements in relation to Part 7 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (SA) (PDI Act). It is expected that additional information will be issued to Proponents to clarify that an application for a licence under Part 4 of the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act 2024 (SA) that has been lodged in relation to the Project is expected to also meet the eligibility requirement of EC16.</p> <p>Projects in South Australia are expected to meet one of these requirements, not both.</p>

Q&A Release 3		Distributed 28/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
12	MC 2 – Project deliverability and timetable	Can any milestone dates (for example, Financial Close and Commercial Operations Date) submitted in Stage A be updated in Stage B?	<p>Proponents are required to provide target (or actual, if applicable) dates for Financial Close and the Commercial Operations Date in their Stage A – Project Bids. These dates should be kept consistent between a Proponent’s Stage A – Project Bid and its Stage B – Financial Value Bid (if the Proponent is invited to Stage B).</p> <p>Where there has been a material change in circumstances (for example, a material delay to the Project has occurred after the Project Bid submission that impacts the Commercial Operations Date), Proponents must notify AEMO and the Australian Government of this change promptly in writing, as outlined in Section 4.33 of the Tender Guidelines.</p> <p>As per Section 4.22 of the Tender Guidelines, a Proponent may not amend its Bid after it has been submitted, unless invited or permitted to do so by the Australian Government or AEMO.</p>

Q&A Release 3		Distributed 28/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
13	Eligibility Criteria	Is a dispatchable asset with two connection points but with shared infrastructure and owned by the same Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) considered two projects for the purposes of the Tender 3 process?	<p>Under Eligibility Criterion 7 an SPV must only carry on the Project, the Associated Project (if applicable), and the existing dispatchable asset (if applicable) and conduct no other business.</p> <p>If both dispatchable assets have separate connection points, then each dispatchable asset will be considered a separate Project and, as per Eligibility Criterion 7, will require separate SPVs.</p>
14	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Assuming the same battery modules, connection, and location. Does the MC 1 score for a 3-hour vs a 4-hour system score linearly?	The duration of a battery is considered in the assessment of reliability benefits within Merit Criterion 1, whereby, all else being equal, longer duration may have higher absolute unserved energy reduction potential. However, this relationship may not be linear, and the relationship may differ in different locations of the system. The approach taken follows AEMO's Electricity Statement of Opportunities (ESOO). Section 4.1.4 in the 2024 ES00 provides examples of the capacity required of different durations of storage to meet the reliability standard or interim reliability measure.
15	Eligibility Criteria	Our hybrid Projects are seeking to include a battery to existing connection agreements/applications under NER Rule 5.3.9. Does AEMO accept the solar farm connection response as evidence for the project's progress towards securing a connection agreement or is further evidence required.	<p>In accordance with the Tender Guidelines, to satisfy EC 14, the Project must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) have received a network service provider response to a connection enquiry; or b) have executed a connection agreement; or c) be in the process of seeking to amend an existing connection agreement. <p>To clarify, limb b) is satisfied only if the connection agreement is executed for the Project, not the Associated Project (i.e. the solar farm). As such, a Hybrid Project with an existing connection agreement for the Associated Project must provide evidence that the Proponent has begun the process of seeking to amend the existing connection agreement.</p>

Q&A Release 3		Distributed 28/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
16	Other	Can any Project parameters be varied between Stage A and Stage B?	<p>The Project parameters (e.g. duration) submitted in Stage A will form the basis of AEMO's Stage A assessment, and thereby, a Proponent may not amend its Bid after it has been submitted (as per Section 4.22 of the Tender Guidelines).</p> <p>If there is a material change to a Bid, such as the Project parameters, the Proponent must notify AEMO and the Australian Government as soon as possible through the Online Portal using the dedicated 'Notice to AEMO' form.</p> <p>In the circumstances where notification of a change has been provided in accordance with the above, AEMO and the Australian Government reserve the right, in accordance with Section 4.33 of the Tender Guidelines, to invite the Proponent to amend its Bid. AEMO and the Australian Government will, amongst other things, give regard to probity considerations in exercising its discretion.</p>
17	Other	Can AEMO please confirm if a Conflict of Interest (COI) form (relating to a conflict of interest between Competing Proponents) needs to be approved by AEMO prior to Stage A tender submission on 18 December 2024? Or if it is OK for the COI form to be submitted at the same time as the Stage A tender submission?	<p>The COI form does not need to be sent to AEMO prior to the Stage A Project Bid submission date on 18 December 2024. Please submit the COI form within section 12 of the Project Bid Form.</p> <p>If any conflicts arise after the submission of the Project Bid form, please use the 'Notification or Clarification to AEMO Services' form to submit an additional COI form.</p>

Q&A Release 3		Distributed 28/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
18	Eligibility Criteria	<p>Would an offtake agreement with a Government Owned Corporation (GOC) disqualify a Project from the Tender under EC 13?</p> <p>Is a GOC included under the definition of "Australian Government, or a State or Territory of Australia"?</p> <p>Would a Proponent still be eligible for a CISA if, in the future e.g. after the CISA is executed, it is awarded a long-term underwriting agreement with a GOC?</p>	<p>To the extent that a Proponent is a GOC, its Bid may still be eligible provided that all Eligibility Criteria are satisfied (including EC 13). The fact that the Proponent is itself a GOC does not render its Bid ineligible under EC 13.</p> <p>With reference to the wording of EC 13 on Page 17 of the Tender Guidelines, "...with the Australian Government, or a State or Territory of Australia..." should be taken to include GOCs. As such, if a Project has a revenue underwriting agreement with a GOC it is unlikely that it will satisfy the requirements of EC 13.</p> <p>However, if the Project has an agreement with a GOC that is on commercial terms at arm's length (such as a PPA), the Project may still be eligible under EC 13 depending on the terms of these arrangements, which would be considered during eligibility assessment. The Proponent should provide sufficient details of the agreements to enable an assessment against EC 13.</p> <p>The conditions of the CISA should be referred to once the CISA has been executed.</p>
19	Eligibility Criteria	<p>We have one SPV/Bid Entity that holds the rights to develop both a generation asset and a dispatchable asset. The generation asset and the dispatchable asset will connect into the NEM through separate connection points and are therefore not Hybrid Projects for the purposes of the Tender Guidelines. As the assets are co-located, they are being developed together but will be submitting separate connection applications. Each asset is on a different development timeline.</p> <p>Can AEMO Services please confirm if separate Bid Entities (i.e., two separate SPVs) are required for each of CIS Tender 3 and Tender 4?</p>	<p>Under EC 7 a SPV must only carry on the Project, the Associated Project (if applicable), and the existing dispatchable asset (if applicable) and conduct no other business.</p> <p>As per the Tender Guidelines, in respect of a Hybrid Project, the Associated Project shares a common connection point. In respect of a Staged Project, an existing dispatchable asset shares a common connection point with a new dispatchable asset.</p> <p>If both the generation and dispatchable assets have separate connection points, then each asset will be considered a separate Project and, as per EC 7, will require separate SPVs.</p> <p>An SPV must be established prior to execution of the CISA.</p>

Q&A Release 3		Distributed 28/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
20	Eligibility Criteria	Can a Proponent still satisfy EC 7 if the market participant of the BESS will be another entity (a related body gentailer) which is entitled to all revenue of the Project? We note that as per cl 8.6(c) of the CISA, the revenue of the related body (as the intermediary) will be deemed the operational revenue of the Project Operator, but we wanted to clarify that we would still satisfy EC 7 (even if we need to rely on cl 8.6 of the CISA).	<p>EC 7 requires, amongst other things, that the Proponent must propose one Bid Entity, which may be the Proponent and which, at the time of the execution of the CISA, must be an SPV which is entitled to all of the revenue, of the Project.</p> <p>Where a Proponent intends to utilise the provisions in Clauses 8.6 (b) and 8.6 (c) for a Permitted Intermediary Contract or Permitted Arrangement, it should provide additional information in its Project Bid to allow AEMO to assess that EC 7 is satisfied by the arrangement. This could include a description of how the Project Revenues are considered / accounted for in the arrangement between the SPV and the intermediary.</p> <p>As outlined in the Tender Guidelines, due diligence may be undertaken on Bids at any time to confirm continuing compliance with the Eligibility Criteria.</p>

Q&A Release 2		Distributed 27/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
7	Eligibility Criteria	Our Project has received a connection enquiry response for a certain number of MWs but we are now looking to increase the size to a larger number of MWs than was in our initial connection enquiry. Can we propose the larger size as part of the CIS and still satisfy the connection enquiry eligibility criteria?	<p>In accordance with the Tender Guidelines, to satisfy EC 14, the Project must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) have received a network service provider response to a connection enquiry; or b) have executed a connection agreement; or c) be in the process of seeking to amend an existing connection agreement. <p>As such, please provide evidence of informing the relevant network service provider that you are seeking an amendment to the initial connection enquiry.</p> <p>In accordance with the Tender Conditions set out in Section 4 of the Tender Guidelines, AEMO has the discretion to accept, reject or refuse to consider any Bid that does not comply with the requirements of the Tender Guidelines.</p>

Q&A Release 2		Distributed 27/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
8	Other	Are proponents allowed to change the Project configuration between submission of the Project Bid and Financial Bid stage? E.g. whether the Project is bid as 100 MW / 2 hrs vs 50 MW / 4 hrs	<p>The Project's technical characteristics, including configuration, submitted in Stage A will form the basis of AEMO's eligibility and merit assessment. As such, a Proponent may not amend its Bid after it has been submitted (as per Section 4.22 of the Tender Guidelines).</p> <p>If there is a material change to a Bid, such as the Project parameters, the Proponent must notify AEMO as soon as possible through the Online Portal using the dedicated Notice to AEMO form.</p> <p>In the circumstances where notification of a change has been provided to AEMO, AEMO reserves the right, in accordance with Section 4.33 and Section 4.22 of the Tender Guidelines, to determine whether a Bid may be amended. AEMO will, amongst other things, consider probity principles as part of its discretion.</p>
9	MC 3 – Organisational capability to deliver project	For Merit Criteria 3 sub-criteria "Delivery of Project" are the corporate structure diagrams intended to display specific people who will be involved in the Project or to show business entities and where the Project sits within the overall company?	<p>Under section 7.1 Delivery of Project of the Project Bid form, the corporate structure diagrams should show:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the direct and indirect owners of the Proponent (and Bid Entity if different). This includes showing the business entities, and where they sit within the overall company; and 2) the contracting structure and/or commercial delivery model. This should show the Proponent's contracting partners and any parties required to deliver the Project. <p>The detail of the specific people who will be involved in the Project should be provided in the first question under section 7.2 Procurement and resources.</p>

Q&A Release 2		Distributed 27/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
10	Other	<p>We are intending to submit a CIS application for a BESS project in Queensland. We noted from the Tender 3 webinar the reason there was no specific amount of dispatchable capacity for Queensland was that terms could not be agreed with the relevant parties within Queensland.</p> <p>If this is correct, would this infer that proposals for Queensland would have a reduced probability of securing a successful tender when compared to states that have allocated dispatchable amounts such as New South Wales and Victoria?</p> <p>Is it possible that the lack of agreed terms referred to in the Webinar for Queensland could be resolved before the dates associated with Stage B of the CIS Tender 3?</p>	<p>As outlined on page iii of the Tender Guidelines, the specific jurisdictional allocations form part of the Australian Government's Renewable Energy Transformation Agreements with state and territory governments.</p> <p>For Tender Round 3 there is 6.8 GWh of unallocated dispatchable capacity to be allocated to Projects across the NEM, based on a merit assessment of the Projects.</p> <p>Any possible future agreed terms with the Queensland Government would not change the jurisdictional targets for this CIS Tender 3.</p>
11	Other	<p>Can a 2-hour BESS be bid as a 4-hour BESS (e.g. a facility that is designed as 200 MW / 2 hour but bids as 100 MW / 4 hour)?</p>	<p>In accordance with Section 2.1.1 of the Tender Guidelines, if a Project has multiple potential configurations or designs (such as storage duration or nameplate capacity), it is a matter for the Proponent to select its preferred configuration before registering and submitting a Project Bid.</p> <p>This should align with the Export Capacity and Storage Capacity that the Projects have registered, or intend to register, with AEMO. As per the Reference Details of the draft CISA, Proponents will contractually commit to an Export Capacity (MW) and Storage Capacity (MWh).</p> <p>By way of example, a project that is designed with an Export Capacity of 200 MW and a Storage Capacity of 400 MWh would be considered to have a 2-hour duration. Duration submitted in the Bid Form should be the Storage Capacity divided by the Export Capacity.</p>

Q&A Release 1		Distributed 26/11/2024	
#	Category	Question	Answer
1	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	If a Proponent wishes to submit attachments in addition to the Single Line Diagram in support of Merit Criterion 1 where should these be submitted? Can multiple attachments be submitted under the upload functionality for the Single Line Diagram (section 5.1 of the online submission form)? It appears there is no other area to submit Merit Criterion 1 attachments.	Under Merit Criterion 1 of the Project Bid Form, there are several technical questions about the specifications of the Project which are used to form a quantitative assessment of the Project's contribution to system reliability and system benefits. The only attachment required for Merit Criterion 1 is the Single Line Diagram.
2	Other	Does Tender 4 allow for submissions that consider the hybrid project (solar farm + BESS) as a whole? Will it only assess the generation portion of a hybrid project, or the dispatchable portion too?	Information regarding Tender 4 will be provided in the upcoming Tender 4 Market Briefing Note. It is expected that this will be published on the AEMO Services website in the coming days.
3	Eligibility Criteria	Please confirm there are no circumstances where a 1.9-hour system would be eligible for the CIS Tender 3?	In accordance with the Tender Guidelines, to satisfy EC 10, a Project must be able to dispatch its registered capacity continuously for a minimum duration of 2-hours.
4	Eligibility Criteria	Will AEMO consider a project eligible under EC 14 if a response to a connection enquiry is received on the 18th, 19th or 20th of December 2024 (assuming the CIS Tender 3 submission due date of 18 December 2024)?	In accordance with Section 3.1 of the Tender Guidelines, Proponents will be required to confirm compliance with each of the Eligibility Criteria via the Online Portal during Stage A – Project Bid. As such, the Proponent must provide information which demonstrates that the Proponent and its Project meets all of the listed Eligibility Criteria, including EC 14, as part of its Project Bid submission.
5	MC 1 – Contribution to system reliability and system benefits	Will AEMO do its own modelling to assess the impact of the Project in terms of relieving unserved energy?	AEMO Limited and AEMO Services (together, AEMO) will undertake modelling to assess the impact of a Project in terms of unserved energy reduction potential.
6	Eligibility Criteria	Can a Project submit a CIS bid for part of its capacity? For example, could a 1 GW BESS submit a bid for a CISA covering 50% (500 MW) of its capacity or does a CISA need to cover 100% of the Project's capacity?	Contracted percentage is not a Bid Variable in this Tender.

Acknowledgement of Country

We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of Australia and their continuing connection to land and sea, waters, environment and community. We pay our respects to the Traditional Custodians of the lands we live and work on, their culture, and their Elders past and present.

© Commonwealth of Australia 2024

Unless otherwise noted, copyright (and any other intellectual property rights) in this document is owned by the Commonwealth of Australia (referred to as the Commonwealth).

All material in this document is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence](#) except content supplied by third parties, logos and the Commonwealth Coat of Arms.