OPTIONS EVALUATION REPORT (OER)

Line 12 - Livrpool - Sydney Sth - Refurb

OER- 000000001271 revision 1.0

Ellipse project no(s):
TRIM file: [TRIM No]

Project reason: Capability - Asset Replacement for end of life condition
Project category: Prescribed - Replacement

Approvals

Author	Zaeem Khan	Transmission Lines & Cables Asset Analyst
Endorsed	Charles Kurniawan	Transmission Lines and Cables Asset Managers
	Debashis Dutta	Asset Analytics and Insights Manager
Approved	Andrew McAlpine	A/Head of Asset Management
Date submitted for approval	13 November 2021	

Change history

Revision	Date	Amendment
0	11/10/2021	Initial Issue
1	13/11/2021	Minor Formatting

Executive summary

Line 12 is a 330kV transmission line between Liverpool and Sydney South 330kV substations. The transmission line is a key part of the network within the Sydney metropolitan region, and its route traverses primarily urban residential areas in south-western Sydney. Consisting of 23 structures, the single circuit section of this line has a route length of 7km and runs from Liverpool to Structure 371 at a field location near Cambridge Avenue, Glenfield.

Detailed analysis of asset condition information has identified that all 23 structures on line 12 have several condition issues that require refurbishment to address asset health and maintain appropriate risk levels across the network.

The main drivers of the need to remediate these issues are:

- Manage network safety risk levels "As-Low-As Reasonably-Practicable" in accordance with the regulation obligations and TransGrid's business risk appetite. Under the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014 Section 5 'A network operator must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the design, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of its network (or any part of its network) is safe'; and
- Provide economic benefit to consumers through reduction in safety and bushfire risks.

The assessment of the options considered to address the need/opportunity appears in Table 1.

Table 1 - Evaluated options[1]

Option	Description	Direct capital cost ($m)	Network and corporate overheads ($m)	Total capital cost[2] ($m)	Weighted NPV (PV, $m)	Rank
Option A	Refurbish asset components that meet the primary condition criteria only	1.75	0.30	2.05	0.61	3
Option B	Refurbish all asset components that have been identified as having condition issues, and replace the corroded sections on both earthwires with an equivalent type	2.71	0.48	3.19	16.04	2
Option C	Refurbish all asset components that have been identified as having condition issues, and replace the existing earthwire on the line	3.85	0.35	4.20	17.34	1

[1] Figures may not add due to rounding

[2] Total capital cost is the sum of the direct capital cost and network and corporate overheads. Total capital cost is used in this OER for all analysis.

The preferred option is Option C, as it has the highest weighted NPV result of the technically and commercially feasible options which were considered. It is therefore recommended that the option be scoped in detail and progressed from DG1 to DG2[3]. In consideration of the delivery requirements and the economic benefit NPV analysis for the need, its optimal timing is 2024/2025.

[3] DG stands for 'decision gate' that forms a part of TransGrids investment decision process.

1. Need/opportunity

Line 12 is a 330kV transmission line between Liverpool and Sydney South 330kV substations. The transmission line is a key part of the network within the Sydney metropolitan region, and its route traverses primarily urban residential areas in south-western Sydney. Consisting of 23 structures, the single circuit section of this line has a route length of 7km and runs from Liverpool to Structure 371 at a field location near Cambridge Avenue, Glenfield.

The transmission line has several condition issues on various line components, all of which increase the probability of asset failure. These issues present a safety and bushfire risk which TransGrid is obligated to manage.

Detailed analysis of asset condition information has identified that all 23 structures on line 12 have several condition issues that require refurbishment to address asset health and maintain appropriate risk levels across the network. The most significant element of concern is the condition of the insulators, which have reached the end of their expected lives, and it can be anticipated that some deterioration of insulation performance will occur. Failure of an insulator may result in a fallen conductor – there was a recently recorded instance in 2011 of an insulator failure resulting in a conductor drop event.

Another issue is the deterioration in the condition of the steel earthwire due to corrosion. Previous inspections and the latest aerial imagery on the line indicate there is widespread and some pitted rust on the single circuit section of Line 12. Ongoing deterioration could lead to metal loss and compromise the mechanical strength of the earthwire, and potentially lead to a fallen conductor event.

Other issues on the line include, but are not limited to:

- Deterioration of tower steelwork and foundation condition due to corrosion due to corrosion – deterioration, particularly of critical members such as tower legs which cannot be readily replaced, can lead to failure and subsequently compromise structural integrity
- Deterioration of conductor spacers, conductor and earthwire fittings, and earthwire dampers – failure of the fitting attachment can result in a fallen conductor
- Deterioration on asset components relating to public safety such as climbing deterrents and signage

There is a need to remediate these issues to:

- Manage network safety risk levels “As-Low-As Reasonably-Practicable” in accordance with the regulation obligations and TransGrid’s business risk appetite. Under the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014 Section 5 ‘A network operator must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the design, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of its network (or any part of its network) is safe.’
- Provide an economic benefit to consumers through reductions in safety and bushfire risks. The direct impact of asset failure can result in a conductor drop event with potential fire ignition and/or safety hazard consequences to the general public, as evaluated in the associated modelling.

If the condition issues on the line are not addressed through the timely implementation of the preferred technically and commercially feasible remediation option, then the asset will operate with increasing probability of failure as it continues to deteriorate. This will lead to consumers bearing an increasing amount of safety and bushfire risk.

Consequently, the proposed project has an economic benefits need, and addressed this need will provide avoided cost savings from reduced in bushfire and safety risk, and maintenance costs that would otherwise occur without refurbishment.

Appendix B provides a summary of the number of structures with condition issues within each asset component category. The figures for each (Option A and Option B) are based on the Transmission Line Refurbishment Criteria document.

2. Related needs/opportunities

- Need N2476: Line 12/76 Refurbishment
- Need N2541: Line 30 Refurbishment
- Need N2550: FY24-FY28 OPGW Rollouts

3. Options

The base case for this assessment is a 'do nothing' scenario, where the assets are left in service until they fail and require replacement. In addition to the base case, three remediation options have been considered. The first, Option A involves a targeted program to address components which have experienced the greatest deterioration. The second, Option B, involves addressing all identified condition issues on the line and replacing corroded sections on both earthwires with an equivalent type. The third, Option C, involves addressing all identified condition issues on the line and replacing one earthwire in entirety with new OPGW fibre connection and replacing the other with an equivalent type.

3.1 Base case

It is noted that a 'run to fail' scenario, where the issues are addressed through increased asset monitoring and preventative maintenance tasks, is not a valid base case for this Need. The condition issues on the asset have already been identified through maintenance inspections, and increasing inspections will not rectify them.

The base case will instead be defined as a 'do nothing' scenario, where the assets are left in service until they fail and require replacement. The replacement cost has been captured in the NPV assessment under financial risk cost.

3.2 Options evaluated

Option A — Remediate identified condition issues for line components that have experienced greater deterioration and/or reached the end of their functional lives [NOSA N1271, OFS N1271A]

Option A will address the condition issues on the line with the exception of the deterioration of the steel earthwire condition due to corrosion. Detail of scope can be found in Appendix B.

It is estimated that this option would cost $2.05 million ± 25% ($2020-21). This option is expected to be completed within the 2024 – 2028 regulatory period, and within 21 months following DG1.

Option B — Refurbish all asset components that have been identified as having condition issues, and replace the corroded sections on both earthwires with an equivalent type [NOSA N1271, OFS N1271B].

Option B will address the condition issues on the line including replacement of 8km of earthwire. Detail of scope can be found in Appendix B.

It is estimated that this option would cost $3.19 million ± 25% ($2020-21). This option is expected to be completed within the 2024 – 2028 regulatory period, and within 22 months following DG1.

Option C — Refurbish all asset components that have been identified as having condition issues, and replace the existing earthwire on the line. [NOSA N1271, OFS N1271C].

Option C will address the condition issues on the line including replacement of one earthwire for the entirety of the route with a new OPGW fibre connection and the other earthwire with an equivalent type. There is a need to replace the earthwire with OPGW to provide reliable, high bandwidth and high speed data communication services to support the power system security of the network. The replacement to OPGW also mitigates single point of failures presented by shared radio towers and propagation paths by deploying route diversity.

It is estimated that this option would cost $4.20 million ± 25% ($2020-21). The benefits are resultant from the mitigation of corrective maintenance financial risks associated with higher deployed asset quantities associated with microwave links and some annualised operating expenditure savings through the removal of microwave licensing and tower inspection requirements.

There are also additional operational benefits available from the modernisation of the digital assets allowing enhanced remote monitoring, control and interrogation, efficiency gains in responding to faults, and phasing out of obsolete and legacy systems and protocols, which provide demonstrable operating cost savings to electricity consumers by minimising the potential for equipment outages and reducing the need to deploy investigative staff to remote sites.

This option is expected to be completed within the 2024 – 2028 regulatory period, and within 24 months following DG1.

3.3 Options considered and not progressed

The following options were considered but not progressed:

Table 2 Options considered and not progressed

Option	Reason for not progressing
Increased inspections	The condition issues have already been identified and cannot be rectified through increased inspections.
Elimination of all associated risk	This can only be achieved through retirement and decommissioning of the associated assets which is not feasible.
New transmission line	Due to significant costs of this option, a new double circuit 330 kV transmission line is not considered commercially feasible.
Non-network solutions	TransGrid does not consider non-network options to be commercially and technically feasible to assist with meeting the identified need, as non-network options will not mitigate the environment (bushfire) and safety posed as a result of corrosion-related asset deterioration.

4. Evaluation

4.1 Commercial evaluation methodology

The economic assessment undertaken for this project includes three scenarios that reflect a central set assumptions based on current information that is most likely to eventuate (central scenario), a set of assumptions that give rise to a lower bound for net benefits (lower bound scenario), and a set of assumptions that give rise to an upper bound on benefits (higher bound scenario).

Assumptions for each scenario are set out in the table below.

Table 3 Scenario parameters

Parameter	Central scenario	Lower bound scenario	Higher bound scenario
Discount rate	4.8%	7.37%	2.23%
Capital cost	100%	125%	75%

Parameter	Central scenario	Lower bound scenario	Higher bound scenario
Operating expenditure	100%	75%	125%
Risk costs benefits	100%	75%	125%
Other benefits	100%	75%	125%
Scenario weighting	**50%**	**25%**	**25%**

Parameters used in this commercial evaluation:

Table 4 Key parameters

Parameter	Parameter Description	Value used for this evaluation
Discount year	Year that dollar values are discounted to	2020/2021
Base year	The year that dollar value outputs are expressed in real terms	2020/2021 dollars
Period of analysis	Number of years included in economic analysis with remaining capital value included as terminal value at the end of the analysis period.	25 years
Expected asset life	Period of depreciation of the asset	35 years
ALARP disproportionality	Multiplier of the environmental and safety related risk cost included in NPV analysis to demonstrate implementation of obligation to reduce to ALARP.	Refer to section 4.3 for details.

The capex figures in this OER do not include any real cost escalation.

4.2 Commercial evaluation results

The commercial evaluation of the technically feasible options is set out in Table 5. Details appear in Appendix A.

Table 5 - Commercial evaluation (PV, $ million)

Option	Capital Cost PV	Other Benefit PV	Central scenario NPV	Lower bound scenario NPV	Higher bound scenario NPV	Weighted NPV	Ranking
Option A	1.71	0.00	0.37	-0.87	2.56	0.61	3
Option B	2.65	0.00	14.03	5.21	30.88	16.04	2
Option C	3.49	1.75	15.19	5.43	33.55	17.34	1

Based on the commercial analysis, Option C is the preferred option as it yields the highest weighted NPV and is technically and commercially feasible. The main driver of the benefit in the NPV is bushfire risk benefit.

4.3 ALARP evaluation

TransGrid manages and mitigates bushfire and safety risk to ensure they are below risk tolerance levels or 'As Low As Reasonably Practicable' ('ALARP'), in accordance with the regulation obligations and TransGrid's business risk appetite. Under the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014 Section 5 'A network operator must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the design, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of its network (or any part of its network) is safe.' TransGrid maintains an Electricity Network Safety Management System (ENSMS) to meet this obligation.[4]

In its Network Risk Assessment Methodology, under the ALARP test with the application of a gross disproportionate factor[5], the weighted benefits are expected to exceed the cost. TransGrid's analysis concludes that the costs are less than the weighted benefits from mitigating bushfire and safety risks. The proposed investment will enable TransGrid to continue to manage and operate this part of the network to a safety and risk mitigation level of ALARP.

Evaluation of the above options has been completed in accordance with As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP) obligations. The Network Safety Risk Reduction is calculated as 6 x Bushfire Risk Reduction + 6 x Safety Risk Reduction + 0.1 x Reliability Risk Reduction.

Results of the ALARP evaluation are set out in Table 6.

Table 6 - Reasonably practicable test ($ million)

Option	Network Safety Risk Reduction	Annualised Capex	Reasonably Practicable?[6]
A	0.12	0.12	Y
B	0.54	0.19	Y
C	0.54	0.25	Y

The result of the ALARP evaluation is that all three options meet the ALARP threshold.

4.4 Preferred option

The preferred option is Option C, as it has the highest weighted NPV result of all the technically and commercially feasible options considered as part of this need. Option C also meets the ALARP threshold. The optimal delivery date for this option is 2024/2025 based on an optimal timing analysis (see Section 5).

Capital and Operating Expenditure

The required capex expenditure is $4.20 million.

The option includes OPGW opex benefits of $0.01m and other benefits of $0.1m per annum.

The benefits are resultant from the mitigation of corrective maintenance financial risks associated with higher deployed asset quantities associated with microwave links and some annualised operating expenditure savings through the removal of microwave licensing and tower inspection requirements.

There are also additional operational benefits available from the modernisation of the digital assets allowing enhanced remote monitoring, control and interrogation, efficiency gains in responding to faults, and phasing out of

---

[4] TransGrid's ENSMS follows the International Organization for Standardization's ISO31000 risk management framework which requires following hierarchy of hazard mitigation approach

[5] In accordance with the framework for applying the ALARP principle, a disproportionality factor of 6 has been applied to risk cost figures. The values of the disproportionality factors were determined through a review of practises and legal interpretations across multiple industries, with particular reference to the works of the UK Health and Safety Executive. The methodology used to determine the disproportionality factors in this document is in line with the principles and examples presented in the AER Replacement Planning Guidelines and is consistent with TransGrid's Revised Revenue Proposal 2023/24- 2027/28.

[6]

obsolete and legacy systems and protocols, which provide demonstrable operating cost savings to electricity consumers by minimising the potential for equipment outages and reducing the need to deploy investigative staff to remote sites.

Regulatory Investment Test

A regulatory investment test for transmission (RIT-T) is not required as the estimated capital cost for the preferred option is below the threshold of $6 million.

5. Optimal Timing

In consideration of the delivery requirements and the economic benefit NPV analysis for the need, its optimal timing is 2024/2025.

The test for optimal timing of the preferred option has been undertaken. The approach taken is to identify the optimal commissioning year for the preferred option where net benefits (including avoided risk costs and safety disproportionality tests) of the preferred option exceeds the annualised costs of the option. The optimal timing assessment considers the delivery requirements of the project and the estimated delivery timeline of two years in the OFS.

The commencement year is determined based on the required project disbursement to meet the commissioning year based on the OFS.

The results of optimal timing analysis is:

- Optimal commissioning year: 2024/2025
- Commissioning year annual benefit: $0.50 million
- Annualised cost: $0.25 million

Based on the optimal timing, the project is expected to be completed in the 2024-2028 Regulatory Period.

6. Recommendation

The preferred option is Option C, as it has the highest weighted NPV result of all the technically and commercially feasible options considered as part of this need.

It is therefore recommended that this option be scoped in detail, so that it can be progressed from DG1 to DG2. Total project cost is $4.20 million including an amount of $0.5 million to progress the project from DG1 to DG2.

Appendix A – Option Summaries[7]

Project Description	Line 12 Refurbishment		
Option Description	Option A - Refurbish components that meet primary condition criteria only		
Project Summary			
Option Rank	*3*	Investment Assessment Period	*25*
Asset Life	*35*	NPV Year	2020/2021
Economic Evaluation			
NPV @ Central Benefit Scenario (PV, $m)	0.37	Annualised CAPEX @ Central Benefit Scenario ($m)	Annualised Capex - Standard (Business Case) 0.12
NPV @ Lower Bound Scenario (PV, $m)	-0.87	Network Safety Risk Reduction ($m)	Network Safety Risk Reduction 0.12
NPV @ Higher Bound Scenario (PV, $m)	2.56	ALARP	ALARP Compliant? Yes
NPV Weighted (PV, $m)	0.61	Optimal Timing	Optimal timing (Business Case) 2030
Cost (Central Scenario)			
Total Capex ($m)	2.05	Cost Capex (PV,$m)	1.71
Terminal Value ($m)	0.53	Terminal Value (PV,$m)	0.14
Risk (Central Scenario)	**Pre**	**Post**	**Benefit**
Reliability (PV,$m)	Reliability Risk (Pre) 1.38	Reliability Risk (Post) 1.34	Pre – Post 0.04
Financial (PV,$m)	Financial Risk (Pre) 1.00	Financial Risk (Post) 0.95	Pre – Post 0.05
Operational/Compliance (PV,$m)	Operational Risk (Pre) 0.00	Operational Risk (Post) 0.00	Pre – Post 0.00
Safety (PV,$m)	Safety Risk (Pre) 12.39	Safety Risk (Post) 12.22	Pre – Post 0.17
Environmental (PV,$m)	Environmental Risk (Pre) 3.92	Environmental Risk (Post) 2.24	Pre – Post 1.68
Reputational ($m)	Reputational Risk (Pre) 0.06	Reputational Risk (Post) 0.06	Pre – Post 0.00
Total Risk (PV,$m)	Total Risk (Pre) 18.76	Total Risk (Post) 16.82	Pre – Post 1.94
OPEX Benefit (PV,$m)			OPEX Benefit 0.00
Other benefit (PV,$m)			Incremental Net Benefit 0.00
Total Benefit (PV,$m)			Business Case Total Benefit 1.94

Commissioning year annual benefit ($k): 124.16

[7] Figures may not add due to rounding.

Project Description	Line 12 Refurbishment		
Option Description	Option B - Refurbish all asset components identified as having condition issues		
Project Summary			
Option Rank	*2*	Investment Assessment Period	*25*
Asset Life	*35*	NPV Year	2020/2021
Economic Evaluation			
NPV @ Central Benefit Scenario (PV, $m)	14.03	Annualised CAPEX @ Central Benefit Scenario ($m)	Annualised Capex - Standard (Business Case) 0.19
NPV @ Lower Bound Scenario (PV, $m)	5.21	Network Safety Risk Reduction ($m)	Network Safety Risk Reduction 0.54
NPV @ Higher Bound Scenario (PV, $m)	30.88	ALARP	ALARP Compliant? Yes
NPV Weighted (PV, $m)	16.04	Optimal Timing	Optimal timing (Business Case) 2025
Cost (Central Scenario)			
Total Capex ($m)	3.19	Cost Capex (PV,$m)	2.65
Terminal Value ($m)	0.82	Terminal Value (PV,$m)	0.21
Risk (Central Scenario)	**Pre**	**Post**	**Benefit**
Reliability (PV,$m)	Reliability Risk (Pre) 1.38	Reliability Risk (Post) 0.16	Pre – Post 1.22
Financial (PV,$m)	Financial Risk (Pre) 1.00	Financial Risk (Post) 0.11	Pre – Post 0.89
Operational/Compliance (PV,$m)	Operational Risk (Pre) 0.00	Operational Risk (Post) 0.00	Pre – Post 0.00
Safety (PV,$m)	Safety Risk (Pre) 12.39	Safety Risk (Post) 1.36	Pre – Post 11.03
Environmental (PV,$m)	Environmental Risk (Pre) 3.92	Environmental Risk (Post) 0.66	Pre – Post 3.26
Reputational ($m)	Reputational Risk (Pre) 0.06	Reputational Risk (Post) 0.01	Pre – Post 0.05
Total Risk (PV,$m)	Total Risk (Pre) 18.76	Total Risk (Post) 2.29	Pre – Post 16.46
OPEX Benefit (PV,$m)			OPEX Benefit 0.00
Other benefit (PV,$m)			Incremental Net Benefit 0.00
Total Benefit (PV,$m)			Business Case Total Benefit 16.46

Commissioning year annual benefit ($k): **613.32**

Project Description	Line 12 Refurbishment		
Option Description	Option C - Refurbish all asset components identified as having condition issues, replace earthwire with OPGW		
Project Summary			
Option Rank	*1*	Investment Assessment Period	*25*
Asset Life	*35*	NPV Year	2020/2021
Economic Evaluation			
NPV @ Central Benefit Scenario (PV, $m)	15.19	Annualised CAPEX @ Central Benefit Scenario ($m)	Annualised Capex - Standard (Business Case) 0.25
NPV @ Lower Bound Scenario (PV, $m)	5.43	Network Safety Risk Reduction ($m)	Network Safety Risk Reduction 0.54
NPV @ Higher Bound Scenario (PV, $m)	33.55	ALARP	ALARP Compliant? Yes
NPV Weighted (PV, $m)	17.34	Optimal Timing	Optimal timing (Business Case) 2025
Cost (Central Scenario)			
Total Capex ($m)	4.20	Cost Capex (PV,$m)	3.49
Terminal Value ($m)	1.08	Terminal Value (PV,$m)	0.28
Risk (Central Scenario)	**Pre**	**Post**	**Benefit**
Reliability (PV,$m)	Reliability Risk (Pre) 1.38	Reliability Risk (Post) 0.16	Pre – Post 1.22
Financial (PV,$m)	Financial Risk (Pre) 1.00	Financial Risk (Post) 0.11	Pre – Post 0.89
Operational/Compliance (PV,$m)	Operational Risk (Pre) 0.00	Operational Risk (Post) 0.00	Pre – Post 0.00
Safety (PV,$m)	Safety Risk (Pre) 12.39	Safety Risk (Post) 1.36	Pre – Post 11.03
Environmental (PV,$m)	Environmental Risk (Pre) 3.92	Environmental Risk (Post) 0.66	Pre – Post 3.26
Reputational ($m)	Reputational Risk (Pre) 0.06	Reputational Risk (Post) 0.01	Pre – Post 0.05
Total Risk (PV,$m)	Total Risk (Pre) 18.76	Total Risk (Post) 2.29	Pre – Post 16.46
OPEX Benefit (PV,$m)			OPEX Benefit 0.19
Other benefit (PV,$m)			Incremental Net Benefit 1.75
Total Benefit (PV,$m)			Business Case Total Benefit 18.40

Commissioning year annual benefit ($k): **495.72**

Appendix B – Structure with Condition Issues by Asset Category

Asset Component Category	Cause	Effect	Consequence	No. of Structures	
				Option A	Option B
Conductor Fittings	Corrosion of fittings.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	2	2
Conductor Spacers	Corrosion of spacers.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Earthwire	Corrosion of earthwire.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	0	23
Earthwire Dampers	Dampers are drooping.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Earthwire Fittings	Corrosion of fittings.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Foundations	Structure legs covered with soil. Failure of critical members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	3	3

Asset Component Category	Cause	Effect	Consequence	No. of Structures	
				Option A	Option B
Insulator	Porcelain insulators have reached end of serviceable life.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	7	9
Public Safety – Climbing Deterrents	Deteriorated.	Unauthorised access	Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	7	7
Public Safety – Danger Signs	Deteriorated.	Unauthorised access	Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	4	4
Tower Body	Corrosion of tower members. Failure of critical members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Tower Crossarm	Corrosion of tower members. Failure of critical members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Tower Fasteners	Corrosion of nuts and bolts. Can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1