1. Format for submissions
   1. Three tables are provided for submitters to use for providing feedback on this consultation paper:
      * 1. a table for responses to the questions set out in the paper;
        2. a table for views on the Code amendment proposals set out in Table 5 in Appendix D, including drafting comments relating to the corresponding draft Code amendment provided in Appendix C; and
        3. a table for views on the Authority’s consideration of items outside the scope of this review as set out in Table 6 in Appendix E.

Table 2 – Form for response to questions from the consultation paper

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question No. | Question | Response |
| 1 | Do you agree the proposed Code amendment to introduce a lower cost connection process promotes the Authority’s statutory objective? If not, please explain why not. |  |
| 2 | What improvements should the Authority consider to the proposed Part 1A process? |  |
| 3 | Which organisations should undertake education and awareness initiatives relating to the connection of DG? If so, what specific initiatives do you think should be considered? |  |
| 4 | Do you consider a three month implementation period gives distributors a reasonable time period in which to prepare for the proposed changes? |  |
| 5 | Do you agree that the proposed technical and operational Code amendments promote the Authority’s objective? Feedback on the individual proposals from Table 5 in Appendix D should be included using Table 3 in Appendix A. |  |
| 6 | Do you have any new proposed amendments to Part 6 of the Code that you consider would be of long-term benefit to consumers? Please describe the proposal and its intended purpose. |  |
| 7 | Are you satisfied that the Authority and the Rulings Panel are the most appropriate bodies to resolve disputes in respect of the regulated terms, as provided for in clause 6.8(1)(a) and Schedule 6.3? If not, what alternative would you favour? |  |
| 8 | What options should be considered by the Authority for improving the existing dispute resolution process? |  |
| 9 | What amendments to clause 6.11, if any, do you propose in order to promote the long-term benefit of consumers? |  |
| 10 | In your view, is there a problem with the priority of applications under clause 17 of Schedule 6.1 or the approach to managing congestion on distribution networks? If so, what is/are the problem(s), the options, and your preferred solution to promote the long-term benefit of consumers? |  |
| 11 | In your view, is there a problem with the requirements of clause 18 of Schedule 6.1 relating to the distributor’s imposition of conditions on an application for connection of DG? If so, what is/are the problem(s), the options and your preferred solution to promote the long-term benefit of consumers? |  |
| 12 | Do you consider the liability limits under the regulated terms best promote the long-term benefit of consumers? If not, what limits would be more suitable? |  |
| 13 | Would there be a long-term benefit for consumers in seeking to develop nationally consistent inverter protection settings (as set out in paragraph 4.6.3) that are also consistent with distributors’ connection and operation standards? |  |
| 14 | Would you prefer a regulatory or non-regulatory measure to create nationally consistent protection settings for inverters? In the case of a non-regulatory measure, would an Authority guideline, an industry guideline or a New Zealand Standard be preferable? |  |
| 15 | What settings, or ranges of settings, would be appropriate? |  |

Table 3 – Form for response to individual proposals from Appendix D

| Proposal Reference | Do you agree that the corresponding draft Code amendment set out in Appendix D promotes the Authority’s statutory objective? If not, please explain why not. |
| --- | --- |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |
| 7[[1]](#footnote-1) |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 |  |
| 29 |  |
| 30 |  |
| 31 |  |
| 32 |  |
| 33 |  |
| 34 |  |
| 35 |  |
| 36 |  |
| 37 |  |
| 38 |  |
| 39 |  |
| 40 |  |
| 41 |  |
| 42 |  |
| 43 |  |
| 44 |  |
| 45 |  |
| 46 |  |
| 47 |  |
| 48 |  |
| 49 |  |
| 50 |  |
| 51 |  |
| 52 |  |
| 53 |  |
| 54 |  |
| 55 |  |
| 56 |  |
| 57 |  |
| 58 |  |
| 59 |  |
| 60 |  |
| 61 |  |
| 62 |  |
| 63 |  |
| 64 |  |
| 65 |  |
| 66 |  |
| 67 |  |
| 68 |  |

Table 1 – Form for response to individual items from Appendix E

| Item Reference | Response and/or comment on the corresponding item set out in Appendix E |
| --- | --- |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 |  |
| 29 |  |
| 30 |  |
| 31 |  |
| 32 |  |
| 33 |  |
| 34 |  |
| 35 |  |
| 36 |  |
| 37 |  |
| 38 |  |
| 39 |  |
| 40 |  |
| 41 |  |
| 42 |  |
| 43 |  |
| 44 |  |
| 45 |  |
| 46 |  |
| 47 |  |
| 48 |  |
| 49 |  |
| 50 |  |

1. Note that questions five, six and seven of the consultation paper also deal with this topic. The Authority requests that submitters only include detail in this field that is not included in their submissions on questions five, six and seven. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)