Appendix A Format for submissions

**Submitter**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Comments** |
| Q1.1 Do you support the Authority’s proposal to amend the Code to require smaller generating stations to comply with frequency-related asset owner performance obligations? |  |
| Q1.2 Do you consider the ‘legacy clause’ provisions in the Code amendment proposal should apply to a generating station for a finite period of time (eg. 10 years)? Please explain your answer. |  |
| Q1.3 Do you see any unintended consequences in making such an amendment? Please explain your answer. |  |
| Q1.4 Do you agree the proposed Code amendment is preferable to the other options identified? If you disagree, please explain why and give your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority’s main statutory objective in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010. |  |
| Q1.5 Do you agree with the analysis presented in the Regulatory Statement? If not, why not? |  |
| Q1.6 Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q2.1 Do you consider there to be any type of generation technology that cannot, and never will be able to, comply with a dead band of ±0.1Hz? Please explain your answer. |  |
| Q2.2 Do you support the Authority’s proposal to amend the Code to specify a permitted maximum dead band of ±0.1Hz, beyond which a generating station must contribute to frequency management and support? |  |
| Q2.3 Do you see any unintended consequences in making such an amendment? Please explain your answer. |  |
| Q2.4 Do you agree the proposed Code amendment is preferable to the other options identified? If you disagree, please explain why and give your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority’s main statutory objective in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010. |  |
| Q2.5 Do you agree with the analysis presented in the Regulatory Statement? If not, why not? |  |
| Q2.6 Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment? |  |