

TPM technical amendments: Implementing regulatory asset base indexation and clarifying the simple method benefit-based charge cap

User:

Submitted: 5/08/2025 12:52:05 pm

Reference: c80421ef-2ef0-4517-a876-b330000e4f18

Summary of information submitted

Contact information

Organisation

Home

Name

Tui Williams

Email *(This information will be redacted from the published version of your submission)*

[REDACTED]

Contact number *(This information will be redacted from the published version of your submission)*

[REDACTED]

Submissions

Would you like to upload a submission or fill in a submission form here

Complete the form here

Introduction (Optional)

Q1. Do you agree the issues identified by the Authority are worthy of attention, and that the proposed changes effectively address those issues?

If you mean do I see you will charge more yes I do see as the more your worth the more you will charge instead of the more we are worth the more we are looked after as citizens,if you effectively want to chargemore when growing and expanding then make deals with businesses to operate but leave homes alone,I myself have no intention of allowing this lines charge to be around and your change means the more your assets are worth the more we pay as in we are paying your insurance. Outcome pay your own insurance your lucky your here,

Q2. Do you agree the issues with the SMBC are worthy of attention, and that the proposed changes effectively address those issues?

No,what needs to happen is you carry all the costs,as citizens born here or immigrated we never asked for the intrusion into our lives of power poles or transmissions,what you did was firstly take away our rights as citizens to be self sufficient and instead rely on you at first being a small cost now being major,I would not care if you left tomorrow,you are like an oil baron loading over nz stealing into our homes

Q3. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? If not, why not?

Because it's a revenue gathering scam I don't agree with i have stated why,you want to bring your asset worth online with what you charge as if I asked for you,I did not.

Q4. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs?

No,

Q5. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to the other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objective in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.

What needs to happen first is the commerce commission is fired immediately for the disgraceful way it sold homes to the devil and the people inside the homes are screaming

an unnatural death from being so poor as to fight for every scrap like a backward country and the only help your offering is more debt to homes and people. Get out of our country, as nz citizens the first government proliferation and limb to be safe and plentiful those were the exact words and costs to consumers of basic living were in line with wages and the present net worth of each citizen right now I pay as much to live as a billionaire in nz the same costs, it is untenable and government verse that we nz people are all the same means you are charging us the same it's not right

Q6. Do you agree the Authority's proposed amendment complies with section 32(1) of the Act?

No all acts in parliament are people first acts and nothing about any proposal here is people first you want to not be charged for your own asset and make us pay your insurance. I can read i read evil.

Q7. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? If not, why not?

I agree you are objectifying nz people as you are asking us to take the costs of your assets without us taking over the rights of your assets as in making decisions on money and assets

Q8. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs?

No and i will argue all the way to the supreme court nz and lines company and transmissions company were never meant to put people in the poor house, you are both doing something wrong upstairs to not navigate strategically better instead bringing a whole farm in to deal with one sheep and leave with the sheep intended, look at yourselves, give the job away we I never will be controlled by this.

Q9. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to the other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objective in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.

All options result in more costs i agree with the option where you take on the costs from your profits and invest the rest in renewal sustainability.

Q10. Do you agree the Authority's proposed amendment complies with section 32(1) of the Act?

No

Q11. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?

That costs of this change are never passed on to us nz citizens.

Privacy (Please specify which question response require redaction prior to publication)

Does this submission contain sensitive information

No
