

Format for submissions

Submitter	
------------------	--

Questions	Comments
Problem definition	
Q1. Do you agree with the problem definition above? Why, why not?	
Proposed solution: principles-based rebates	
Q2. Do you agree with these principles? Why, why not?	
Q3. Do you agree that the principles should only apply to mass-market consumers, or should they apply to larger consumers and generators also? Why, why not?	
Q4. Do you agree the principles should apply to all mass-market DG, including inflexible generation (noting that the amount of rebate provided will still be based on the benefit the DG provides)?	
Q5. Do you agree with the direction of the guidance that would likely accompany the principles? Why, why not?	
Q6. Are there any additional issues with the principles where guidance would be particularly helpful?	
Q7. Do you agree the principles should be incorporated within the Code, rather than being voluntary principles outside the Code? Why, why not?	
Q8. Do you agree with the proposed implementation timeline for this proposal? If not, please set out your preferred timeline and explain why that is preferable.	
Q9. Do you agree the proposal strikes the right balance between encouraging	

price-based flexibility and contracted flexibility? Why, why not?	
Q10. Do you agree the proposal will lead to relatively minor wealth transfers in the short term, and will lead to cost savings for all consumers in the longer term?	
Alternative option: prescribed rebates	
Q11. Do you agree that more prescriptive requirements to provide rebates will be less workable than a principles-based approach, and therefore should not be preferred? Why, why not?	
Alternative option: consumption-linked injection tariffs	
Q12. Do you agree that a consumption-linked injection tariff would not be sufficiently targeted, and therefore should not be preferred? Why, why not?	
Q13. If this approach was progressed, do you think: a) injection rebates should perfectly mirror consumption charges? b) there are sufficient safeguards in place that would allow distributors to avoid over-incentivising injection to the extent that it incurs additional network costs?	
Regulatory statement	
Q14. Do you agree with the objective of the proposed amendment? If not, why not?	
Q15. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh the costs?	
Q16. 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 objectives in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.	

Proposed amendment Code drafting

Q17. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?