|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Submitter: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Comments |
| 1. Do you agree that failing to provide key information will have an impact on the commissioning of an asset, power system security and the system operator’s ability to meet the PPOs and dispatch objective?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposal to mandate minimum time frames for the activities in Chapter 1 of the proposed CACTIS?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed time frames for asset owners to submit a commissioning plan and for the system operator to review them?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree that requiring asset owners to use a standard commissioning plan template would help streamline the preparation and review process?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed time frames for asset owners to submit asset capability statements at the planning, pre-commissioning, and final stages of the commissioning process, and for the system operator to review them?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree that formalising the asset capability statement assessment requirements will provide clarity for asset owners?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposal to formalise requirements for asset owners to provide urgent or temporary changes to asset capability statements?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed time frames for asset owners to submit m1 and m2 models, and for the system operator to review them?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree that the updated modelling requirements are necessary to reflect the increasing complexity and changing generation mix within the New Zealand power system?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree that the system operator needs TSAT and PSCAD software models to conduct the studies needed to maintain power system security and meet the PPOs?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed time frames for asset owners to submit a final connection study report, and for the system operator to review it?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed approach of using RMS studies for scenario screening and EMT studies for detailed fault ride through analysis of IBRs?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposal to require asset owners to repeat fault ride through studies when control system parameters are modified during or after commissioning?
 |  |
| 1. Do you support the proposed process for accessing encrypted models from other asset owners when needed for fault ride through studies?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed time frames for asset owners to submit a commissioning plan and for the system operator to review it?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed time frames for asset owners to submit a final engineering methodology, and for the system operator to review it?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposed testing requirements for wind, solar photovoltaic and BESS technologies?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree that the system operator needs the additional data identified in this section to maintain power system security and meet the PPOs?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the proposal to use high-speed monitoring data to verify asset performance and reduce the need for routine testing of generating stations between 10 MW and 30 MW?
 |  |
| 1. Do you agree with the data quality requirements as described in Chapter 9 of the proposed CACTIS for high-speed monitoring and operational reporting?
 |  |
| 1. Do you currently have the ability to provide the additional information proposed in the draft CACTIS? If not, when do you expect to be able to meet these requirements?
 |  |