# Security of Supply Forecasting and Information Policy Review Consultation Questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Submission Date:** |  |
| **Organisation:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1:** Do you support our proposal to amend the SOSFIP? |
|  |
| **Question 2:** Are there any other SOSFIP amendment options we should consider? Please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority’s statutory objective in the Electricity Industry Act 2010 and consideration of practicality of the solution to implement it. |
|  |
| **Question 3:** Do you have any feedback on our Energy Security Outlook and/or Quarterly Security of Supply Outlook communications? This may include suggestions about how we could make them more useful and accessible in future. |
|  |
| **Question 4:** Do you agree that introducing an additional ERC and SST scenario using contracted fuel information to our Energy Security Outlooks would better support understanding about forward energy risks, and mitigating actions by participants? This scenario would be in addition to continuing to provide the current physical capability scenario. Please provide your reasons. |
|  |
| **Question 5:** How far into the future do you think any contracted fuel information scenario should be modelled? This could be any duration up to the full length of the physical capability scenario, which is up to 24 months. Please explain your rationale. |
|  |
| **Question 6:** Do you agree with our proposal to replace the current worst-case SST with a time-to SST that is progressively less pessimistic into the future? Note the time-to SST will be used to determine the estimated time-to for Alert, OCC and as part of our CSRB buffer discretion process? Please provide reasons for your answer. |
|  |
| **Question 7:** Do you agree with the proposal to update the definition of the Watch curve to ensure Watch is always above the Alert curve, and our preference for Option 1? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 8:** Do you agree with the proposal to have a minimum time under Alert of 4 weeks to reduce the uncertainty? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 9:** Do you agree with the proposal to change our ERCs and SSTs tools and analysis to a 3-hour model (rather than the current day-night model)? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 10:** Do you agree with the proposal to enhance our NZGB and Energy Security Outlook reporting for greater alignment by extending the NZGB time horizon, adding addition capacity scenarios to NZGB and including capacity risk assessment (using NZGB) to Energy Security Outlooks? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 11:** Do you agree with the proposal to expand the systems risks for consideration as part of the quarterly scenario assessments? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 12:** Do you agree with the proposal to update the Alert CSRB buffer for the access to contingent hydro storage? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 13:** Do you agree with the proposal for the System Operator to retain the CSRB buffer discretion process? If not, please provide reasons for your answers. |
|  |
| **Question 14:** Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed SOSFIP amendment? |
|  |
| **Question 15:** Do you agree it is appropriate to rely on qualitative evaluation of the costs and benefits of the proposed SOSFIP amendment? If not, what information, evidence etc can you provide and/or what methods would you recommend to quantify the costs and benefits? |
|  |
| **Question 16:** Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment to the SOSFIP can reasonably be expected to outweigh its costs. |
|  |
| **Question 17:** Do you agree that the proposed amendment complies with section 32(1) of the Act? |
|  |
| **Any other comments:** |
|  |