|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Response template for consultation on the Administration of the  Green Gas Support Scheme | | |

This template contains all the questions posed within the Administration of the Green Gas Support Scheme (GGSS) consultation document. Through this template we’re aiming to collect your feedback on our proposals on how we will administer the Green Gas Support Scheme. We welcome your views and encourage you to respond to the questions that are of most interest. Please provide your contact details in the fields below. To respond, please provide your views in the space below the relevant question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Organisation Name: |  |
| Organisational Type: |  |
| Completed by: |  |
| Contact details: |  |

# Consultation Questions

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Is there any additional information that you think should be included in Provisional Tariff Guarantee Notices (PTGNs)? |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the administration of tariff guarantees? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed evidence requirements for demonstrating that a plant has commissioned? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. In relation to providing evidence of commissioning, are there other standards, practices, procedures or tests that should be considered? Please provide evidence to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the equipment we have suggested is included in our interpretation of ‘equipment used to produce biomethane’ and therefore must not have been previously used to produce biomethane? Please provide evidence to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. In addition to any points made in relation to questions above relating to specific aspects of registration (questions 3-5), do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to registration? Please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach to making payments? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any comments on the proposed process for submitting injection data? |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed fuel measurement and sampling (FMS) process? Do you have any suggestions on how it could be improved? |
|  |
| 1. We propose that the FMS questionnaire for the GGSS will be a similar format to the existing FMS questionnaire on the NDRHI scheme. Do you have any comments on the NDRHI FMS questionnaire and/or any suggestions on how it could be improved? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any comments on the overall arrangements for reporting on the waste and fossil fuel content of feedstocks? |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach to the greenhouse gas criteria? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach to the land criteria? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposals for preparing and submitting annual sustainability audit reports? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to require annual, independently assured audit information as further validation of GGSS/RTFO interaction by biomethane producers? Please give your reasons and any appropriate evidence to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to require independently assured audit information on GGSS/RTFO interaction as an additional section to an Annual Sustainability Audit rather than as a separate stand-alone report instead? Please provide reasons and any appropriate evidence to support your answer. |
|  |
| 1. Are you aware of any reason why an auditor could not assess the proposed additional requirements, and do you think both the current sustainability reporting requirement and the proposed RTFO interaction section could be provided by the same auditor? Please provide reasons for your answer/s. |
|  |
| 1. What documentation and/or evidence would you be able to provide to an independent auditor to demonstrate that dual claiming for the same biomethane is not taking place? |
|  |
| 1. Can you suggest any different approaches that could be taken to evidence GGSS/RTFO interaction by biomethane producers? Please provide reasons for your answer/s and supporting evidence. |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any additional comments on our proposed administration of GGSS/RTFO interaction? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any feedback on our proposal that all registered producers will be subject to a site audit during the first year of operation? Please provide evidence and examples to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any comments on the process for addressing overpayment? |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with our proposed administration of the right of review? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that new producers should be able to meet outstanding obligations on behalf of the previous registered producer? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any additional comments on how we will administer the change of registration process? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any comments on the process for withdrawing from the scheme? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any suggestions for additional information that could be included in quarterly and annual reports, or on the format of the reports? |
|  |
| 1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach to managing a shortfall in scheme funding? If you disagree, please provide alternative suggestions, including any evidence, to support your response. |
|  |