Appendix B: Format for submissions

|  |
| --- |
| **Electricity Information Exchange Protocols (EIEPs) - 2017 operational review consultation paper** |
| Submitter (contact name, position, email address): |

| **Question** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- |
| Q1. Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to the EIEP Overview document? |  |
| Q2. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the EIEP1 sections “Application” and “Description of when this protocol applies”?  If not, please provide reasons and discussion” |  |
| Q3. As a distributor, what is your preferred EIEP1 reporting methodology?  Which of the four reporting methodology options do you currently receive? |  |
| Q4. As a trader, which EIEP1 reporting methodologies can you provide? Which is your preferred reporting methodology, and why? |  |
| Q5. Do you agree that as distributors move to more cost-reflective delivery pricing that incremental [as billed/RM] normalised may no longer be suitable, and that it will require a shift to replacement RM normalised? If you disagree, please explain. |  |
| Q6. Do you agree that it is problematic for distributors receiving and processing EIEP1 files from traders using different reporting methodologies, and potentially problematic for traders depending on how the distributor manages the data based on a mix of methodologies?  Please outline any issues with mixing methodologies that you have observed. |  |
| Q7. Do you consider that there should be a default reporting methodology?  Please give reasons and state your preferred reporting methodology. |  |
| Q8. Do you agree with the Authority’s proposed Option D in paragraph 6.10(d) to amend business requirement 12?  If not, please explain. |  |
| Q9. If feedback indicates there is a clear majority favouring one of the options in paragraph 6.10 which is incompatible with your current system design, what would be the estimated cost of your system changes to align? |  |
| Q10. Do you agree with the proposed new business requirements 22 and 23 as marked up in EIEP1 (see Appendix A), restricting the distributor’s right to mix as billed and normalised data, or to normalise as billed data, where validly provided by a trader, when generating its invoice for network charges?  If you do not agree, please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q11. Do you agree with the proposal in paragraph 6.18 and marked up in EIEP1 (see Appendix A) for the replacement RM normalised methodology that sets out minimum requirements for revision files to be provided by traders, and minimum requirements on distributors to process revision files provided by traders?  If you disagree, please provide reasons and discussion? |  |
| Q12. Do you agree with adding new EIEP1 file types to be used by distributors to support their invoices for network charges?  If not, please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q13. Do you agree with amending the EIEP1 field description from ‘Network price category description’ to ‘Price category code’, and amending the validation rule to ‘Network price category code as per the Sender’s records’?  If not, what is your preference? Please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q14. Do you agree that the inconsistent approaches in EIEP1 files to unit quantity and attributes used in the calculation of the network charge are important enough that a single approach should be specified? |  |
| Q15. If participants prefer a single approach to the EIEP1 unit quantity and attributes used in calculating the network charge, do you agree that the approach outlined in paragraph 6.28 is the most sensible solution?  If not, please advise your preference and reasons.. |  |
| Q16. What is the estimated cost of your system changes to align with the preferred single approach set out in paragraph 6.28? |  |
| Q17. Are there any other amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP1? |  |
| * 1. ***New supplementary question****: background information available on the* [*consultation paper webpage*](http://www.ea.govt.nz/development/work-programme/operational-efficiencies/2017-operational-review-of-electricity-information-exchange-protocols-eieps/consultations/#c16615)*.*   2. Q17A. Where HHR data is aggregated (framed) to establish time blocked volumes for EIEP1 reporting, what should be the validation rule for the register content code and period of availability? Please provide what you consider is the most appropriate option from the list below:  1. must reflect the physical NHH channel configuration (and registry NHH channel record) 2. must reflect the source of the HHR data used for framing (and registry HHR channel record) 3. must reflect either the actual or the ‘virtual NHH channel’ data functionality that relate to the eligibility criteria for the price component code 4. must be Null.   If you do not agree with any of the options listed above, or if you have an alternative option, please provide details. |  |
| Q18. Are there any amendments that you would like to see made to EIEP2? |  |
| Q19. Are there any amendments that you would like to see made to EIEP3? |  |
| Q20. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to EIEP4?  If not, please provide reason and discussion |  |
| Q21. Are there any other amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP4? |  |
| Q22. Do you agree with making EIEP5A mandatory?  If not, please provide reasons why not and discussion. |  |
| Q23. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to EIEP5A?  If not please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q24. As a distributor, if the planned service interruption information you currently provide does not comply with EIEP5A, what would be the estimated cost to modify your notification files to comply? |  |
| Q25. Do you consider the Authority should consider option 1 described in 6.43(a)?  Please provide reasons and discussion for your view. |  |
| Q26. Do you consider the Authority should consider option 2 described 6.43(b)?  Please provide reasons and discussion for your view? |  |
| Q27. Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP5A?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q28. Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP5B? |  |
| Q29. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to EIEP6A and EIEP6B?  If not, please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q30. Are you currently using EIEP6A and/or EIEP6B? If so, what would be the estimated cost of your system changes to incorporate the proposed changes? |  |
| Q31. If you are not using EIEP6A and EIEP6B, and other participants indicate they are not using either EIEP, do you consider the EIEPs should be removed from the EIEP functional specification? |  |
| Q32. If there is support for retaining EIEP6B, should Meter detail, Meter channel detail, and Load control device detail rows be deleted? |  |
| Q33. Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP6A or EIEP6B?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q34. As a trader, do you provide any distributors with EIEP7 files?  If so, please advise when you use it and how many distributors receive files. |  |
| Q35. Do you consider EIEP7 is useful and should be retained, or should be removed from the EIEP functional specification?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q36. Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP7?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q37. Do you use EIEP8 for notifying network price category code changes?  If not, please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q38. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to EIEP8 to add a new Rejection file (together with rejection reason codes in Table 4)?  If not, please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q39. As a distributor, what would be the estimated cost of your system changes to develop/implement the proposed EIEP8 Rejection file functionality? |  |
| Q40. Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP8?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q41. Are there any amendments that you would like to see made to EIEP9?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q42. Do you use, or anticipate using, EIEP11? |  |
| Q43. If you do not use EIEP11, are you satisfied that the processes currently used for requesting and livening new ICPs, and receiving advice of creating an ICP, are effective? |  |
| Q44. If you do not use or do not anticipate using EIEP11, do you agree it should be removed from the functional specification (i.e. removed from the set of voluntary EIEPs published on the Authority’s website)? |  |
| Q45. Do you agree with the proposed changes to EIEP12? If not, please provide reasons and discussion. |  |
| Q46 Are there any amendments beyond those proposed that you would like to see made to EIEP12? Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q47. Do you consider the Authority needs to consider any new EIEPs?  Please provide discussion. |  |
| Q48. Are there any other considerations in respect of EIEPs in general that we should consider at this time? |  |
| Q49. Do you consider that six months would be sufficient time to implement the proposed amendments?  If not, what time would be required? |  |
| Q50. Noting there are no address standards for EIEPs, are there any issues or problems occurring that involved address standards in EIEPs that are exchanged between traders and distributors? |  |
| Q51. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendments, as set out in paragraph 9.1?  If not, why not? |  |
| Q52. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendments outweigh their costs, as set out in the table in section 8? |  |
| Q53. Do you agree the package of proposed amendments to EIEPs 1-9 and 12 is preferable to the option of not proceeding with some of the amendments?  If you disagree, please give reasons. |  |