

20 September 2016

Submissions
Electricity Authority
PO Box 10041
Wellington 6143

VECTOR AMS
LEVEL 1, SEABRIDGE HOUSE
110 FEATHERSTON STREET
PO BOX 39980
WELLINGTON 6011
NEW ZEALAND
VECTORAMS.CO.NZ

Sent by email to: submissions@ea.govt.nz

To whom it may concern;

Feedback on reorientation of advisory groups

1. This is Vector Advanced Metering Services' (VAMS) submission on the Electricity Authority's (Authority) consultation on the proposed reorientation of its advisory groups.
2. AMS feels that the membership focus of the WAG and RAG advisory groups has been limited to retailers, distributors, and consumers, so we are particularly interested in the new Innovation and Participation Advisory Group (IPAG), from a Metering Equipment Provider (MEP) perspective.
3. The Market Development Advisory Group (MDAG) description and purpose outlined seems to centre on the electricity market operation, with focus on the trading market and pricing and supply. Depending on the topics and projects MDAG considers (new technology, for example) MEP representation may be beneficial as MEPs play an important part in the electricity supply chain.

Please see our responses to your specific questions in Appendix A.

If you would like to discuss further, please contact me on 03 335 5403 or andrew.baken@vector.co.nz.

Yours sincerely



Andrew Baken
Compliance Manager

Appendix A Format for submissions

Submitter	Vector Advanced Metering Services Ltd
------------------	--

#	Question	Comment
Question 1	What feedback do you have on the proposed IPAG, including its purpose and scope?	VAMS is interested in the IPAG, and can see benefits particularly around the introduction of new technologies.
Question 2	What are your views on the membership of IPAG, and how to engage the sorts of parties that will ensure it can achieve its purpose?	The consultation paper does not specifically mention MEP as possible members. However, the technical domain which the MEP operates in is evolving very quickly, with a range of new communications technologies enabling innovations within the metering/sensor space. We believe MEP participation in IPAG may help facilitate and support earlier uptake of such technologies and opportunities for the exposure of new ideas and concepts to the wider market.
Question 3	What are your views as to how the IPAG might operate, so as to best achieve its purpose?	We like the idea that the group is served by a larger pool of members from a variety of backgrounds, who contribute to specific projects on a case-by-case basis (i.e. an advisory panel-type approach). However, we believe it could benefit from a small core group to help maintain consistency across projects. We believe regular face to face meetings may not always be the most efficient use of time and better use of technology should be adopted.
Question 4	What feedback do you have on the proposed MDAG, including its purpose and scope?	Depending on the topics and projects MDAG considers, MEPs should be considered as potential members as we also play an important part in the electricity supply chain.

#	Question	Comment
Question 5	What are your views as to the membership of the MDAG, and how it should operate?	As above, MEPs should not be excluded. We also think there should be non-Authority members on the appointment panel for these two new groups to help ensure broad and non-bias selection of members.
Question 6	Do you agree with the Authority's proposal to: a) introduce new terms of reference for the IPAG and MDAG, subject to the feedback provided under Q1 - Q5 b) replace the current terms of reference for the SRC in its entirety, with an updated and streamlined version c) replace the current version of the charter in its entirety, with an updated and streamlined version?	Agree. These are new groups with new agendas in an ever changing market. This would be a good time to renew these.
Question 7	Do you agree with the Authority's assessment of its proposals? If not, what alternative assessment would you make and why?	Agree
Question 8	Are there alternatives to either of the Authority's proposals that you consider would better meet their respective objectives? If so, please describe the alternative and why it would be preferable.	None that we have identified at this time.
Question 9	Do you have any specific comments on the drafting of the proposed new versions of the Charter and terms of reference for the SRC, IPAG, and MDAG?	No