

## Appendix A Format for submissions: Switch process review issues paper

Submitter	Tenco
-----------	-------

Please answer the general questions once (Q1 and Q2).

For each individual issue you will be responding to (1 to 22), please answer questions Q3 to Q5. The template below has been started with the first two issues.

Question	Response
<i>General questions</i>	
Q1. Which, if any, of the 22 issues raised in this paper do you consider should not be investigated further? Please give reasons.	<i>Null</i>
Q2. Are there any issues not raised in this paper that you consider should be investigated? Please identify these other issues and give reasons why they should be investigated.	<i>No</i>
<i>Issue #18 The process for switching ICPs between distributors is inefficient</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	This is very material issue from our perspective and this should be considered when the switch review goes further. The current process is manual where email's between participants is the only method available to advise the active retailer of ICP switches between distributors. A retailer often wins an ICP and will then be notified that the ICP is being switched.
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	Yes, embedded networks are continually increasing, and the owners are selling their properties more frequently.

Question	Response
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	The registry and code was never intended for the number of embedded networks as we have today.