

Appendix A Format for submissions: Switch process review issues paper

Submitter	intelliHUB – Niu Nelson
-----------	-------------------------

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.

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

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>As a new participant we have not yet come across the issues raised in this paper but happy to provide feedback where we can.</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 #1 The actual switch event date is delayed or is not as agreed</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #2 Replacing/modifying metering installations on the trader ICP switch event date is difficult</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	Medium
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	No comment to add
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	Not practical for a MEP to modify, replace or reprogram an installation to always match the switch event date.

Issue #3 Gaining traders face difficulties ensuring accurate switch event meter readings

Q3. How material is this issue?

No comment to add

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?

Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?

Issue #4 A trader should not have to issue a switch completion notification for an ICP with only unmetered load

Q3. How material is this issue?

No comment to add

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?

Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?

Issue #5 A gaining trader may face a delay receiving the first AMI meter reading for the ICP

Q3. How material is this issue?

Medium

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?

No comment to add

Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?

1. Backdated switches could cause delays for the MEP to supply reads.
2. Contracts not in place with MEP and gaining Trader.
3. No Comms flag on the Registry not utilised.

Issue #6 AMI switch event meter readings are not necessarily midnight meter readings

Q3. How material is this issue?

No comment to add

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?

Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?

Issue #7 Interpreting trader ICP switching as customer or embedded generator switching may be misleading

Q3. How material is this issue?

No comment to add

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?

Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	
---	--

<i>Issue #8 There is no mechanism to identify the sale and transfer of customer or embedded generator accounts between traders</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #9 It is unclear whether an acknowledgment of a switch request notification is required</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #10 Different timeframes for different types of ICP switches add complexity to the ICP switching process</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #11 Switch withdrawals can be delayed because of delayed information from third parties</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	Medium
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	No comment to add
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	Timely updates of metering to the Registry.

<i>Issue #12 Different timeframes for applying a meter reading to a NHH ICP switch add complexity to the ICP switching process</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #13 Sometimes switch event meter readings cannot be obtained despite best endeavours</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #14 Preventing losing traders from updating an ICP identifier during a switch can mean the gaining trader is unaware the ICP is electrically disconnected</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #15 The Code is ambiguous as to whether a switch event meter reading is required for certain ICPs with a category 3—5 metering installation</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #16 The replacement read process is inefficient</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

<i>Issue #17 Delays to a trader being assigned a new ICP may delay installing a metering installation at the ICP and electrically connecting the ICP</i>	
--	--

Q3. How material is this issue?	Medium
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	No comment to add
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	Delay in change of status from the Distributor from NEW to READY before Traders and MEP can install metering or issues around 'event dates'

Issue #18 The process for switching ICPs between distributors is inefficient

Q3. How material is this issue?	Low
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	No comment to add
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	Suggest that MEP's be involved of the consent process.

Issue #19 The Code prohibits backdating price category codes

Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

Issue #20 The provision of initial metering data to a trader is not always timely

Q3. How material is this issue?	No comment to add
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	

Issue #21 Meter reading file formats are not standardised

Q3. How material is this issue?	Low
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	No comment to add
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	Create a template for new entrants to use as a guideline but not standardise the format and leave this open for discussion between the Trader and MEP.

Issue #22 The gaining and losing MEPs cannot use the same MEP event date for an MEP switch

Q3. How material is this issue?

Low

Q4. Is this issue getting worse?

No comment to add

Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?

Losing MEP is processing the meter removal details on the Registry when not required.