

Format for submissions: Proposal for a single standardised reporting methodology for EIEP1 and delivery mechanism for EIEP5A

Submitter	Malti Prasad Flick Electric
-----------	--------------------------------

No	Question	Comment
1	Do you agree that in the interests of standardisation and efficiency we should mandate a single standardised EIEP1 reporting methodology for trader to distributor files for NHH ICPs? If not, please provide reasons.	Yes, we agree that in the interests of standardisation and efficiency the EIEP1 reporting methodology should be mandated.
2	If you agree that we should mandate a single standardised EIEP1 reporting methodology for trader to distributor files for NHH ICPs, do you agree that option 1 is the best option to implement. If not, please provide which of the Options 2 or 3 you prefer, and why?	We agree that option 1 which is replacement RM normalised would be the best option to implement as this methodology more closely reflects what customer will actually be billed for the period.
3	As a trader, if you cannot currently provide replacement RM normalised files, please advise the estimated cost and time required to do so.	N/A
4	As a distributor, if your current system does not have the capability to process replacement RM normalised files (including at least a month 3 replacement file), or you have not commenced developing the capability, please advise the estimated cost and time required to do so.	N/A
5	Do you have any comments on the draft mark ups (attached as Appendices A and B) to EIEP1 and EIEP2 reflecting each of the three options?	No
6	If we decide to implement one of the options, do you agree with setting 1 April 2020 as the implementation date, subject to a minimum lead time of 12 months from when we issue the decision paper? If not, please advise what you consider to be a more appropriate implementation date and lead time, and why.	Yes, we agree with this timeframe.
7	Do you agree that in the interests of standardisation and efficiency we should mandate a delivery mechanism for EIEP5A planned service interruption information, instead	We agree for transmission mechanism for EIEP5A to be mandated for efficiency.

	of retaining the status quo? If not, please provide reasons.	
8	If you agree that we should mandate a delivery mechanism, do you agree with our preferred option. If not which of the Options 1, 2 or 4 do you prefer, and why?	We agree with your preferred option.
9	If we mandated a delivery mechanism as for Options 1 to 4, what system costs would you incur? Please list the costs for each option.	Initially there will not be any significant costs attached to the options listed from 1 to 4. However, there would be Technical costs involved once Flick decides to automate their internal process of submitting outage information to the customers. The benefits would outweigh the costs eventually.
10	Do you have any comments on the draft mark ups of EIEP5A reflecting Options 1, 2 and 3?	No
11	Do you have any comments on the draft registry functional specification?	No
12	If we proceed, we intend to provide web services for planned outage information. Would you prefer a new dedicated web services for planned outage information or a new version of icp details with outage information appended? See Appendix C for further information.	We would prefer a new dedicated web services for planned outage information.
13	Do you have any comments on the draft Code changes proposed for Schedule 11.1 reflecting Option 4?	No
14	Do you agree that six to 12 months is sufficient lead time from the time the decision is issued to implement the proposed solution? If not, please advise what you consider to be a more appropriate implementation date and lead time, and why.	We lean towards 12 months being a more realistic timeframe as this gives time to retailers and networks to upgrade their systems if required.
15	Do you agree with the costs and benefits of the proposed amendments? If not, why not	Yes, we agree with costs and benefits. The benefits would outweigh the costs eventually.
16	What are your costs associated with making RM	We already use this methodology so there would be no cost at our

	normalised the single standard reporting methodology for EIEP1? Please provide details.	end for this change.
17	Are there any other costs or benefits we have not identified?	N/A
18	Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? If not, why not?	Yes
19	Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? If not, why not?	Yes
20	Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to the other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objective in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.	Yes
21	If you prefer Option 4 over the other options, do you have any comments on the proposed Code drafting in Appendix D? If yes, please provide details.	N/A
22	Do you agree the Authority's proposed amendments comply with section 32(1) of the Act?	Yes
23	Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment for Option 4?	No