

## Appendix A Format for submissions

A.1 Please complete the table below for each proposed amendment on which you wish to submit. Please include the reference number from the first row of the table in Appendix B).

Reference	2019-01 Revised timeframe for distributors to change price category code information in the registry
<b>Question 1: Do you agree with the Authority's problem definition? If not, why not?</b>	
Problem 1: Agree that a certain level of backdating is acceptable.	
<b>Question 2: Do you agree with the Authority's proposed solution? If not, why not?</b>	
<p>The proposed solution states:</p> <p><i>(aa) in the case of a change to the information provided under clause 7(1)(g) that is intended to take effect from a date earlier than the date on which the distributor and the trader responsible for the ICP agree on the change, no later than 3 business days after the distributor and the trader responsible for the ICP agree the date on which the change takes effect; and</i></p> <p>The solution states that the retailer and distributor have to agree on the date of backdating but is silent on what happens if agreement cannot be reached. Agreement generally means a two-way negotiation. In our view price plan changes should preferably be a one-way negotiation, i.e. a "request -&gt; accept/decline" model.</p>	
<b>Question 3: Do you have any comments on the Authority's proposed Code drafting?</b>	
<p>We propose the following change to the proposed solution:</p> <p><i>8(2)(aa) in the case of a change to the information provided under clause 7(1)(g), then no later than 3 business days after the change takes effect, unless the trader responsible for the ICP has proposed an earlier date for the change to take effect and the distributor responsible for the ICP has accepted; and</i></p>	
<b>Question 4: Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? If not, why not?</b>	

Agree with the objective, but the proposal is not clear on the resolution if the distributor and retailer do not agree. It should not allow unnecessary backdating, e.g. retailers not changing price plans in an efficient manner but then expecting agreement on backdating. This poses a revenue risk to a distributor.

**Question 5: Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? If not, why not?**

It is not clear that the benefits outweigh the cost as the proposal contains an open-ended potential backdating of price plans, posing a revenue risk. As an example, in our case a retailer requested backdating price plans for over a 100 ICPs' for months back. If the proposed Code change was in operation it would have meant that as the distributor, we would have had to backdate or not agree. If we did not agree, what was the next step. In our view, there is no reason for the retailer in this example not to request the correct price plan in the prescribed time.

It is understandable that there is a need to backdate if the error is on the distributor's side or if the consumer has requested the change.

**Question 6: Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to the other options? If not, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objective in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010.**

We propose the following change to the proposed solution:

*8(2)(aa) in the case of a change to the information provided under clause 7(1)(g), then no later than 3 business days after the change takes effect, unless the trader responsible for the ICP has proposed an earlier date for the change to take effect and the distributor responsible for the ICP has accepted; and*