

Multiple trading relationships: Format for Submission

Submitter	Saveawatt
-----------	-----------

Question		Comment
Q1.	How material are the constraints to consumers establishing multiple trading relationships at a single connection identified above?	-
Q2.	Are there other constraints that prevent multiple trading relationships from efficiently occurring? If so, please describe them.	-
Q3.	What do you consider to be the benefits of multiple trading relationships?	Q3. We support the view that multiple trading relationships, as defined in the paper, can facilitate innovation where cost savings can be demonstrated to consumers. Which in turn can lead to increased consumer engagement.
Q4.	What other services could be enabled by reducing or removing the barriers to multiple trading relationships?	-
Q5.	What changes, if any would be needed to the switching and disconnection/reconnection processes if a consumer were able to have multiple retailers?	-
Q6.	What other data exchange processes that have not been identified in this paper need to be changed to accommodate multiple trading relationships?	Q6. Providing visibility of the switch status would be beneficial to non-participant service providers.
Q7.	How could the data exchange processes be modified to accommodate multiple trading relationships?	-
Q8.	What other services, if any, would have to share costs between multiple users?	-
Q9.	How could the cost of these services be shared amongst multiple users?	-
Q10.	Could consumer data be more efficiently shared with service	Q10. Yes 1. Standardise or confirm the

providers that have a legitimate claim for access to their consumer's data? If so, how?

authorisation protocol so the determination of authorisation is not discretionary to the holder of the information / consumption data.

This will have privacy implications on the holder of this information / consumption data. Such implications could be overcome by the EA either standardising the protocol and amending the Code. Or providing confirmation (either directly or via a gateway to the Privacy Commission) that the service providers' authorisation processes are compliant with the Privacy Act.

2. Alternatively the EA could require an authorisation key like a QR code to be embed in the power bill. Refer United Kingdom processes. Such a process enables the consumer to pass the information (or key to information) to their desired recipient without requiring the independent approval of the information holder.
3. Speed up the process of supplying the information. One would assume all data transfer times will need to speed up to facilitate multiple trading relationships.

Q11. How much value is there in making it easier for appropriately authorised firms to access information such as a consumer's tariff structure, the smart meter functionality that is used by the consumer's MEP, a consumer's controllable appliances?

Q12. Are there other industry participants that may need to amend their systems to operate

Q11. Significant value from a consumer engagement perspective. Without complete information for an end to end service the consumer or interested party is required to independently source the missing information. Such barriers reduce consumer engagement and add to service costs.

	in an environment with multiple trading relationships?	
Q13.	What are the costs of the above changes recognised in questions 10-13?	
Q14.	What other obligations need to change if multiple traders can serve an ICP?	
Q15.	How could the obligations discussed above be amended to accommodate multiple traders at an ICP?	
Q16.	What costs would be involved in amending consumer-related responsibilities to accommodate multiple traders at an ICP?	
Q17.	What additional matters would need to be considered if we were to introduce multiple trading relationships? What amendments would need to be made to the Code to facilitate multiple trading relationships?	
Q18.	What is the cost of the changes needed to enable multiple trading relationships?	