Code review programme #7 submission form

Please complete and return this form to provide feedback on Code review programme #7.

Submissions are due by 5.00pm Tuesday 9 June 2026 to distribution.feedback@ea.govt.nz with 'Code review programme #7 consultation' in the subject line.

Code amendment proposal

Submitter	**Bluecurrent** Contact: **Joseph Taylor,** Compliance Manager Joseph.Taylor@bluecurrent.co.nz and/or **Scott Caldwell**, ATH Manager Scott.Caldwell@bluecurrent.co.nz
Organisation	**Bluecurrent**
Proposal number	**CRP7-006** Require action when insufficient load to certify metering

Questions	Comments
Q1. Do you agree the issue(s) identified by the Authority need attention? Any comments?	**No.** Bluecurrent does not consider proposed amendment CRP7-006 to be warranted. While the intent of this proposal is commendable, it does not recognise the wider context and current difficulties associated with insufficient load certification, which can result in adverse/unintended consequences. Some cases could result in unnecessary disconnections, which are not in the long-term interest of consumers. Insufficient load is not always a testing or purely testing issue; for example, it can be an indication that the site's metering no longer suits its actual usage. Repeated visits or creating artificial load may enable certification, but they can also mask more fundamental problems such as oversized CTs or a metering configuration that is no longer appropriate. In some instances, addressing the cause of insufficient load could require action/cooperation from parties other than, or in addition to, the MEP and/or retailer – which is not provided for under current arrangements. While we acknowledge that proposed amendment CRP7-006 can drive action, it does not clearly address when/if insufficient load should trigger a reassessment of
Q2. Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? Any comments?	
Q3. Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? Any comments?	

Questions	Comments
	the installation, redesign of the metering, or customer action to resolve the underlying issue. We propose an alternative approach in this submission. **Context to insufficient load** Proposed amendment CRP7-006 does not take into account the underlying issues that can result in insufficient load certification or be caused by the use of this certification. Insufficient load certification can result from any of the following circumstances: • The full site load (which can exceed the required limit) is not available at the time of testing. This is often caused by the load being intermittent or timed to specific times of the day (e.g. in the case of EV chargers or life services lifts). • There is not enough actual consumption to reach the required limits, which is often associated with new installations where load is being added in stages over time, or change of site usage over the years. • This can be the result of over-designed specification for contingency or future proofing, resulting in the metering installation having a larger capacity than the actual or likely future requirements. The use of insufficient load certification, as currently set out in the *Electricity Industry Participation Code* (the Code), has several unintended negative consequences with regards to fitness for purpose: • There is no specified maximum duration for insufficient load certification, so it is possible for the site to never achieve the minimum required current for the total duration of its category certification period (5 years for Cat 5 meters, and 10 years for Cat 2 and 3). There is no Code requirement to monitor or limit this. • Recertification of an existing site may result in insufficient load certification when the site usage has changed, masking the need to assess fitness for purpose of the metering installation. • For higher metering categories, there can be substantial loads that do not achieve the minimum current requirements for the installed CTs (2000/5 standard CTs have a minimum 5% of 100A). This can result in substantial consumption that is outside the calibrated range of the CTs. An approach used by some MEPs to avoid insufficient load certification is to require the Approved Test House (ATH) to use an external load brought by the metering technician to

Questions	Comments
	supplement site load to reach the required level of current. This is appropriate for new installations where there is a valid expectation of additional load in the future, but not so much for an existing site (10+ years old) where the load profile may have changed to lower levels and not likely to return (e.g. factory converted to warehouse), again masking fitness for purpose issues. A common issue when looking at fitness for purpose due to insufficient load of existing sites is that the issue may be transitory (e.g. the site is in between tenants or there is a likely reinvestment), or could be long-term. • The Code does not provide any guidance on suitable timeframes or materially relevant values of consumption to aid in assessing fitness for purpose or setting expectations with retailers and end customers. • The Code does not have any provisions on customer requirements to meet their obligations to invest in changes to the site installations to enable changes in metering (CT to whole current conversion, down time to change CTs, etc). • Sites may have varying needs over time, often depending on the tenants (may start as industrial, changed to warehousing, converted to commercial, and then back to industrial over a course of 50 years). This potentially requires the site metering to be changed several times (cost) to maintain fitness for purpose. **Issue 1**: There is no guidance in the Code regarding obligations or processes relating to changes in the nature of a site over time. **Issue 2**: The current Code requires a return visit within 20 days any time sufficient load is identified in the raw data but does not provide any guidance on, or allowance for, determining the context of the detected increase in load. • Detected increase in load could be an isolated result such as a cold winter's day that aligns with peak production. While the site may have the ability to reach sufficient load, normal operations might not make it available on demand. • Load may only be present at specific times of the day or even month and may not occur again within the required 20-day limit set by the Code. • There is no requirement to identify any patterns of occurrence and convey this information to the ATH. • Certain types of load would require the provision of enabling items/assets such as EV cars for EV chargers.

Questions	Comments
	• Certain load types are inherently intermittent and unable to maintain consistent 30-minute loads (e.g. lifts). **Issue 3**: Addition of load or artificially running total site capacity for certification does not always reflect normal site load profile. It is not uncommon for a site to be operating at below minimum current requirements most of the time.
Q4. Do you agree the proposed amendment is preferable to any other options? If you disagree, please explain your preferred option in terms consistent with the Authority's statutory objectives in section 15 of the Electricity Industry Act 2010. Q5. Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment?	**No.** Bluecurrent does not consider the proposed amendment to be preferable to other options. **Response to proposed amendment and propositions** As indicated in our response to Q1 – Q3, proposed amendment CRP7-006 does not recognise the wider context and current difficulties associated with insufficient load certification: • The retailer does not necessarily have the ability to assess the data or ask the right questions of the end customer. • The load type may make it impossible to perform the testing (due to intermittent load or specific circumstances). Provisions need to be made in the Code on how to deal with these circumstances. • Electrical disconnection seems to be an extreme response, which indicates the lack of full certification to be a critical issue. Yet, the proposed Code amendment is silent on the possibility of the site being low load certified for the full period of the category certification (10 years for Cat 2 and 3, and 5 years for Cat 4). We consider the proposed amendment to be a disproportionate response. **Proposition 1**: If it is intended that electrical disconnection is to be used as a deterrent against insufficient load (to complete testing), this should be provided its own clause (referred to in various clauses of the Code) as a fall-back option for retailers when dealing with any end customer issues. End customer (or third party or customer site) issues could include: failure to upgrade switchboard to enable metering, failure to provide access to site for metering purposes, failure to enable/invest in required changes to metering to make the site fit for purpose – with an appropriate escalation process. **Proposition 2**: To address the current challenges identified above and in our response to Q1 – Q3, we propose that the Code provide the following:

Questions	Comments
	• A clear definition of insufficient load levels and how these are determined (minimum current limit is the lowest calibration point for the CTs) • A defined time limit for insufficient load certification, depending on current/expected consumption levels (material limits) and age of site • A definition of “fit for purpose” that takes into account specific metering-related circumstances: new vs existing, awaiting new tenants, change of site usage, and defined material limits for consumption against which to assess fitness • Potentially, a register of uncertified (at risk) consumption, and recognition that CT metering inherently has a band of certified measurement and a band of uncertified measurement • MEP re-assessment if the metering installation is fit for purpose upon certain triggers (repeat visits, exceeding defined time limit with insufficient load) • A process for dealing with intermittent or conditional loads (e.g. for EV charges, lifts) which could require special dispensation • A process for dealing with inability to provide sufficient load. **Proposition 3:** In addition, we suggest the following modifications to the Code: • The retailer must assess if it is possible to provide the required load on demand or not (Load type classification). • Any information from the retailer on when to attend a site must include a time agreed with the end customer and appropriate site contact. • Any penalty relating to electrically disconnecting a site should have a defined escalation process and ability for the end customer to respond.
Q6. Do you have any further comments on the proposal?	We strongly urge the Authority to consider the alternative approach we propose in this submission – to avoid any unintended consequences that are not in the long-term benefit of consumers. We are happy to discuss with the Authority any aspects of this submission.
Q7. Is any part of your submission confidential? If yes, please explain which part, why it is confidential and provide a publishable replacement	No. We are happy for this submission to be published in its entirety.

Questions	Comments
(refer paragraphs 1.10 to 1.12 of the consultation paper).	