

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

Submitter	Nathan Astwood, Analyst, nathan.astwood@alpineenergy.co.nz Alpine Energy
-----------	--

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
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?	Option 1
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.	Our system currently has the capability to process ICPMMNM and ICPMMRM
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?	None

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
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 of retaining the status quo? If not, please provide reasons.	As per the previous submission in 2017 our position on making EIEP5A mandatory was strongly opposed by us. With the decision to make EIEP5A a regulated EIEP, we agree with mandating a delivery mechanism
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?	Option 1. Closely aligned with our existing systems and processes
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.	Approximately \$4000 for each option
10	Do you have any comments on the draft mark ups of EIEP5A reflecting Options 1, 2 and 3?	None
11	Do you have any comments on the draft registry functional specification?	None
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.	Would not prefer a new dedicated web service. If reports can be extracted from the Registry and/or fields in the Registry have such information this is sufficient.
13	Do you have any comments on the draft Code changes proposed for Schedule 11.1 reflecting Option 4?	None
14	Do you agree that six to 12 months is sufficient lead time	Should be adequate 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.	
15	Do you agree with the costs and benefits of the proposed amendments? If not, why not?	Yes we agree
16	What are your costs associated with making RM normalised the single standard reporting methodology for EIEP1? Please provide details.	N/A
17	Are there any other costs or benefits we have not identified?	None
18	Do you agree with the objectives of the proposed amendment? If not, why not?	Agree with the MEP's having access to such information in order to better plan compliance work and deployments.
19	Do you agree the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh its costs? If not, why not?	Questionable. Unsure if it is. We see it as an addition to our existing processes and procedures with questionable benefit and additional cost.
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 we agree
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 we agree
23	Do you have any comments on the drafting of the proposed amendment for Option 4?	Very happy that the EIEP's are constantly reviewed, happy with the improvements being considered