

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

Submitter	Powerco
-----------	---------

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.	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?	Agree
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.	Capability already exists within our systems
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 comments
6	If we decide to implement one of the options, do you	Agree

	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.	
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.	Agree
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?	Agree with preferred, all of the options have minor impacts on us as distributors as the file produced has the same data
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.	Minor impact on costs of the options as the costs are driven by the change to an automated file, we had previously estimated this at \$30-40k.
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.	No preference
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 from the time the decision is issued to implement the	Yes 12 months gives us sufficient time to implement the changes

	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?	Agree