

Responses to questions

The Energy Use Policy team welcomes your feedback on as many sections as you wish to respond to; please note you do not need to answer every question.

Status quo and problem definition	
1.	<p>What are your experiences of accessing consumer and product data for electricity under the status quo?</p> <p>.</p>
2.	<p>Do you agree with our summation of the status quo and problem definition? Is anything missing or incorrect in your view? And please provide any evidence you may have to support your views.</p> <p>.</p>
3.	<p>Do you think that regulatory options are necessary to unlock better access to customer and product data?</p> <p>Yes, the level of coordination necessary for a CDR to operate effectively is not possible in a competitive market.</p>
4.	<p>What do you consider to be the likely outcomes for access to customer and product data in the absence of a CDR for electricity?</p> <p>.</p>
What a consumer data right for electricity could look like	
5.	<p>Who else may be impacted by a designation of the electricity sector? Should particular groups or classes of entities be explicitly included or excluded from a potential designation?</p> <p>.</p>

6.	What customer data do you think is the most important? And what else (now or in the future) would be important? And why? What are the benefits from consumers having ready access to this data?
	<p>We consider that metering data and product data is the most important data for customers.</p> <p>We do not consider that the other data considered in the consultation paper is necessary to meet the purpose of the CDR.</p>
7.	If access to customer data is designated for all consumers (residential, small business, large business and large consumers) what are the potential benefits, risks or costs associated with each type of customer? And why?
	We do not consider that this regime is appropriate for large businesses and customers. These customers are usually on bespoke plans and are provided detailed information on their usage. We do not consider that they are well suited to a CDR designed with smaller consumers in mind.
8.	What product data do you think is the most important? And what else (now or in the future) could be important? And why? What are the benefits from this data?
	We consider that product data should be aligned with the data collected by the Electricity Authority under their proposed expansion of retail data information disclosure. This will avoid duplication and unnecessary costs by having two datasets for a similar purpose.
9.	Are there any other issues with product data we should be aware of? And why? Please provide examples.
	As above, we consider product data should be aligned with the data produced for the Electricity Authority.
10.	What factors should be considered when identifying who the best data holder is under a potential CDR regime? And how might contracting agreements affect the application of a CDR in regard to data holders? (e.g., contracts between metering equipment providers and retailers to share data).
	We are comfortable that in most cases the retailer is the appropriate party to be identified as the data holder.
11.	Do you agree with our initial framework for how to identify/designate data holders? Why or why not?

	.
12.	What actions could be designated for electricity under a CDR? And why? What are the potential benefits from these? Please provide examples.
	We agree with MBIE that no actions should be designated. The actions considered have substantial overlap with the work undertaken by the Electricity Authority, and risk having two regulatory regimes attempting to do the same role.
Potential benefits and risks	
13.	What are your thoughts on the potential impacts of a designation on the interests of consumers? Are there any specific benefits that are likely to be enabled with designation? What is the likely scale of the benefits, and over what timeframe would they occur?
	.
14.	Do you have any comments on the specific interests of different types of consumers, such as, residential, business, industrial, rural, Māori, or other groups of consumers?
	.
15.	What are your views on the nature and scale of costs/benefits? Who would these costs/benefits apply to and when?
	As noted above we do not consider that the proposed regime is sufficiently defined to assess costs and benefits.
16.	Would you be able to quantify potential additional costs to your organisation associated with designation under the Bill?
	As noted above we do not consider that the proposed regime is sufficiently defined to assess costs and benefits.

17.	Do you have any comments on the benefits and risks to security, privacy, confidentiality, or other sensitivity or customer data and product data?
	Privacy concerns largely relate to the role of accredited requestors, and how customer consent is recorded and kept up to date. We consider the complexity of this regime is such that its benefits and costs should be assessed separately from the benefits and costs of providing a customers own data.
18.	Are there any risks from the designation to intellectual property rights in relation to customer data or product data?
	We consider this unlikely, but we cannot yet say as 'metered data' is not yet sufficiently defined.
Other aspects of a potential designation	
19.	What do you consider to be important if designing an accreditation regime for the sector?
	We consider that it will be complex for a retailer to verify that an accredited requestor has up to date consent. We encourage MBIE to work with the industry to design this system in a safe way that does not add unnecessary cost.
20.	What are your views on fees for requests for customer electricity data under the Bill? If fees are charged, what limits or restrictions should be placed on fees? Do you have any comments on the costs and benefits of the various options?
	We agree that a customer should have free access to their own data. If accredited requestors are included in the regime it will impose significant additional cost on retailers. We consider it appropriate for retailers to be able to recover those costs from accredited requestors. Without this, accredited requestors will be free riding, and the costs of the service they provide will not be economically efficient.
21.	Are there any particular considerations for electricity that should be taken into account for a consumer consenting process?
	At this stage we are not aware of any particular complexities for electricity compared to other sectors such as banking.
22.	Do you think that standards should be led by industry, by government or co-led? What is the role of industry in developing standards? And why?

	We strongly support a co-led approach.
23.	How do you believe a CDR and the Code could/could not work together?
	It is important that wherever possible the CDR is aligned with the Code, and the data requested is in a similar format to avoid unnecessary costs.
General Comments:	