

26 August 2025

Energy Use policy team
Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
Via email: energyuse@mbie.govt.nz

Tēnā koe,

Efficient energy data sharing for consumer benefit

We fully support an electricity consumer data right (CDR) providing a framework for instantaneous transfer and access of data via electronically standardised mechanisms. A data sharing framework will be central to optimise outcomes for consumers in our future energy system, and a CDR in electricity is one component of that framework. We have responded to the questions in the discussion document in the attachment. Our summary views are:

CDR is part of a broader drive to improve data sharing

- We support a CDR as a mechanism to improve data sharing. Streamlined and instantaneous data flow with standardised approaches are a key enabler in New Zealand's future energy system.
- Data systems and uses are complex. Reducing administrative and compliance costs is possible through design of systems, automated responses and integration across regulatory data sharing requirements (including various workstreams in progress).
- While Powerco is not a proposed data holder, we still expect some cost impact as data systems across the energy sector must interact with each other.

CDR proposals are an appropriate response, at least initially

- The proposed scope for an electricity CDR is targeted and relatively confined. It would be beneficial for the regulations to incorporate enough flexibility to adapt. For example, data collected is expected to change quickly, and customer access shouldn't be limited by data that is collected today.
- A focus only on retail electricity with this CDR will be incomplete. While a first step, it misses consumers seeking to manage their total energy and investigate switching across electricity, gas and other energy products such as LPG or flexibility providers.

This submission does not contain any confidential information. If you have any questions regarding this submission or would like to talk further on the points we have raised, please contact Irene Clarke (Irene.Clarke@powerco.co.nz).

Nāku noa, nā,

Emma Wilson



Head of Policy, Regulation and Markets
POWERCO

1. Customer data

1: Do you agree with the proposed scope of customer data? Are there any classes of data missing or that should be excluded?

2: In your view does the proposed scope align sufficiently with the EA's requirements on retailers for data?

3: Does the 100MWh/calendar year eligibility boundary accurately reflect industry practice in relation to business's access to their consumption data? If not, what threshold should be used?

In principle, Powerco supports mechanisms to improve data sharing and customer data is at the core of this. We endorse consumption data scope of half hourly increments, going back 2 years. There is a balance in prescribing the data designated for a CDR, and the expectation that data collected (and relevant) will change over time. For example, 30-minute consumption data is collected currently, but this may change to 5-minute data in the future. While the scope of data, eg 30-minute consumption data, will need to be set in regulation, we encourage the CDR to drive for systems supporting the data sharing to be built with flexibility to change in response to changes in standard data collected.

Data sharing for consumer benefit goes beyond the current electricity system. The proposed scope of the proposal is focused only on electricity, and data is missing on gas or other energy types such as LPG or flexibility providers. Over 310,000 customer network connections in New Zealand are for both electricity and gas. Almost a half of gas connections on the Powerco gas network have smart meters and this will continue to grow as smart gas meters are rolled out. A consumer seeking to manage their energy and/or investigate alternative retail options will be looking at both electricity and gas in the case of over 310,000 homes and businesses in New Zealand. A focus only on retail electricity with this CDR is an important first step, but will be incomplete.

2. Product data

4: Do you agree with the proposed scope for designated product data?

5: Should any product data be excluded or included?

6: Does this proposed designation align sufficiently with requirements from the EA?

7: Do you agree with the decision to exclude data on the full terms of bundling in the initial designation?

We agree with the proposed scope of product data as it will enable product offerings to be compared fairly. We agree with the reference to lines company as it is now clarified as relevant to the extent it is an eligibility criterion for the 'product'. We also reinforce the importance of aligning with EA requirements to avoid unnecessary regulatory cost for many parties involved in the energy system (and ultimately cost to consumers).

3. Data holders

8: Do you agree with the proposed approach to designate data holders?

9: Are there significant issues in excluding social retailers from providing customer data? Should social retailers have a higher threshold before they are required to provide customer data?

The discussion document identifies retailers as the only proposed data holder. This is appropriate as retailers have the most direct access to the data and a consumer's primary relationship is with the retailer. We support the decision to not designate the small group of designated retailers specified as social/not-for profit retailers provide a non-comparable service.

The consultation paper discusses that meter equipment providers (MEPs) may hold more data than retailers but finds that retailers are the more natural location for customers to access their data, and also notes that retailers have data exchange relationships with MEPs. However, the consultation paper does not clarify obligations in a situation whereby a retailer does not hold the designated customer or product data eg 2 years of consumption data. If the MEP or another retailer holds this data, does the data holder then access that data and provide it to the customer? With a system of instantaneous data transfer, this should be a streamlined and efficient process. Clarification of this will ensure a customer is not disadvantaged in their data access due to the fact they have switched retailers.

4. Identifying and verifying customers and their authorisations

Question 10: Do you have a preferred approach to verify customers' identity and consent in the standards?

Question 11: What are the key issues with verifying customers under a digital framework?

Question 12: Are the current methods of verification used by retailers sufficient for a CDR regime?

The proposals are appropriate, and we do not have any further comments.

5. Accredited requestors

13: Do you agree with MBIE's proposed additional requirements for accredited requestors?

14: Are the additional requirements a material barrier to participation by potential accredited requestors?

15: Are there any additional requirements for accredited requestors that should be designated?

16: Do you agree with the obligation to on-board accredited requestors within five working days of a request being made?

The proposed additional accreditation requirements are appropriate and should not be onerous. We consider dispute resolution processes and insurance as standard expectations, not a barrier.

There should be scope for existing energy sector participants with verified status and scrutiny to be confirmed as accredited requestors without the full application and vetting process. For example, the regulations could confirm that all electricity 'data holders', all energy retailers, MEPs and distributors are deemed to be accredited requestors. The compliance costs and time for both applicants and the regulator could be avoided for those parties known to meet the criteria (eg due to existing regulatory requirements) and known to be a relevant accredited requestor.

Although there may be other options for data access, EDBs may look to access customer data through CDR, eg consumption data to be used for ICP based pricing. As an accredited requestor, the distributor could then work with a customer or group of customers on individual pricing. This aligns with government workstreams to develop the future system operation for New Zealand's electricity system.

The discussion document does not clarify if data requests are on an individual customer basis only or may be for bulk data access (with the customers authorisation). While the focus is on enabling individual customers to realise the value of their data, there would also be customer benefit in some accredited requestors, including EDBs, having broader access to data through the CDR for purposes directly related to their core customer line services – network planning and pricing.

6. Fees

17: Is the proposed fee structure reasonable to both consumers and data holders?

18: Should any groups be exempt from paying fees?

We support a CDR approach for data sharing that provides free access to data for the customer, as they have already paid for the data collection through their retail charges. With instantaneous and automatic data sharing, fees for individual requests should not be relevant. We query the need for a limit on the number of requests.

7. Dispute resolution

19: Do you agree with MBIEs proposal for designating Utilities Disputes Limited as the designated disputes provider?

We support designating Utilities Disputes Limited for efficiency and consistency within the sector.

8. Costs

20: Can you quantify the costs associated with each of these sets of costs?

21: What other costs are there, in any?

As Powerco will not be a designated data holder, there are no direct costs expected. However, energy sector data systems are established, at least in part, to meet existing regulatory requirements, including those for both retailers and distributors. And all data systems must 'talk' to each other for automated registry data exchange. Therefore, there may be consequential impacts for energy sector participants who are not data holders. Our own data system is now outdated and will require significant upgrading to meet changing expectations in data exchange.

The best approach to minimising ongoing operation and compliance costs is to ensure that the regulatory requirements are fully automated, instantaneous and standardised. Implementing new data systems will initially take time and will need to align with Code/registry changes in progress by the Electricity Authority. Sector alignment is important. Using the electricity registry may be the most efficient option for the sector, and we strongly discourage any new system which would duplicate the registry.

Ultimately, consumers will pay for any implementation of a CDR. The systems and resourcing for data management are complex and costly. The costs need to be further assessed to understand the scale of cost of CDR vs other mechanisms for data sharing and compare to customer benefit. It may be difficult to attribute costs just to CDR vs other drivers for systems and data changes. This is an area where it is important for MBIE to work with the Electricity Authority on related data proposals, and liaise with the sector on options and efficiencies.