STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

The template below has been developed to enable stakeholders to provide their feedback on the questions posed in this paper and any other issues that they would like to provide feedback on. The AEMC encourages stakeholders to use this template to assist it to consider the views expressed by stakeholders on each issue. Stakeholders should not feel obliged to answer each question, but rather address those issues of particular interest or concern. Further context for the questions can be found in the consultation paper.

SUBMITTER DETAILS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ORGANISATION:** |       |
| **CONTACT NAME:** |       |
| **EMAIL:** |       |
| **PHONE:** |       |

**CHAPTER 3 – The current situation**

QUESTION 1 – Understanding energy bills

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Do you agree with the statement of issues by the proponent, that bills are no longer fit-for-purpose because there are gaps in content, the information is too dense, and the language is too complex? Please explain your view.
 |  |
| 1. If you consider there are issues with billing, do the NERR billing provisions cause or contribute to these issues? Please explain your view with reference to the specific requirements listed in [Table](#_662aa1a6-0404-4e70-b1a2-a679130b6743/_) 3.1.
 |  |
| 1. What other factors also contribute to the billing issues you have identified (e.g. lack of educational tools or campaigns)?
 |  |

QUESTION 2 – Receiving energy bills

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Do you agree there is a need to specify requirements for retailers on how they issue and deliver bills? Please explain your view.
 |  |
| 1. Do you have a view on how best to give effect to the principle of consumer choice driving billing issuance and delivery? Please explain your view.
 |  |

QUESTION 3 – Materiality of the issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Which, if any, parts of a bill are confusing to customers, and how does any confusion affect a customer's ability to engage with the market to better manage their energy?
 |  |
| 1. How do current billing arrangement meet or not meet customer requirements? Please specify whether your comments relate to all customers or specific segments of customers.
 |  |
| 1. Do you have suggested improvements to billing arrangements that address any issues you consider are material? Please explain how your proposed solutions are compatible with the trend towards increasing digitalisation, the move to a two-sided market, and the introduction of the Consumer Data Right in energy.
 |  |

sECTION 5 – RELATED PROJECTS AND RESEARCH

QUESTION 4 – Related projects and research

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Are there other research findings or projects the Commission should consider in making its determination; what are the most relevant research conclusions and project linkages?
 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. What key lessons should the Commission take from good practice regulatory frameworks for bills in comparable Australian sectors, or energy retail markets overseas?
 |  |

**CHAPTER 4 – solutions**

QUESTION 5 – Proposed solution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. To what extent would the proposed solution address the identified problems and their causes, and promote the NERO?
 |  |
| 1. Do you consider the proponent's solution could be modified to be more effective? Please explain your view. Please explain the benefits, costs, risks and implementation issues associated with the proponent's solution.
 |  |

Alternative solutions

QUESTION 6 – Rules-based approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Are there rules-based solutions that the Commission should consider (e.g. filling gaps in rules 25 and 170 of the NERR, a principles-based bill format provision, or using opt-out provisions for information pertaining to certain bill functions)? Please explain (i.e. benefits, costs and risks).
 |  |

QUESTION 7 – Non-rules-based approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Are there non-rules based approaches — such as an industry code, a non-binding guideline or other industry initiatives — that the Commission should consider to address the issues raised by the proponent and their causes? Please explain (i.e. benefits, costs and risks).
 |  |

QUESTION 8 – Hybrid approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Are there hybrid approaches — a suite of rules and non-rules approaches — that the Commission should consider to address the issues raised by the proponent and their causes? Please explain (i.e. benefits, costs, risks, and balance between principles-based and prescription and rules/non-rules)?
 |  |

**CHAPTER 5 – assessment framework**

QUESTION 9 – Assessment framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Is the proposed assessment framework appropriate for considering the rule change request? Are there other considerations that should be included?
 |  |