

	Suggested change	Detail	Commission's response	Development Priority level †	Rule change required
1	EnergyHedge contracts	This was discussed at the first workshop. Participants are still eager to see data uploaded directly from EnergyHedge to the Commission's proposed system (System) to remove the need for verification in both systems.	The proposed rules do not preclude participants from automatically uploading and verifying EnergyHedge contracts. This can be achieved by participants making arrangements with the Wholesale Information and Trading System (WITS) provider. It will still be necessary for such automated systems to meet the requirements set out in the rules. Obligations to meet such requirements will still rest with participants.	4 (already possible under the current arrangement)	N
2	Ability for non-participants to opt out of receiving verification emails	This was also discussed at the first workshop. Participants do not see the benefit of non-participants receiving verification emails.	<p>The Commission wants to ensure that non-participants are not overburdened by the requirements of the proposed rules. However, the Commission must balance this with the objective of the verification process which is to improve the validation of the data within the system and improve awareness amongst parties. The Commission considers that it is important that all non-participants be given the opportunity to verify the contract details and to ensure this happens the Commission considers that the choice to opt out of verification should be issued by WITS rather than via the seller (which may forget to advise of this choice or for any other reason fail to do so).</p> <p>To address the original concern of a burden on non-participants, the following features will be recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing grouping by Grid Zone Area (this means sellers have the opportunity to reduce the number of emails sent to non-participants per deal to five, irrespective of the complexity of 	4	N

† 1 = Almost certain to be incorporated into the System prior to the new rules being recommended, 2 = Good idea, but less likely to be incorporated prior to the new rules being recommended, 3 = To be considered for future enhancement after the System go-live and the proposed new rules have come into effect, 4 = Not being progressed or no change required

	Suggested change	Detail	Commission's response	Development Priority level †	Rule change required
			<p>the contracts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clicking on any one of those links will allow the non-participant to review the information for all elements of the contract • Clear information within the email stressing that verification is voluntary • Information within the WITS verification page that the non-participant can withdraw without having to verify • Provide information that can be shared with the non-participant at the time the contract is struck to explain the process • Provide links to additional information when the non-participant receives the email on the verification process 		
3	Verification emails	The verification emails contain a 'one use only' link. Parties who click on the link the first time to see the details but need to go back later for verification can no longer use that link.	The Commission has suggested making the following change to the System: The second time that the link is clicked, parties would be re-directed to a page where they can 'reset' the link to be used once more. Another email with a new 'one use only' link would be sent out to the same email address.	1	N
4	Explanation of entry fields on screen		The Commission supports this suggestion. An online help will be available.	1	N
5	"trade date" definition	Participants commented that for some contracts, there could be a long period between the date a contract is signed and	Currently the timeframe for submitting contract information is 5 business days after the trade date for all contract types. The Commission will amend this timeframe in the recommendation to 10 business days for contracts other than contracts for differences or options contracts, thereby allowing more time for participants to lodge contract information into the System. The Commission believes this	1	Y

	Suggested change	Detail	Commission's response	Development Priority level †	Rule change required
		the date it is entered into a participant's recording database. Participants therefore suggested that the definition of "trade date" could be amended to be the date the contract ID was recorded in a participant's recording database.	would strike a balance between having sufficient time to lodge contract information and allowing too much time between the date that the contract was signed and the date that the contract is recorded in participants' recording database.		
5	Explanation of calculated contract prices	For example, load weighted versus average etc.	If the recommended rules are made, this would be further explained in an information sheet to be published. An example was also included within the spreadsheet that was emailed to workshop attendees earlier.	1	N
6	Change "\$" to "\$/MW" for contract price		The Commission supports this change.	1	N
7	Warning messages for non-verified contracts	Participants would like to be notified when contracts have not been verified by counterparties.	The Commission supports this suggestion.	1	N
8	Change default value of "Party Role" field	Currently the default value of "Party Role" field is "buyer". Since parties entering the	The Commission supports this change.	1	N

	Suggested change	Detail	Commission's response	Development Priority level †	Rule change required
		contracts would almost always be sellers, it is easy to have this field default to "seller".			
9	M-co Electricity Price Index	Currently, some Participants provide information to M-co to produce a fixed price index. Participants question the need for further providing this information after the System goes live.	M-co has agreed that the index would not be published further once the System goes live.	N/A	N/A
10	A map showing grid zone areas		The Commission supports this suggestion.	1	N
11	Graphing of contract information		The HMDSG originally advised against the Commission providing detailed graphing or analysis of the contract details. The HMDSG suggested this kind of analysis should be provided by independent operators and/or participants. The Commission considers there may be value in adding some high level graphing capability, but believes consideration of adding this functionality to the System should be considered as a post go-live enhancement.	3	N