

Benchmark/benchmark criteria reference	Feedback on benchmark criteria	Feedback on achievement standard
1.1	None	<p>We agree with the flexibility proposed by the Commission.</p> <p>However, some of the proposed achievement standards seem inappropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options (d) and (e) seem onerous, involving relatively high costs for low expected benefit. Contrast the advertising requirements for low user tariffs. • Presentations to community groups could be a reasonable option but (a) more clarity is needed on the meaning of “major”; and (b) annual presentations may not be required. •
1.3	None	<p>We question whether it is cost-effective to have promotional material produced in different languages. BOPE regularly deals with, and supplies energy to, customers who speak little or no English without publishing its written material in different languages.</p>
1.6	This benchmark is vague.	This standard is vague and impractical.

1.7	Nationwide access may not be a requirement for regional based schemes.	<p>We question whether a dedicated 0800 phone number and freepost service are essential for regional schemes.</p> <p>BOPE already operates a 0800 phone number and associated call centre to deal with customer inquiries. Call centre staff are trained to identify and direct complaints to BOPE's complaints manager.</p>
1.8 & 1.11		Although there is no direct charge to complainants who access BOPE's scheme, the costs of the scheme are ultimately met by BOPE's customers.
1.12		Ongoing staff training every 6 months is unnecessary for schemes such as the BOPE scheme because of (a) the low numbers of staff; and (b) the low number of complaints. Staff training will be conducted on an 'as required' basis.
2.3		With one member schemes, it is appropriate for the scheme member to have input into the selection of the complaints adjudicator. However, the member should have no control over the final selection.
2.5		Appointment of scheme staff may not be necessary for regional schemes. There should be the ability for the decision-maker to use suitable temporary resource if required.
2.6, 2.7 & 2.8	We question the need to set up a <i>separate</i> entity to oversee each	Local community and/or consumer trusts and power committees are well placed to provided all

	complaints scheme. First, the Commission has expressed its intention to conduct ongoing monitoring. Second, under the BOPE scheme, the complaints adjudicator is answerable to the Independent Third Party.	necessary independent oversight of schemes such as the BOPE scheme. There is no need to create an new entity for this purpose.
2.9		It is misleading to describe any scheme as self-funding. The reality is that members are required to pay for or contribute to the costs of operating their scheme. Those costs will then be passed through to customers.
4.1	We question the rationale for this benchmark. Decisions will have no precedent value.	
4.2	We question the rationale for this benchmark. However, we agree that there should be a process for requesting confidentiality.	
4.3		This report may contain a very low number of cases and, in some instances, may not be required at all. Since commencement of BOPE's scheme (18 months ago), only one complaint has been considered by the Complaints Adjudicator.
5.11		As with 4.3, the need for reviews will depend on the volume of complaints.
6.2(b)		We question the rationale for setting the jurisdictional cap as high as \$20,000. We note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Disputes Tribunal (a lay disputes resolution system) has a jurisdictional cap of \$7,500. Above that, the legislature has determined that

		<p>disputes must be referred to the District Court. We cannot see any basis for departing from that benchmark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In light of the restrictions on parties using legal representation and the inability to appeal decisions, it is inappropriate to expose members to significant liabilities (over \$7,500). • If the Commission insists on a jurisdictional cap of \$20,000, we consider that the benchmarks will need to be changed to ensure that a more robust (and consequently less accessible) process is in place.
--	--	--