

Question	Response
<p>1. Do you see any problems with the Commission using the Australian Benchmarks consumer complaints resolution schemes? If so, what valuation method should the Commission use?</p>	<p>The six principles espoused in the Australian benchmark for resolution schemes are universally transferable but should be applied to recognise New Zealand conditions; namely the geography, size, population, demographics and psyche of the peoples. The success of the small claims tribunal in dealing with disputes locally, quickly and at low cost and inconvenience should be emulated in the development of any resolution scheme.</p>
<p>2. The suggested level of achievement is to indicate the level at which the Commission believes the benchmark criteria would be met. Is it useful to have a suggested level of achievement for each of the benchmark criteria?</p>	<p>A suggested level of achievement provides a standard against which scheme performance can be assessed and user's satisfaction measured. The complainant's satisfaction with the process is the key indicator of a successful scheme and should be the most significant measure of achievement level.</p>
<p>3. The Commission is seeking comments on the individual benchmark criteria and achievement standards detailed in the table attached as Appendix One:</p> <p>a) Identify benchmark criteria that are not suitable for the evaluation of an electricity consumer complaints resolution scheme. If possible, suggest an alternative;</p> <p>b) Identify achievement standards that are not suitable for the evaluation of an electricity complaints resolution scheme. If possible, identify an alternative; and</p> <p>c) Should any additional benchmark criteria be inserted? If so, what should the additional benchmark criteria specify, and what would the achievement standard be?</p>	<p>Observations on the details of a scheme will be made later in our submission but it is necessary for criteria and standards to reflect local needs and aspirations.</p>
<p>4. Should the Commission approve more than one scheme?</p>	<p>The King Country Electric Power Trust has established a resolution scheme which is independent, readily accessible, speedy and at no cost to consumers. A range of schemes should be permissible that deliver these key attributes and allow local people to solve local issues.</p>
<p>5. If the Commission were to approve more than one scheme, what should be required of each scheme to ensure that consumer confusion is avoided? Are the achievement standards under criteria 6.2(a) sufficient?</p>	<p>In the case of the King Country, geographic topography and separated population centres makes confusion unlikely; however if there is an alternative, then the choice of scheme should rest with the complainant.</p>

<p>6. Is it appropriate that the Commission is able to consider applications that do not meet the level of achievement for each benchmark criterion? That is, should the Commission be able to accept alternative evidence that a benchmark principle is met to an acceptable standard even though individual benchmark criteria are not satisfied as specified by the achievement standards?</p>	<p>As stated earlier, the complainant's satisfaction is the main measure of scheme achievement and if this is being met, there should be flexibility in the benchmark criteria to recognise the successful outcomes of the scheme.</p>
<p>7. Do you have any comments on the performance monitoring process?</p>	<p>Performance monitoring is accepted as necessary but a plea to keep it simple and compliance costs to a minimum is advanced. As the King Country Electric Power Trust is democratically elected and accountable to its consumer/beneficiaries, the pass on to the Electricity Commission of its adjudicator's annual report could provide the basis of reporting requirements.</p>